## NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

April 14, 2006
TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Mara Ulloa, Plan Amendment Program Specialist
SUBJECT: Washington County Plan Amendment
DLCD File Number 001-06
The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. Due to the size of amended material submitted, a complete copy has not been attached.
A copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures*

## DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: April 28, 2006

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review 45 days prior to adoption. Pursuant to ORS $197.830(2)(b)$ only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { *NOTE: } \begin{array}{l}
\text { THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION } \\
\text { WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE } \\
\text { BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAN IT WAS MAILED } \\
\text { TO DLCD. AS A RESULT YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER } \\
\text { THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED. }
\end{array} .=\text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Cc: Doug White, DLCD Community Services Specialist Gary Fish, DLCD Regional Representative Aisha Willits, Washington County
<paa> ya/ <br> \title{
LCD NOTICE OF ADOPTION <br> \title{
LCD NOTICE OF ADOPTION <br> This form must be received by DLCD within 5 working days after the final decision <br> per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18 <br> (See reverse side for submittal requirements)
}


Describe how the adopted amendment differs from the proposed amendment. If it is the same, write "SAME." If you did not give notice for the proposed amendment, write "N/A/."
SAME

| Plan Map Changed from: | NRA | to: | N/A <br> Zone Map Changed from: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | N/A | to: | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |

Location: Generally south of Kemmer Rd. and east of Grabhorn Rd. Acres involved: Approx. 231

Specified Change in Density: Previous: N/A New: N/A

Applicable Statewide Planning Goals: $\quad 1,2,3,5,8,14$

| Is an Exception Proposed? | Yes: $\square$ | No: $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Was an Exception Adopted? | Yes: $\square$ | No: $\boxtimes$ |

DLCD No:

$$
\frac{001-06}{(14977)}
$$

Did the Department of Land Conservation and Development receive a notice a Proposed Amendment FORTY-FIVE (45) days prior to the first evidentiary hearing?

| Yes: | $\boxtimes$ | No: $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes: $\square$ | No: $\square$ |  |
| Yes: $\square$ | No: $\square$ |  |

Affected State and Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts:
Washington County, Metro

Local Contact: Aisha Willits, Associate Planner
Area Code + Phone Number: 503-846-3961
Address: Washington County DLUT, 155 N First Avenue, Suite 350-14
City: $\qquad$ Zipcode + 4: $\quad$ 97124-3072
Email Address: Aisha_willits@co.washington.or.us

## ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

## This form must be mailed to DLCD within 5 working davs after the final decision <br> per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18

1. Send this Form and TWO (2) Copies of the Adopted Amendment to :

## ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT 635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150 SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540

2. Submit TWO (2) copies of the adopted material, if copies are bound, please submit TWO (2) complete copies of documents and maps.
3. Please Note: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD no later than FIVE (5) working days following the date of the final decision on the amendment.
4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.
5. The deadline to appeal will be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within TWENTY-ONE (21) days of the date, the "Notice of Adoption" is sent to DLCD.
6. In addition to sending the "Notice of Adoption" to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.
7. Need More Copies? You can copy this form on to $81 / 2 \times 11$ inch green paper only; or call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax you request to (503) 378-5518; or email your request to Larry.French@state.or.us - ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.

## AGENDA

## WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Public Hearing - First Reading and Public Hearing -<br>Agenda Category: Land Use \& Transportation; County Counsel (All CPOs)<br>Agenda Title: PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 653 - AN ORDINANCE<br>AMENDING THE ALOHA-REEDVILLE-COOPER MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY PLAN AND THE RURAL/NATURAL RESOURCE PLAN RELATING TO ADOPTION OF THE COOPER MOUNTAIN MASTER PLAN AND APPLYING THE STATE AND REGIONAL PARK OVERLAY DISTRICT TO THE COOPER MOUNTAIN NATURAL AREA

Presented by: $\quad$ Brent Curtis, Planning Division Manager, Dan Olsen, County Counsel

## SUMMARY (Attach Supporting Documents if Necessary)

Ordinance No. 653 proposes to amend the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan to adopt the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and to apply the State and Regional Park Overlay District to the rural properties within the 231-acre Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Text amendments are proposed for the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan to describe the area of the park that is within the urban growth boundary and the community plan boundary (approximately 89 acres). Policy 24 , Recreation, of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan would be amended to provide a description of both the existing state park, north of Highway 26 near Banks, as well as the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan would be amended to update the state park map and to add the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and apply the State and Regional Park Overlay to the rural properties included in the Cooper Mountain Natural Area.

On March 15, 2006, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the ordinance. The Planning Commission's recommendation will be included in the staff report, which will be provided to the Board prior to the April 4, 2006 hearing. Copies of the report will also be available at the Clerk's desk prior to the hearing.

- Consistent with Board policy about public testimony, testimony about the ordinance is limited to three minutes for individuals and twelve minutes for a representative of a group.


## DEPARTMENT'S REQUESTED ACTION:

Read Ordinance No. 653 by title only and conduct the public hearing. At the conclusion of the public hearing, adopt Ordinance No. 653.

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION:

I concur with the requested action.


BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON

An Ordinance Amending the Washington County Rural/Natural Resource Plan and Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan Elements of the Comprehensive Plan Relating to adoption of the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and applying the State and Regional Park Overlay District to the Cooper Mountain Master Plan

The Board of County Commissioners of Washington County, Oregon, ordains:
SECTION 1
A. The Board of County Commissioners of Washington County, Oregon, recognizes that the Rural/Natural Resource Plan (Volume III) was readopted with amendments, by way of Ordinance No, 307 , with portions subsequently amended by Ordinance Nos. $342,383,411,412,458,459,462,480,482,499,539,547,572,574$, $578,588,598,606,609,615,628,630,631,637,648$ and 649.
B. The Board of County Commissioners of Washington County, Oregon, recognizes that the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan was adopted by Ordinance Nos. 263 and 265 and amended by Ordinance Nos. 292, 294, 344, 367, 418, $420,471,480,551,588,610,615,620$ and 649.
C. Subsequent ongoing planning efforts of the County indicate a need for changes to the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan to adopt the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and to apply the State and

Regional Park Overlay District to the rural portion of the Park. The Board takes note that such changes are necessary for the benefit of the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of Washington County, Oregon.
D. Under the provisions of Washington County Charter Chapter X, the Land Use Ordinance Advisory Commission has carried out its responsibilities, including preparation of notices, and the County Planning Commission has conducted one or more public hearings on the proposed amendments and has submitted its recommendations to the Board. The Board finds that this Ordinance is based on that recommendation and any modifications made by the Board, as a result of the public hearings process.
E. The Board finds and takes public notice that it is in receipt of all matters and information necessary to consider this Ordinance in an adequate manner, and that this Ordinance complies with the Statewide Planning Goals, and the standards for legislative plan adoption, as set forth in Chapters 197 and 215 of the Oregon Revised Statutes, the Washington County Charter, and the Washington County Community Development Code. SECTION 2

The following exhibits, attached and incorporated herein by reference, are hereby adopted as amendments to the designated documents as follows:
(A) Exhibit 1 (2 pages) amends the Cooper Mountain Area subarea text of the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan;
(B) Exhibit 2 (4 pages) amends the Summary Findings and Conclusions section of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan Policy 24, Recreation, including replacing the State and Regional Park Overlay District map for the Stub

Stewart Memorial State Park located in Appendix fof the Rural/Natural Resource Plan (Exhibit 2, Page 2), adding the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and State and Regional Park Overlay District map to Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan (Exhibit 2, Page 3), and adding the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and State and Regional Park Overlay District map to Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan (Exhibit 2, Page 4); and
(C) Exhibit 3 (109 pages) amends Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan to incorporate the Cooper Mountain Master Plan, dated November 2005.

## SECTION 3

All other Comprehensive Plan provisions that have been adopted by prior ordinance, which are not expressly amended or repealed herein, shall remain in full force and effect.

## SECTION 4

All applications received prior to the effective date shall be processed in accordance with ORS 215.427 (2005 Edition).

## SECTION 5

If any portion of this Ordinance, including the exhibits, shall for any reason be held invalid or unconstitutional by a body of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby and shall remain in full force and effect, and any provision of a prior land use ordinance amended or repealed by the stricken portion of this Ordinance shall be revived and again be considered in full force and effect.

## SECTION 6

The Office of County Counsel and Department of Land Use and Transportation are authorized to prepare planning documents to reflect the changes adopted under Section 2 of this Ordinance, including deleting and adding textual material and maps, renumbering pages or sections, and making any technical changes not affecting the substance of these amendments as necessary to conform to the Washington County Comprehensive Plan format.

## SECTION 7

This Ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after adoption.
ENACTED this $\quad 4+h$ day of Anrit , 2006, being the first reading and $f$ irst public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners of Washington County, Oregon.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON:


READING
First April 4, 2006


PUBLIC HEARING
$\qquad$ April 4: 2006
Second $\qquad$


Third $\qquad$


Fourth $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Fifth $\qquad$
Sixth $\qquad$ Vote: Aye: Brian: Duyck; Rogers. Leeper
Recording Secretary: $\qquad$ Date: April 4, 2006

Page 4 - ORDINANCE 653

The Cooper Mountain Area subarea text of the Aloha - Reedville - Cooper Mountain Community Plan is amended to reflect the following:

## COOPER MOUNTAIN AREA

This is generally a lower density residential area south of the Farmington Road corridor. It includes Cooper Mountain and areas around its base, as well as the majority of Jenkins Estate, a facility operated by Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD). It is bounded on the east by Beaverton and on the south by the Regional Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Several major streets traverse the area, including 155th, 170th and 185th Avenues, and Hart, Bany, 175th Ave. (Reusser Rd.) and Rigert Roads. Other roads on the east flank of the mountain, including Nora/Beard, Satterberg and Weir Road, are planned for improvement, realignment or extension.

In 2002, Metro expanded the UGB to include approximately 509 acres south of Gassner Road. The predominant land use of this area is single family residences on small acreage, as well as agricultural and forestry uses. The southeast corner of the area includes property Metro purchased through its Greenspaces Program, which will be developed in accordance with the master plan created for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area some-time in the future consistent with its-Greenspaces Program. The properties in this area are designated Future Development - 20 Acres (FD-20) and will maintain this designation until the planning for this new urban area is complete. The planning for this area shall be consistent with the requirements of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Title 11 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

The Cooper Mountain Natural Area Master Plan was developed by Metro and adopted by the Metro Council in December 2005. The master plan was subsequently adopted by the Washington County Board of Commissioners in 2006. The natural area, which is a regional park, is located on the southwest slope of Cooper Mountain, south of Kemmer Road and east of Grabhorn Road. The natural area offers views of the Tualatin River Valley and Chehalem Mountains, interpretive facilities, ADA-accessible trail loops, hiking trails, and trails available for equestrian use. Approximately 89 acres of the park is inside the urban growth boundary and is designated Future Development 20 Acre District (FD-20). The remaining 144 acres is rural land designated Agriculture and Forestry 20 Acre District (AF-20) and is outside the boundary of the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan. The Rural/Natural Resource Plan was amended to apply the State and Regional Park Overlay District only to the rural portion of the natural area.

The Community Plan map designated most of the area within this Community Plan in 1983 for low density residential development ( $\mathrm{R}-5$ or $\mathrm{R}-6$ designations). This was done because the area is some distance from Arterials and employment centers and has steep slopes in some locations which make access and development somewhat difficult.

Two Neighborhood Commercial sites are located in this subarea to serve as focal points for neighborhood activity and to provide close convenience shopping opportunities. One is located at the southeast corner of 165th Avenue and Hart Road, near the intersection of Hart/Bany and 170th. This site was previously sanctioned for Neighborhood Commercial use when the Summercrest Planned Unit Development was approved. Another Neighborhood Commercial
site is planned at the intersection of Nora/Beard Road and 155th Avenue. Both sites are over a mile from each other and from similar commercial areas.

Large uncommitted properties near these neighborhood commercial sites are designated for residential development at up to 9,15 or 24 units per acre to allow for greater housing choice in the area. Future residents will be close to convenience shopping facilities and major roads. Therefore, they will have less need of using their autos for shopping. When residents choose to drive, they will not need to travel on local streets through existing neighborhoods.

The Summary Findings and Conclusions section of Rural/Natural Resource Plan Policy 24, RECREATION, is amended to reflect the following:

## Summary Findings and Conclusions

Open space outside the urban area will be of growing importance to Washington County residents as they seek open space and recreation opportunities close to where they live. The County possesses a variety of natural resources, especially rivers, which are attractive for rural recreation. Access to these sites and development of trails are needed priorities for rural recreation. There is currently no comprehensive plan for rural open space and recreation facilities although non-urban recreation sites and facilities are used extensively by the urban residents of the County and the Portland metropolitan area in general.

In 2001, the County adopted the State Park Overlay District concurrently with the adoption of a state park master plan for land located near the intersection of Highway 26 and Highway 47, just north of Buxton and south of Hoffman Road. The Banks-Vernonia State Trail passes through the property. The park, named the Stub Stewart Memorial State Park, includes an enhanced trail system, day use facilities, overnight camping with group and equestrian areas, a hike-in camping area, and interpretive signage.

The State Park Overlav District was amended in 2004 to include regional parks. The Cooper Mountain Natural Area Master Plan was developed by Metro and adopted by the Metro Council in December 2005. The master plan was subsequently adopted by the Washington County Board of Commissioners in 2006. The natural area is located on the southwest slope of Cooper Mountain, south of Kemmer Road and east of Grabhorn Road. The natural area, which is a regional park, offers views of the Tualatin River Valley and Chehalem Mountains, interpretive facilities, ADA-accessible trail loops, hiking trails, and trails available for equestrian use. Approximately 89 acres of the park is inside the urban growth boundary and is designated Future Development 20 Acre District (FD-20). The remaining 144 acres is rural and is designated Agriculture and Forestry 20 Acre District (AF-20). The State and Regional Park Overlay District was applied only to the rural portion of the natural area.

Replace the State and Regional Park Overlay District map for the Stub Stewart Memorial State Park located in Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan with the map shown below:


Stub Stewart Memorial State Park

State and Regional Park Overlay
Banks-Vernonia State Park

Add the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and State and Regional Park Overlay District map shown below to Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan.


Add the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and State and Regional Park Overlay District map shown below to Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan.


The Cooper Mountain Master Plan is available for review on the Internet at: http://www.co.washington.or.us/deptmts/lut/planning/ord2006/ord653/CooperMountain_MP.html

Amend Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan to incorporate the Cooper Mountain Master Plan, dated November 2005, which follows this page.

# WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS 

Agenda Category:
Agenda Title:
Presented by:

Action - Department of Land Use \& Transportation
(all CPOs)
ADOPT FINDINGS FOR ORDINANCE NO. 653
Brent Curtis, Planning Division Manager

SUMMARY (Attach Supporting Documents if Necessary)
Ordinance No. 653 proposes to amend the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan to adopt the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and to apply the State and Regional Park Overlay District to the rural properties within the 231-acre Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Text amendments are proposed for the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan to describe the area of the park that is within the urban growth boundary and the community plan boundary (approximately 89 acres). Policy 24, Recreation, of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan would be amended to provide a description of both the existing state park, north of Highway 26 near Banks, as well as the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan would be amended to update the state park map and to add the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and apply the State and Regional Park Overlay to the rural properties included in the Cooper Mountain Natural Area.

As required by ORS 197.615, post acknowledgment comprehensive plan amendments (e.g., amendments made to the County's Comprehensive Plan after it was acknowledged by the State Department of Land Conservation and Development as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals) must be accompanied by findings setting forth the facts and analysis showing that the amendments are consistent with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Revised Statutes, State Administrative Rules and the applicable provisions of Washington County's Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, as required by Title 8, Section 3 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, any amendment to a comprehensive plan or implementing ordinance shall be consistent with the requirements of the Functional Plan.

Attached is the Resolution and Order to adopt the findings. The proposed findings will be provided to the Board prior to the hearing and will also be available at the Clerk's desk.

## DEPARTMENT'S REOUESTED ACTION:

Adopt the proposed findings for Ordinance No. 653 and sign the Resolution and Order memorializing the action.

## COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION:

I concur with the requested action.


## IN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

## FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of Adopting ) RESOLUTION AND ORDER
Legislative Findings in Support
of Ordinance No. 653

## No. O6-78

This matter having come before the Washington County Board of Commissioners (Board) at its meeting of April 4, 2006; and

It appearing to the Board that the findings contained in Exhibit " $A$ " summarize relevant facts and rationales with regard to compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals, Oregon Revised Statutes and Administrative Rules, Washington County's Comprehensive Plan, and titles of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan relating to Ordinance No. 653; and

It appearing to the Board that the findings attached as Exhibits " $A$ ", " $B$ ", and " $C$ " constitute appropriate legislative findings with respect to the adopted ordinance; and

It appearing to the Board that the Planning Commission, at the conclusion of its public hearing on March 15, 2006, made a recommendation to the Board, which is in the record and has been reviewed by the Board; and

It appearing to the Board that, in the course of its deliberations, the Board has considered the record which consists of all notices, testimony, staff reports, and correspondence from interested parties, together with other items submitted to the Planning Commission and Board regarding this ordinance; it is therefore,

RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the following findings are adopted in support of Ordinance No. 653:
(1) Exhibit "A" Findings for Ordinance No. 653; and
(2) Exhibit " $B$ " Washington County Comprehensive Plan Findings developed by Metro, dated March 2006; and
(3) Exhibit "C" Cooper Mountain Natural Area Transportation Impact Analysis report prepared by DKS Associates, dated September 2005.

DATED this $4^{\text {th }}$ day of April, 2006.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, OREGON


## FINDINGS FOR ORDINANCE NO. 653

# AMENDING THE ALOHA-REEDVILLE-COOPER MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY PLAN AND RURAL/NATURAL RESOURCE PLAN ELEMENTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN RELATING TO ADOPTION OF THE COOPER MOUNTAIN NATURAL AREA MASTER PLAN AND APPLYING THE STATE AND REGIONAL PARK OVERLAY DISTRICT TO THE COOPER MOUNTAIN NATURAL AREA 

APRIL 4, 2006

## GENERAL FINDINGS

Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to adoption of the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and application of the State and Regional Park Overlay District to properties within the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. The proposed changes affect properties on Cooper Mountain that are owned by Metro. The State and Regional Park Overlay District would be applied only to properties within the Cooper Mountain Natural Area, but outside of the regional urban growth boundary. The master plan, added to Appendix F of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan, provides a concept plan to guide future development of the natural area.

Because the ordinance would make changes that do not affect compliance with Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals (Goals), it is not necessary for these findings to address the Goals with respect to each amendment. The Board of County Commissioners (Board) finds that the Goals apply to amendments covered by these findings only to the extent noted in specific responses to individual Goals, and that each amendment complies with the Goals. Goals 15 (Willamette River Greenway), 16 (Estuarine Resources), 17 (Coastal Wetlands), 18 (Beaches and Dunes) and 19 (Ocean Resources) and related OARs are not addressed because these resources are not located within Washington County.

## GOAL FINDINGS

The purpose of the findings in this document is to demonstrate that Ordinance No. 653 is consistent with Statewide Planning Goals, ORS and OAR requirements and the Washington County Comprehensive Plan.

## Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement

## CONCLUSION

Washington County has an acknowledged citizen involvement program that provides opportunities for citizens and other interested parties to participate in all phases of the planning process. In addition, Chapter $X$ of the County Charter sets forth specific requirements for citizen involvement during review and adoption of land use ordinances.

Washington County has utilized these requirements for the adoption of this ordinance. Plan compliance with Goal 1 is maintained by implementing these citizen involvement options. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. Washington County's Citizen Participation Policy is outlined in Resolution and Order 86-58.
2. Resolution and Order 86-58 endorses a variety of citizen involvement mechanisms. These include public hearings, town hall meetings, open houses, advisory committees, the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) and Citizen Participation Organizations (CPOs).
3. Proposed Ordinance No. 653 and an accompanying summary were mailed on February 3, 2006 to the CPOs and CCI. Also on February 3rd, notice of the ordinance was mailed to special service districts and cities in Washington County and other interested parties. Additionally, notice of the proposed ordinance and copies of the ordinance were mailed to DLCD on January 26, 2006.
4. A copy of the proposed ordinance was made available for review at the Cedar Mill Library and the Tigard Public Library. Copies of the ordinance were also available for review in the office of the Department of Land Use and Transportation and on the county's website.
5. Chapter $X$ of the County Charter requires that a display ad be published in local newspapers at least 14 days prior to the first hearing. Display ads for Ordinance No. 653 were published in the following newspapers: the Washington County Weekly section of The Oregonian on February 23, 2006 and The Hillsboro Argus on February 24, 2006.
6. Chapter $X$ of the County Charter requires that individual notice for the initial public hearings on the ordinance be mailed at least 14 days prior to the first hearing to those persons who have requested them in writing and paid a fee. Notice for Proposed Ordinance No. 653 was mailed on March 1, 2006.
7. On March 3, 2006, a notice of public hearing was sent to property owners within 1,000 feet of the Metro-owned properties subject to Ordinance No. 653. The notice described the proposed ordinance and provided a map of the nine tax lots that make up the Cooper Mountain Natural Area.
8. The Planning Commission held a public hearing for this ordinance on March 15, 2006. This hearing resulted in a recommendation for adoption of Ordinance No. 653 to the Board of Commissioners. The Planning Commission also recommended that the park's public vehicular access points be limited to roads designated as collectors. The Commission further recommended that vegetation buffering be coordinated with residents that are opposed to sight lines to the two
defined vehicular access points and parking lot locations. The Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on this ordinance on April 4, 2006 and voted to adopt the ordinance as filed.

## Goal 2, Land Use Planning

## CONCLUSION

Statewide Planning Goal 2 addresses Land Use Planning. Goal 2 requires an adequate factual base to support a decision and coordination with affected governmental entities. Washington County has an acknowledged land use planning process that provides for the review and update of the various elements of the Comprehensive Plan, which includes documents such as the Rural/Natural Resource Plan, Urban Planning Area Agreements and the Community Development Code. Washington County utilized this process to adopt this ordinance.

The amendments that were made to the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan by this ordinance are consistent with the parameters set forth in the acknowledged Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area - Policy 1, Implementing Strategy (d); and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan - Policy 1, Implementing Strategy (d). Plan compliance with Goal 2 is maintained by implementing these two strategies. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. The acknowledged Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Rural/Natural Resource Plan both require that legislative Plan and Code amendments be adopted by ordinance in accordance with the procedures specified in the Washington County Charter and State Law.
2. Chapter $X$, Section 100 (d) of the County Charter defines "land use ordinances" to include any ordinance that amends a comprehensive plan. Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan, both elements of the county's Comprehensive Plan. It is therefore a legislative land use ordinance in accordance with the definitions in Chapter $X$ of the County Charter.
3. Chapter $X$ of the Washington County Charter requires that initial notice of public hearings be prepared by the Land Use Ordinance Advisory Commission. The Commission met February 16, 2006 to draft a notice for Ordinance No. 653. The Charter also requires that the notice be mailed at least 14 days prior to the initial Planning Commission hearing to those persons who have requested notices in writing and paid a fee. This notice was mailed on March 1, 2006.
4. Chapter $X$ requires that a display ad be published in a newspaper of general circulation 14 days prior to the initial Planning Commission hearing, which was
held on March 15, 2006. ORS Chapter 215.060 requires the county to provide 14 days advance public notice prior to the first public hearing. Display ads were published in the following newspapers: the Washington County Weekly section of The Oregonian on February 23, 2006 and The Hillsboro Argus on February 24, 2006.
5. ORS 197.610, OAR 660-018-0020 and Senate Bill 543 (effective on June 30, 1999) require that notice of proposed amendments to the county's acknowledged comprehensive plan shall be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) at least 45 days before the first hearing. Notice of Proposed Ordinance No. 653 was mailed to DLCD on January $26,2006$.
6. At its hearing on March 29, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners adopted the 2005 Planning Division and Land Use Ordinance Work Program. This ordinance, to adopt a master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area, was filed following the Metro Council's adoption of the master plan. The master plan was adopted in December 2005; Ordinance No. 653 was subsequently filed in January 2006 to adopt the master plan as an appendix to the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and to apply the State and Regional Park Overlay District designation to the rural properties within the natural area.

## Goal 3 - Agricultural Land

## CONCLUSION

Policy 15, Implementing Strategies (a) and (f) of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan include provisions for the preservation of agricultural lands. Plan compliance with Goal 3 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and standards for protecting agricultural lands identified under Goal 3. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. The EFU and AF-20 land use districts are Washington County's acknowledged exclusive farm use districts. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies or Code standards related to farm land resources. However, the ordinance applied the State and Regional Park Overlay District designation to four properties within the Cooper Mountain Natural Area that are designated AF20.
2. Oregon Revised Statute 215.296 lists the permitted uses in exclusive farm use zones and provides standards for development. An "impact analysis" based upon standards in ORS 215.296 must be submitted at the time of development review for certain uses, including parks. Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces staff
developed an impact analysis for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and is attached to these findings. Attachment 1 provides an analysis of the potential impacts from the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Attachment $\mathbf{2}$ is a map of the properties included in the impact analysis. Attachment 3 consists of the cover letter and questionnaire that was mailed to surrounding property owners in an effort to obtain information regarding present uses of adjacent properties. Attachment 4 is a matrix of surrounding property owners and provides information regarding the owners' names, tax lot number, parcel size, present uses, and how information was obtained by Metro staff. The attachments follow this findings document.

## Goal 4 - Forest Lands

CONCLUSION
Policy 16 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan includes provisions for the preservation of forest lands. Amendments made by Ordinance No. 653 are consistent with Goal 4; OAR Chapter 660, Division 06; and the county's acknowledged policies for preservation of forest lands. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

FACTS

1. The EFC District is Washington County's acknowledged exclusive forest district. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies or Code standards related to forest land resources which impact the county's compliance with Goal 4. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 4.

## Goal 5 - Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas and Natural Resources

## CONCLUSION

Policies 10, 11 and 12 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area, Policies 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and various sections of the Community Plans and the Community Development Code include provisions for the protection of Goal 5 resources. In addition, OAR 660-023-0250 requires application of current Goal 5 provisions to Post Acknowledgment Plan Amendments (PAPAs) initiated on or after September 1, 1996 when the PAPA creates or amends a resource list or a portion of an acknowledged plan or land use regulation that protects a significant Goal 5 resource or if the PAPA allows new uses that could be conflicting uses with a particular significant Goal 5 site.

Plan compliance with Goal 5 is maintained with amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and standards for the protection of Goal 5 resources as well as those set forth in OAR 660 Division 23. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. Ordinance No. 653 amended the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to adoption of the Cooper Mountain Master Plan and application of the State and Regional Park Overlay District to rural properties within the Cooper Mountain Natural Area.
2. While Ordinance No. 653 did not directly amend any Plan policies or strategies or Code standards relating to Goal 5 , the amendments represent a step towards the development of a 230 -acre park on Cooper Mountain that features an interpretive center, hiking, equestrian and ADA-compliant trails, native plant preservation, and scenic views.

## Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Resource Quality

## CONCLUSION

Policies 4, 5, 6 and 7 in the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Policies 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan provide for the maintenance and improvement of the quality of air, water and land resources.

Plan compliance with Goal 6 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and standards for the protection of Goal 6 resources. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. The Community Development Code standards related to these resources are contained in Section 379 (Mineral and Aggregate Overlay District), Section 410 (Grading and Drainage), Section 423 (Environmental Performance Standards) and Section 426 (Erosion Control). Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies or Code standards related to air, water or land use quality which impact the county's compliance with Goal 6 . Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 6.

## Goal 7 - Natural Disasters and Hazards

## CONCLUSION

Policy 8 in the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Policy 8 in the Rural/Natural Resource Plan set out the county's policy to protect life and property from natural disasters and hazards. Plan compliance with Goal 7 is maintained with the
amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and standards for regulating development exposed to potential natural disasters and hazards addressed by Goal 7. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. The Community Development Code standards relating to natural disasters and hazards are contained in Sections 410 (Grading and Drainage) and 421 (Flood Plain and Drainage Hazard Area Development).
2. Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to the adoption of a master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies related to flood plain areas, or to natural disasters and hazards. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 7.

## Goal 8 - Recreation Needs

## CONCLUSION

Policies 33 and 34 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area, Policy 24 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and the individual Community Plans address the recreational needs of the citizens of Washington County and visitors. Plan compliance with Goal 8 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and strategies for satisfying recreational needs as required by Goal 8 . This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. The Code standards related to recreation uses are contained in Sections 405 (Open Space), 430-11 (Amusement Park), 430-25 (Campground), 430-50 and 430-51 (Golf Courses), 430-69 (Hunting and Fishing Preserves), 430-95 (Parks Type I), 430-97 (Parks - Type II), 430-100 (Private Hunting and Fishing Operations in the EFC District), 430-125 (Shooting Club), 430-131 (Special Recreation Use) and 431-7 (Common Open Space).
2. Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to the adoption of a master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. While Ordinance No. 653 did not directly amend any Plan policies or strategies or Code standards relating to Goal 8 , the amendments provide a step towards development of a 230 -acre park on Cooper Mountain that features an
interpretive center, hiking, equestrian and ADA-compliant trails, native plant preservation, and scenic views, which supports Goal 8 - Recreation Needs.

## Goal 9 - Economy of the State

## CONCLUSION

Policy 20 in the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Policies 15, 16, 20 and 21 in the Rural/Natural Resource Plan set out the county's policies to strengthen the local economy. The Community Development Code contributes to a sound economy by providing standards that facilitate development in an orderly and efficient fashion.
Plan compliance with Goal 9 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and strategies for strengthening the local economy as required by Goal 9. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. Implementing Strategy a. of Policy 20 (Urban Area Economy) of the county's Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area states in part that, "The County will clarify and streamline the development review process in the Community Development Code." While there are no specific Code standards directly related to this goal, amendments to the Code should follow this policy to achieve the economic development goal.
2. Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to the adoption of a master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and the application of the State and Regional Park Overlay District to rural properties within the natural area. Ordinance No. 653 did not make amendments to Plan policies or Code standards related to the local economy. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 9.

## Goal 10 - Housing

## CONCLUSION

Policies 21, 22, 23 and 24 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Policies 19 and 25 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan address the provision of housing in the urban and rural areas of the county. The Community Development Code contributes to the provision of adequate housing by establishing standards that facilitate development in an orderly and efficient fashion. Plan compliance with Goal 10 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and standards for regulating housing
in the urban and rural area as required by Goal 10. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

FACTS

1. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies related to housing. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 9.

## Goal 11 - Public Facilities and Services

## CONCLUSION

Policies 15, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Policy 22 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan address the provision of public facilities and services in the urban and rural areas of unincorporated Washington County. The Community Development Code requires that adequate public facilities and services be available for new development. Plan compliance with Goal 11 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653 . The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and strategies for the provision of public facilities and services as required by Goal 11. The amendments are also consistent with the provisions of Chapter 660, Division 11 of the Oregon Administrative Rules and Oregon Revised Statute 195.110. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. The standards for public facilities and services in the Community Development Code are outlined in Article V (Public Facilities and Services).
2. In 1991, Washington County adopted a public facility plan, consistent with OAR 660, Division 11. Ordinance No. 653 does not amend the Washington County Public Facilities Plan.
3. Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to the adoption of a master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. The adoption of the master plan provides a concept plan for development of the natural area, and the application of the State and Regional Park Overlay District allows certain uses on the properties within the park that are designated AF-20 provided a master plan has been developed for the area. In the case of the Cooper Mountain Natural Area, the park's developers may be able to construct a caretaker's residence within the park in an area subject to the overlay, which may require the provision of public facilities. No Plan policies or Code standards relating to public facilities and services were amended by Ordinance No. 653. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 11.

## Goal 12 - Transportation

## CONCLUSION

Policy 32 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area, Policy 23 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan, and in particular the Washington County 2020
Transportation Plan, describe the transportation system necessary to accommodate the transportation needs of Washington County through the year 2020. Implementing measures are contained in the Transportation Plan and the Community Development Code. Plan compliance with Goal 12 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and strategies for the provision of transportation facilities and services as required by Goal 12 (the Transportation Planning Rule or TPR, implemented via OAR Chapter 660, Division 12) and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

FACTS

1. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies related to transportation. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 12.

## Goal 13 - Energy Conservation

## CONCLUSION

Policies 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and Policy 25 of the Rural/Natural Resource Plan address energy conservation in the urban and rural areas of unincorporated Washington County. The Community Development Code implements the energy conservation policies by establishing standards that promote energy efficient development, especially in Article IV. Plan compliance with Goal 13 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and strategies for promoting energy conservation as required by Goal 13. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACT

1. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies or code sections related to energy conservation. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 13.
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## Goal 14 - Urbanization

## CONCLUSION

Policies $13,14,16,17,18$ and 19 of the Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area address urbanization within the Regional Urban Growth Boundary. The Community Development Code implements the urbanization policies by establishing standards to promote appropriate urban development. The Community Plans implement the urbanization policies by designating sufficient land for appropriate development. Plan compliance with Goal 14 is maintained with the amendments made by Ordinance No. 653. The amendments are consistent with the county's acknowledged policies and strategies for urbanization as required by Goal 14. This conclusion is supported by the following facts:

## FACTS

1. Ordinance No. 653 did not amend the applicable Plan policies or Code standards related to urbanization which impacts the county's compliance with Goal 14. Therefore, it is not necessary to make specific findings for Goal 14.

# FINDINGS OF COMPLIANCE WITH METRO'S URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN FOR ORDINANCE NO. 653 (RELATING TO ADOPTION OF A <br> MASTER PLAN FOR THE COOPER MOUNTAIN NATURAL AREA AND APPLICATION OF THE STATE AND REGIONAL PARK OVERLAY DISTRICT) 

FOR THE APRIL 4, 2006 HEARING

## Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

Section 3.07.830.A. of Title 8 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) requires that all comprehensive plan changes submitted after February 19, 1997 "...be consistent with this functional plan." The following findings have been prepared to address Titles 1, 3, 6 and 8 of the Functional Plan.

## Title 1 - Requirements for Housing and Employment Accommodations

Functional Plan policies in Title 1 seek ways to increase the capacity within the urban growth boundary, such as changing local zoning to accommodate development at higher densities in locations supportive of the transportation system.

## RESPONSE

Ordinance No. 653 amends the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain Community Plan and the Rural/Natural Resource Plan elements of the Comprehensive Plan relating to adoption of a master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area and application of the State and Regional Park Overlay District to rural properties within the natural area. The master plan for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area provides a framework for development of a regional open space and does not impact housing or employment accommodations.

## Title 3 - Water Quality, Flood Management and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation

Protect beneficial uses and functional values of water quality and flood management resources by limiting uses in these areas. Establish buffer zones around resource areas to protect from new development.

## RESPONSE

Implementation of Title 3 requirements has been completed primarily through the adoption of regulations by Clean Water Services (CWS). CWS is responsible for water quality and flood management within the urban unincorporated areas of Washington County. Ordinance No. 653 does not change any standards relating to water quality or flood plain management. The ordinance does not amend any significant natural resource designations. However, the development of the Cooper Mountain Natural Area is intended to restore native habitat such as oak prairies within the park boundary.

## Title 6 - Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers and Station Communities

Title 6 intends to enhance Centers by encouraging development in these Centers that will improve the critical roles they play in the region and by discouraging development outside Centers that will detract from those roles.

RESPONSE
Ordinance No. 653 does not change any standards relating to the designation of Title 6 Centers.

## Title 8 - Compliance Procedures

Title 8 sets forth Metro's procedures for determining compliance with the Urban Growth Management Functional Pian. Included in this title are steps local jurisdictions must take to ensure that Metro has the opportunity to review amendments to Comprehensive Plans.

## RESPONSE

Consistent with Title 8, Metro was sent a copy of Proposed Ordinance No. 653 on February 3,2006. The findings in this document demonstrate the amendments made by this ordinance are in substantial compliance with the UGMFP.

# IMPACT ANALYSIS (ORS 215.296) FOR ADJACENT FARMS AND FOREST (AF-20) AND EXCLUSIVE FARM USE (EFU) LANDS 

Pursuant to ORS 215.296, impact analysis findings are required demonstrating that the public uses proposed in the Cooper Mountain Master Plan will not force significant changes to, or significantly increase the costs of, accepted farm or forest practices on surrounding lands designated for farm or forest uses. The following findings address that requirement.

## FINDINGS


#### Abstract

ANALYSIS AREA:

The analysis area includes properties zoned AF-20 or EFU surrounding Metro's Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Agriculture and forest properties primarily lie to the west, south and east of the Natural Area. Properties to the north of the Natural Area are inside the Urban Growth Boundary. Properties included in this analysis include all contiguous rural lands, as well as noncontiguous parcels located within a $1 / 4$ to $1 / 2$ mile of the Natural Area boundaries. In addition, three parcels located inside the Urban Growth Boundary are included in the inventory because they are currently farmed or forested. Four properties beyond the $1 / 2$ mile radius have also been included in the inventory where aerial photography maps indicate the presence of orchards. The analysis area was chosen after considering the topography of the area, farm and forest uses and parcel sizes.


## INVENTORY OF FARM USES AND PRACTICES:

The inventory of existing farm and forest practices was carried out via a mailed survey and phone calls to landowners. See Attachment B. A questionnaire was mailed out to 29 property owners in the analysis area and follow up phone calls were made by Metro staff to reach those who did not return the questionnaire. Ten surveys were completed and returned and Metro reached five additional landowners through follow up calls. Metro rangers working at Cooper Mountain were also interviewed about their knowledge of neighboring landowner's practices and issues based on their ongoing interactions with landowners and their interpretation of aerial photos compared to in-field work.

Inventory results indicate that predominant land uses surrounding the Natural Area are small wood lots and/or hay or pasture fields. See attachment C. As the AF-20 zoning designation implies, many of these lands are smaller scale with limited and/or part time farm and forest uses, in large part due to lack of irrigation and the thin soils associated with the higher elevations of Cooper Mountain. Based upon returned surveys and ground and aerial photo interpretation, the following uses and practices identified include:

Livestock: One organic farm landowner, located approximately 1 mile away from the Natural Area, keeps a herd of 20 dairy goats, 10 beef cattle, peafowl and breeding horses. Two other
landowners raise beef cattle. One has 200 head of beef and the other keeps a small herd of 20. At least six landowners keep horses for personal use, breeding and/or boarding. One landowner operates a large horse boarding facility and the remaining keep about 4-8 horses. Aside from specific animal husbandry practices, the main farm practice associated with raising livestock is pasture management, addressed below.

Pasture/hayfields: Approximately three quarters of the landowners inventoried maintain pasture or hay fields on their land. The degree to which the fields are actively managed is variable. For those that are actively managed, fertilizer is generally applied once or twice in the spring with tractor and spreader. Herbicide spray is broadcast on the ground with tractor boom, and blackberries are generally sprayed with a wand using Crossbow or Garlon. Hay fields are cut and baled, usually twice during the summer.

Orchards: There are seven nut orchards in the analysis area - both filbert and walnut. One orchard is organic. The orchards range in size from 5 to approximately 35 acres. All but one are located a half-mile away, or further. Year round practices generally include winter pruning, February fertilizer applications, spring and summer cultivation and weed control, pest control from April through August and harvesting in October. Pesticide applications are sprayed mechanically up through branches of the trees for pests and diseases, and broadcast on the ground to control weeds.

Woodlots: Approximately half of the landowners inventoried have woodlands or timber on their land. Many of these woodlands are along riparian corridors and are maintained as buffers. Forestry practices that are carried out on woodlots grown for timber include weed control after harvest, usually applied in spring; fall spraying of broadleaf trees about 4 years after harvest, periodic thinning operations and harvest. Thinning is done using chainsaws or a feller buncher. None of the wood lots are of a size that would require road building for harvesting.

Field or Row Crops: Two to three landowners grow wheat, oats or corn. Wheat crops are planted in fall and are harvested in June or July. Corn crops are planted in spring, cultivated in summer and harvested in fall.

Ornamental Nursery and Christmas Trees: One landowner grows Christmas trees and some nursery stock on a 10 -acre parcel. This parcel is inside the UGB, contiguous to the Natural Area. Herbicide and pesticide applications are applied mechanically in spring, summer and fall.

Vineyard: Cooper Mountain Winery, located approximately $1 / 4$ mile northwest of the Natural Area, grows and produces pinot grapes and wines. Another Cooper Mountain vineyard parcel is located $1 / 2$ mile to the southeast of the Natural Area. The growing practices of the vineyard are biodynamic and $100 \%$ organic. Cover crops are planted beneath vines to build soils and beneficial organisms.

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED USE OF THE NATURAL AREA:

Public use of the Natural Area will be nature-based recreation; that is to say primarily hiking, horse back riding, wildlife viewing, and environmental education along a 3 and $1 / 2$ mile system of trails. The number of visitors, types of activity and level of noise associated with this type of nature-based recreation is a comparatively low impact to the surrounding community as well as to the natural resources of the Natural Area. Trails will generally be used by a single user, family or very small group, unless it is an organized field trip or environmental education activity sponsored and conducted by Metro, THPRD or a nearby school. These groups are typically school children and are limited to a 30 -person group. Supporting facilities such as restroom, children's nature play area, a small shelter and picnic tables, are located and consolidated at the Natural Areas' entrances. Two entrances to the Natural Area are proposed to split and minimize traffic impacts on adjacent roads and to accommodate rural equestrian riders. Entry gates to the parking lots will be closed in the evenings. The master plan proposes the accommodation of a future regional bike trail, which, in the long term, will provide an alternate commuting mode to the Natural Area.

The existing small dwelling on the north end of the Natural Area is proposed to convert to a "Nature House", which will be used primarily for nature programming for school groups. A small shelter near the Grabhorn Road trailhead will also be used for school field trips or for small group picnicking. A caretaker residence and storage yard is proposed to near the Grabhorn entrance to provide a permanent management presence on site and to achieve maintenance efficiencies. This site, like all Metro properties will close at sunset. However, use of the Natural Area in the evenings will be accommodated via special use permits for special programs, such as star-gazing.

Anticipated visitor use of the Natural Area is expected to occur during non-peak commuter hours - mid-day or after work, and on weekends. Average daily weekday vehicle use, based on volumes documented from similar Metro natural areas, is estimated to range from 15 to 25 vehicles per day, divided between the two proposed entries. Future "peak" use estimates, based on peak season weekend use and on full build out of trails and facilities, is estimated to range from 100-150 vehicles/day, divided between the two proposed entries. Off-season use will be appreciably lower. School field trips by bus, based on similar programs at other Metro natural areas, will generally be limited to $6-8$ weeks in the spring and fall, one bus per day, three days per week.

## IMPACT ANALYSIS:

## Potential Conflicts and Impacts

The described nature based public uses proposed for the Natural Area commonly co-exist with neighboring agriculture and forestry activities without significant conflicts. However, the following areas of concern for potential conflicts were identified by landowners' responses.

Trespassing - Trespassing on private property is a concern of property owners living next to the Natural Area. The owner of tax lot 1S2250002801, who grows Christmas trees, expressed
interest in having a fence installed along his property line. Since its purchase of the Natural Area, Metro has installed fencing around the private property in-holding and at other strategic locations along the boundaries to prevent trespass on to private property. Pre-existing informal access points between the Natural Area and adjacent private properties have been fenced and/or posted with no trespassing/no entry signs to inform users. Some pre-existing informal trails have been closed to prevent access. The Master Plan states that Metro will install permanent boundary markers along all of the Natural Area property boundaries to clearly demarcate the public property edge. The Master Plan also stipulates that future trails will be laid out to maintain at least a 50' buffer between the trail and property edge. Total fencing of the Natural Area is not planned because it would conflict with wildlife passage. However, Metro rangers will continue to work with landowners on a case-by-case basis to prevent unlawful trespass that may occur on private property at specific locations.

Complaints about farming/forest practices - Farming and forest practices, such as prescribed burning, thinning, pesticide use, dust, noise and/or livestock smells might be perceived by the public as a nuisance.

Forest Practices: Cooper Mountain is mostly forested and Metro employs forest practices similar to those employed by surrounding landowners to manage vegetation. Metro land managers will continue to conduct invasive weed removal, fuel load removal, periodic thinning and prescribed burning as part of its ongoing forest management practices, and will communicate these practices and their schedules to Cooper Mountain neighbors and the public. Metro's proactive role in invasive weed removal will help surrounding landowners manage weeds on their own lands.

Future users of the Natural Area may complain about smoke or noise from adjacent private property forest operations. Metro's role will be to educate park users about forest practices and user complaints will not result in any actions on Metro's part that would force significant changes in forest practices on neighboring lands.

Farming Practices: Landowners listed disturbance to livestock and conflicts with pesticide applications. Given the terrain, distances and vegetation buffers that will be maintained between proposed Natural Area uses and adjacent properties, pesticides applied by adjacent owners should not affect public use of the Natural Area. All of the orchards identified are in lower elevations approximately $1 / 2$ mile away. There is no indication that aerial sprays are used in the management of these orchards. Metro is a good neighbor with respect to weed control and will help adjacent landowners manage their pastures and fields by aggressively managing invasive vegetation in the Natural Area, thus eliminating the spread of invasive weeds from public property. All applications of herbicide by Metro will be applied according to laws governing its use.

One landowner has cattle that seasonally graze on backfields contiguous to the Natural Area. No trails are proposed along this boundary line. Another landowner adjacent to the Natural Area has horses. Fencing and a vegetation buffer separate this use from the Natural Area. Finally, Metro code prohibits dogs in Metro owned parks and natural areas. Hence, dogs should not pose an impact to adjacent lands supporting livestock. Prohibition of dogs will be signed and enforced by rangers.

Traffic - The Natural Area will be designed as a low impact public use area. However, increased traffic on roads surrounding the natural area is a general concern of Cooper Mountain residents. One survey respondent listed equipment moving on roads as a concern. Another respondent suggested shoulder improvements along Grabhorn to encourage equestrian, bicycling and walking modes to the park. Because traffic was a concern expressed by nearby residents in the master plan public involvement process, Metro commissioned a traffic study to project future use as it relates to future traffic impacts on surrounding roads. The traffic impact analysis determined that:

- Additional traffic from the proposed development (Natural Area) does not impact the level of service at any of the study intersections and will not result in unacceptable impacts to the existing road classification capacities
- An evaluation of traffic signal warrants indicated that none of the study intersections need signalization in either the shott term or long term
- A left lane warrant analysis indicated that there is no requirement for left or right turn lanes at the study area intersections.

Target Practice - The use of firearms in target practice was listed as a potential conflict between rural practices and public park users. While not a direct farm or forest practice, Metro recognizes that this is an allowed practice on rural lands as long as it is practiced in a safe manner. Therefore any complaints made by users of the Natural Area will be explained by Metro and will not result in any actions on Metro's part that would prevent this practice.

## CONCLUSION:

Given the modest scale and low impact nature of anticipated use at Cooper Mountain Natural Area, combined with the distances and wooded buffers between developed areas of the Natural Area and surrounding agriculture and forest lands, no indication exists that the uses proposed in the Master Plan would force significant changes in, or significantly increase the cost of, accepted agricultural or forest practices.

ATTACHMENT 2


## Dear Landowner:

Over the last two years Metro has undertaken and completed a master plan for Cooper Mountain Natural Area that strives to accommodate public use of the natural area compatible with habitat protection and the surrounding community. The completed Master Plan, which can be viewed on Metro's website at www.metro-region.org, proposes low intensity uses such as hiking and horse back riding on a 3.5 mile trail system, environmental education for school groups, and facilities for individual or small group picnicking. Two entries and trailheads are proposed - one on Grabhorn Road and one on Kemmer Road. In addition to these proposed facilities, the Master Plan also prescribes vegetation management of the site and maintenance and operations, including provision of a future ranger residence.

In the coming months, the Washington County Board of Commissioners will review and consider approval of the Cooper Mountain Master Plan based on its consistency with the Washington County Comprehensive Plan. As part of this review, pursuant to ORS 215.296, Metro is conducting a survey of surrounding farm and forest zoned properties in order to identify and address any potential conflicts that the future Natural Area may pose.

You have been included in this survey because of your property's zoning, land use and proximity to Cooper Mountain Natural Area. To perform a meaningful analysis, we would appreciate your help in informing us of the farm or forest practices that occur on your land. Please take a few minutes to answer the enclosed survey and return it in the envelope provided by or before March 9, 2006. If you have any questions or wish to discuss the survey in more detail or if you have any other concerns, please feel free to call Lora Price at 503-797-1846. We will also follow up with landowners we have not heard from after March $9^{\text {th }}$.

As the County develops, we hope that Cooper Mountain Natural Area proves to be an asset to your family and community as well as a good neighbor.

Sincerely,

Lora Price
Project Lead, Cooper Mountain Master Plan
Metro Parks \& Greenspaces

# Farm/Forest Compatibility and Impact Survey 

Tax lot/s $\qquad$ Acreage/s $\qquad$ Primary use $\qquad$ Owner/manager $\qquad$ Address $\qquad$
$\qquad$
What type of farm or forest uses occur on your land?

Woodlots Christmas trees Vineyard Berries or other food crops Other $\qquad$

Please describe the practices you carry out for the above farm or forest uses that apply. (e.g. for farms: field preparations, planting, cultivating, pesticide or herbicide applications, harvesting, delivery to markets; for woodlots: thinning and harvesting, fire management, herbicide applications, road construction, etc.) $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Peak operational time periods (hours and/or seasons): $\qquad$

Prevailing wind conditions during peak operational periods:
Pesticide/Herbicide/Fertilizer Applications (methods and time): $\qquad$

Consequences of current operations and practices (e.g. smoke, dust, noise, odors, etc.) $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Projected future operations or changes to current operations due to market changes, operating costs, etc.:

Any issues (water supply, livestock disturbance, equipment movements or product transport, etc.) that may be impacted by the proposed project $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Issues or concerns of owner/manager (if any) in conjunction with the proposed project? $\qquad$ .

ATTACHMENT 4
Property Owner Matrix

## COOPER MOUNTAIN NATURAL AREA <br> FARM AND FOREST INVENTORY OF SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS MARCH 2006

|  | Tax Lot/Acres | Landowner | Farm/ Forest Uses | How information obtained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 2360000200 \\ & 9.6 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | Carol M. Low\& Gregory L. Toye | Rural residence, pasture, woodland | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 2360000402 \\ & 11.0 \mathrm{ac} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | P. D. \& Carol Selman | Rural residence, horses, woodlands | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 3 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 1 \mathrm{~S} 2360000304 \\ 11.3 \mathrm{ac} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Calvin T. Tanabe \& H. Mayho Trustees | hayfields | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S2360000303 } \\ & 20.0 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | Lawrence \& Priscilla Grice c/o Steve and Jill Grice | Rural residence, horses, walnut orchard, pasture | Phone contact Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S236000300 } \\ & 15.6 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | Bengt \& Carol Dahlberg | Rural residence, hayfields, woodlands | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S2350001201,1202, } \\ & 32.1 \mathrm{ac} \\ & 1 \mathrm{~S} 2350001000 \\ & 44.7 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | Carl F. Dyess | Rural residence, horse stable, walnut orchard, corn, wheat and oat crops, hay fields | Mailed survey Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S2360000600, } 601 \\ & 87.2 \mathrm{ac} \\ & 2 \mathrm{~S} 2010001504 \\ & 18.56 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Roscoe E. \& Victoria V Bierly Trustees, Bierly Family Trust | Rural residence, filberts, cattle, hay and pasture, woodlands | Phone contact Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 2360000801 \\ & 14.6 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | V. David \& Charlene A. Foglio | Rural residence, hay fields, woodlands | Mailed survey Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S23600000802 } \\ & 20.1 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | G. Scott \& Vicki Wenzel | Rural residence, horses, hay/pasture fields, woodlot | Mailed survey Ranger Interview Aerial photo |
| 10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S2360001000 } \\ & 195.5 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | John R. Kobbe | Rural residence, woodlots, hay fields, wheat crops | Phone contact Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 1310001602 \\ & 61.5 \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ | William R. \& Barbara L. Gee | Rural residence, horse stables, hay fields and pasture | Ranger interview Aerial photo Website |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { S1310001604 } \\ & 9.8 \mathrm{ac} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | William S. \& Pamela Y. Powell | Rural residence, hayfields, woodlands | Mailed survey Aerial photo |
| 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S2360000804 } \\ & 19.5 \mathrm{ac} \text { : } \end{aligned}$ | Theodore J. Georgeson | Rural residence, hay fields, woodland | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2S2020000601 } \\ & 46.28 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Roberta M. \& Robert C. Ling Trustees | Rural residence, cattle, hay and pasture fields | Mailed survey Aerial photo |


| 15 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { 1S2360000302 } \\ 2.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Robert A. \& Rose M. Long | Rural residence | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 130 \mathrm{CB} 02500 \\ & 4.7 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Ralph H. \& Nancy G. Nagel Trustees | Rural residence, woodland, hay field | Phone contact Ranger interview |
| 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2S2010000700 } \\ & 11.85 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Minerva T. \& James E. Nolte Nolte Family Trust | Rural residence, beef, horses, goats, hay and pasture, filberts | Mailed survey Aerial photo |
| 18 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 1310001800 \\ & 9.8 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | David A. \& Candice J. Ohlsen | Rural residence, woodlot | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 19 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 1S1310001603 } \\ & 9.7 \mathrm{ac} . \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Boon C. Ooi \& Beng S. Tan Trustees | woodlot | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 20 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 1310001700 \\ & 9.8 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Casey H. \& Carol S. Sayre | Rural residence, woodlot | Mailed survey Aerial photo |
| 21 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 2350001300 \\ & 25.15 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Steven S. \& Nancy K. Starkel | Rural residence, woodlots | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 22 | 1S1310001600-36.76 ac. <br> 1S1310001605-15.96 ac. <br> 1S225CB02000,2800,2900 <br> 1S225CC01600,1700,1800, <br> $1900,2000,2100,2200$, <br> $2300,2400,2500-21.18$ ac. | Cooper Mountain Vineyards, LLC <br> Robert Gross | Vineyard, winery | Phone contact Aerial photo Website |
| 23 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{~S} 130 \mathrm{CC} 00100 \\ & 41.6 \mathrm{ac} . \\ & 1 \mathrm{~S} 130 \mathrm{C} 000201 \\ & 40.6 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Charles Merrill <br> Five Oaks Ltd Partnership <br> Merrill Management Co | Rural residence, woodlots, hay fields | Phone contact Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 24 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \mathrm{~S} 1060000700 \\ & 9.45 \mathrm{ac} . \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Helen V. Haack Trust | Rural residence, hazelnuts | Mailed Survey Aerial photo |
| 25 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 S 1310000800 \\ & 42.6 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Craig W. \& Martin H. Moore MPR Development Co | Rural residence, woodland, hay fields | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S2360000401 } \\ & 1.2 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Richard W. \& Chong H. Brenner | Rural residence | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 27 | 1S225DA00200 <br> 4.7 ac . | Richard Cartwright | Rural residence, woodland, hayfield | Phone contact Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 28 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { S } 1310001900 \\ 49.4 \mathrm{ac} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | John A. \& Helen E. Cooper | Rural residence, woodlots, hay fields | Ranger interview Aerial photo |
| 29 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { S2250002801 } \\ & 9.3 \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ | Mark Ellebrook Western Oregon Nursery | Christmas trees, nursery stock | Mailed Survey Ranger interview Aerial photo |

# Cooper Mountain Master Plan Washington County Comprehensive Plan Findings March 2006 

RURAL NATURAL RESOURCE PLAN POLICIES

## POLICY 1 - THE PLANNING PROCESS

It is the policy of Washington County to establish an ongoing Planning Program which is a responsive legal framework for Comprehensive Planning, Community Development and Resource Conservation which accommodates changes and growth in the physical, economic and social environment, in response to the needs of the county's citizens. It is the policy of Washington County to provide the opportunity for the landowner to initiate quasi-judicial amendments to the Comprehensive Plan on a semi-annual basis. In addition, the Board of Commissioners, the Planning Director, or the Planning Commission may initiate the consideration of quasi-judicial map amendments at any time deemed necessary.

## Implementing Strategy $t$.

The County will provide for legislative plan amendments to apply or remove the State and Regional Park Overlay District; add uses, structures or roads not included in an approved State or Regional Master Plan; or change the location or size of structures, uses and roads not allowed by an approved Master Plan, when the applicant demonstrates that the request is consistent with the requirements of Section 383 of the Community Development Code and OAR 660-034.

FINDINGS: Metro is seeking a Comprehensive Plan amendment that will apply the State and Regional Park Overlay District to the rural/natural resource portion of Cooper Mountain Natural Area.. On October 5, 2004, the Board of Commissioners adopted Ordinance 628, which amends the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and the Community Development Code by amending the State Park Overlay District to include regional parks. This amendment allows regional park planners to utilize the master plan provisions identified in Oregon Administrative Rule 660-034.

Metro adopted a master planning process for Cooper Mountain Natural Area that adheres to the master planning criteria and process contained in State Park Rule OAR 736, Division 18. This planning process included: 1) citizen involvement (described below) 2) a thorough resource inventory of natural, cultural and scenic resources, 3) an analysis of those resources to determine land suitability for accommodating development, 4) an evaluation of surrounding areas to determine opportunities and constraints that nearby and adjacent properties represent to the planning of the Natural Area, and 5) an inventory and analysis of recreation needs and demand.

## POLICY 2-CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

It is the policy of Washington County to encourage citizen participation in all phases of the planning process and to provide opportunities for continuing involvement and effective communication between citizens and their county government.

FINDINGS: Metro engaged local governments, businesses, stakeholder groups, neighbors and interested citizens in the Cooper Mountain master planning process. This public involvement helped Metro draw from a broad knowledge and interest base and gain a deeper understanding of the issues and constraints related to the property, which was instrumental in creating a master plan that reflects and serves the community.

During the course of the 20 -month planning process, Metro employed the following Public Outreach and Involvement Tools:

- Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee - an 18 -member committee was formed which met six times throughout the process to provide input, review information and provide recommendations to the master plan.
- Individual stakeholder interviews were conducted early in the process.
- Cooper Mountain Chronicle ( 1,800 direct mail) - a master planning newsletter was sent out 4 times which included an interest survey, announcements for master plan participation opportunities and updates on the planning process.
- Metro's web site - this site provided ongoing information, updates and announcements regarding the planning process.
- Public Opinion Survey - The survey was distributed via the Cooper Mountain Chronicle (mailed to 1800 ) and was posted on the website. Approximately 400 responses were received.
- Speaker's bureau - Metro attended six community meetings with neighborhood and homeowner's associations, and other civic groups. Announcements and updates were also incorporated into their newsletters.
- A design workshop was conducted on April 14, 2006, which brought together several disciplines and agencies to explore potentials and alternatives.
- Public open houses were held in May 2004 and September 2004. A virtual open house was also provided on the website to allow citizens to respond to concept alternatives.
- Three guided tours of Cooper Mountain were offered in Spring 2004.
- Metro Green Scene magazine - was sent out quarterly to 15,000 residents, which periodically provided updates on the Cooper Mountain Master Plan.
- Metro Council and Washington County Board of Commissioners - Updates were provided twice to both governing bodies in public meetings advertised to the public.
- Public review comments were solicited on the Draft Master Plan from October 20, 2005 November 11, 2005
- Public Hearings on the completed Master Plan were held before Metro Council on December 5, 2005 and will be held before the Washington County Planning Commission on March 15, 2006 and before the Washington County Board of Commissioners on April 4, 2006.


## POLICY 3 - INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

It is the policy of Washington County to effectively coordinate its planning and developmental efforts with other governments and special districts to ensure that the various programs and activities undertaken by these bodies are consistent with the county comprehensive plan.

FINDINGS: Metro consulted with Washington County Planning and Transportation Division from the initial scoping stage of the master plan to ensure that the process and product would fulfill the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, representatives from the Planning Division, from Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District and the City of Beaverton were members on the Project Advisory Committee, along with other stakeholders, who provided input, review and recommendations throughout the course of the planning process. The City of Beaverton and THPRD also provided financial support to the Master Plan process.

## POLICY 6 - WATER RESOURCES

It is the policy of Washington County to maintain or improve surface and ground water quality and quantity.

FINDINGS: By protecting the headwaters of Lindow Creek, a tributary to the Tualatin River, this plan contributes to the protection of water quality in the Tualatin River Watershed. The Tualatin Riverkeepers were represented on the Project Advisory Committee to ensure that water quality goals were addressed in the planning of the natural area. The proposed 3.5 mile trail system is designed to minimize erosion and will actually eliminate many existing social trails that are poorly located and result in concentrated drainage and resulting erosion problems.

The proposed level of use should not impact ground water quality and quantity. An existing on site well will not be used for public use, but may be used for a future ranger residence. Irrigation is not proposed unless required by Washington County for Street frontage landscape improvements along Kemmer Road and $190^{\text {th }}$ Street. Public water use will be limited to Kemmer Road entrance facilities, which will provide a drinking fountain and restroom in addition to the existing house, which is currently on the City of Beaverton municipal water supply.

## POLICY 8 - NATURAL HAZARDS

It is the policy of Washington County to protect lives and property from natural disasters and hazards.

FINDINGS: $\quad$ Flood and earth movements are the two major natural hazards in Washington County. There are no floodplains in the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. A review of the Washington County Soils Map reveals no natural hazards on this property. All slopes on this site are $25 \%$ or less with the exception of some isolated spots along the most southeasterly drainage that are more steeply sloped. Proposed trail development avoids these areas.

## POLICY 10 - FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT

It is the policy of Washington County to protect and enhance significant fish and wildlife habitat.
FINDINGS: Cooper Mountain Natural Area is the headwaters to Lindow Creek, a tributary to the Tualatin River, therefore its protection as a natural area inherently serves to protect fish habitat. Riparian vegetation buffers along each of the headwater drainages will be protected and maintained as part of the resource management plan for the Natural Area. A diversity of wildlife habitats, which include conifer forests, open oak woodlands, native prairies, meadows, wetland seep areas and a small pond where red-legged frogs reside, will also be protected and enhanced as part of the resource management plan. Metro has planted 60,000 trees to date to reforest areas that were clear-cut prior to ownership and has actively removed invasive vegetation since its purchase of the property. Invasive removal and reforestation efforts will be ongoing as described by the resource management plan for the natural area.

## POLICY 11 - SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS

It is the policy of Washington County to protect and enhance significant natural areas.
FINDINGS: $\quad$ Similar to Policy 10, the Cooper Mountain Master Plan's primary goal is to protect and enhance natural resources. Cooper Mountain was identified as a significant natural area in the 1992 Metro Greenspaces Master Plan and was identified as one of 14 target areas identified for acquisition with 1995 Open Space Bond Measure funding. The natural area totals 231 acres. In the region, it is distinctive for its high elevations, upland oak woodland and native prairie habitats that contain a diversity of plant and wildlife species, some of which are listed as sensitive species. It also features mature conifer forests, riparian woodlands, meadows, wetland seep areas and a small pond. Restoration and ongoing vegetation management of this natural area is central to the Master Plan and Metro has invested substantial effort to date to reforest clear cut areas, remove invasive vegetation, expand oak woodland areas and restore the wildflower prairies.

## POLICY 13 - SCENIC RESOURCES

It is the policy of Washington County to protect and enhance its outstanding scenic views, routes and features.

FINDINGS: The significant natural resource and wildlife habitat features of Cooper Mountain Natural Area are also the scenic features of the site, which will be protected and enhanced. Specifically, the vegetation management plan explicitly calls to maintain the large open meadow at the highest elevations of the Natural Area along with the native prairies within the site in order to maintain spectacular views that overlook the Tualatin River Valley and Chehalem Mountains beyond. Views will also be maintained into the site from both Kemmer Road and Grabhom Road by maintaining vegetation on these edges of the site as meadow and open oak woodland respectively.

## POLICY 17 - AGRICULTURE AND FOREST-20 LAND

It is the policy of Washington County to designate those lands as Agriculture and Forest 20 that were zoned $A F-5$ and $A F-10$ by the 1973 Comprehensive Framework Plan and for which a Goal Exception has not been provided, and in doing so strive to retain small scale and part-time agricultural and forest production.

The portion of the Cooper Mountain Natural Area that is outside the UGB is part of the Rural Natural Resource District. All of the parcels in this portion of the site are zoned AF-20. Metro is seeking to amend the Comprehensive Plan to apply the Park Overlay District to the rural portion of the site on the County Zoning Map. With the application of a Park Overlay District and by completing a master plan pursuant to State Park Rule OAR 736, Division 18, park facility improvements would be consistent with the zoning without having to take an exception to AF-20 land use. In addition, the overlay of the State and Regional Park District will guarantee the possibility of developing a ranger/caretaker residence on site, which would result in better management oversight and operational efficiencies.

## POLICY 22 - PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

It is the policy of Washington County to provide public facilities and services in the rural/natural resource area in a coordinated manner, at levels which support rural type development, are efficient and cost effective, and help maintain public health and safety.

FINDINGS: $\quad$ The proposed public facilities at Cooper Mountain Natural Area will be developed in accordance with health, safety and ADA requirements.

Schools: The Beaverton School District currently serves the area surrounding Cooper Mountain Natural Area. A ranger's residence is proposed as part of the Master Plan Concept which, if developed, could potentially be a family dwelling utilizing the school district.

Fire Protection: The Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District provides Cooper Mountain Natural Area with Fire Protection. The nearest fire station is approximately 1.5 miles from the site with an estimated response time of 6-7 minutes. TVF\&R was represented on the Project Advisory Committee and in doing so provided input to ensure adequate access, efficient incident response and optimal coordination in wildfire prevention through vegetation management. The department contains keys to the site and has equipment that is suited to the trails and terrain of the site. 1000 ft . hoses will be used either from one of three fire hydrants located around the northern perimeter of the site or from trucks within the site.

Police Protection: Washington County Sheriff's department can respond to 911 calls or other violations of the law that may occur on site. Additionally, Metro and Washington County are in the process of executing a plan that will enable both the Washington County Sheriff's Department and Metro Rangers to enforce park specific regulations on site.

## POLICY 23 - TRANSPORTATION

It is the policy of Washington County to regulate the existing transportation system and to provide for the future needs of the county through the development of a transportation plan as an element of the comprehensive plan.

FINDINGS: In 2002, The County adopted an updated and revised Transportation Plan as an element of the Comprehensive Plan. That plan classifies Kemmer Road and Grabhorn Road, which the Cooper Mountain Natural Area fronts, as collector streets. Collector streets provide both access and circulation between residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural community areas and to the arterial streets. Commercial, industrial and institutional uses (of which Cooper Mountain Natural area is considered) are eligible for direct access to collector streets.

As part of the Master Planning process for Cooper Mountain, a Transportation Impact Analysis was conducted by DKS Associates to evaluate anticipated future public use and its potential impacts on nearby and adjacent roads. The traffic study included the evaluation of existing and future traffic conditions, with projected added trips resulting from proposed facilities during peak traffic periods. Traffic signal warrant and turn lane warrant analysis was also carried out to identify turn lane requirements (if any) for existing and future years. In addition, site access, trip generation, sight distance, safety and pedestrian issues were also addressed as part of the analysis. Specifically, proposed site entrances on Kemmer Road and Grabhorn Road were examined to determine if adequate site distances existed for safe egress and ingress.

The results of the transportation analysis reveal that all of the study area intersections on adjacent collector streets operate within acceptable level-of-service (LOS) and volume to capacity (v/c) ratio for all future use scenarios. The additional traffic from the proposed development does not impact the level of service at any of the study intersections. The study concludes that the level of anticipated use that the proposed development for the Natural Area will generate will not result in unacceptable impacts to the existing road classification capacities.

In addition, an evaluation of traffic signal warrants indicated that none of the study intersections need to be signalized in either the short term or long term. A left lane warrant analysis indicated that there is no requirement for left or right turn lanes at the study area intersections. The study also concluded that entrances on both roads could be safely accommodated with an adjustment of the proposed driveway on Kemmer Road to approximately 390 feet east of the existing house on site. Therefore, the proposed type and scale of public use for Cooper Mountain Natural Area is consistent with the Washington County Transportation Plan.

## POLICY 24 - RECREATION

It is the policy of Washington County to ensure that open space and recreational facilities are provided which reflect the needs of the county residents.

FINDINGS: The Cooper Mountain Master Plan very directiy addresses this policy by providing 231 acres of natural open space with public facilities that enhance the recreational experience. Recreation will be primarily nature-based, accommodating hiking, equestrian trail use, wildlife viewing, and environmental education, while also offering picnic facilities and a nature play area for small children. It will also accommodate a future regional bike trail. Mile markers and interpretative stations will be placed along the 3.5 -mile trail system. Approximately 1 mile of trail will be ADA accessible. Two entrances are provided for parking; one will accommodate horse trailers and the other will accommodate bus drop offs. Entrance amenities will include restrooms, orientation signage, seating, bike racks and a drinking fountain. An existing small home on the site will be converted to a "nature house" which will be designed to provide nature education programs to school and community groups.

## 2020 TRANSPORTATION PLAN POLICIES

### 1.0 TRAVEL NEEDS POLICY

It is the policy of Washington County to provide a multi-modal transportation system that accommodates the diverse travel needs of Washington County residents and businesses.

Cooper Mountain Natural Area Master Plan responds to Policy 1 in several ways. In addition to providing access and parking for vehicular travel, the plan proposes an alignment that will accommodate a regional bike trail through the site, which will ultimately serve as an east-west regional trail connector between two proposed north-south regional trails that are identified in the Washington County Transportation Plan. These are the Westside Power Line Trail and the Burlington Northern trail. The facilities proposed in the master plan will also include sidewalk improvements along Kemmer Road and $190^{\text {th }}$ to better accommodate pedestrian and bike access, and handicap parking and a bus drop-off at the trailheads.

### 2.0 SYSTEM SAFETY POLICY

It is the policy of Washington County to provide a transportation system that is safe.
As part of the Master Planning process for Cooper Mountain, a Transportation Impact Analysis was conducted by DKS Associates to evaluate anticipated future public use and its potential impacts on nearby and adjacent roads. The traffic analysis includes the evaluation of existing and future traffic conditions, with projected added trips resulting from proposed facilities. Traffic signal warrant and turn lane warrant analysis was also carried out to identify turn lane requirements (if any) for existing and future years. In addition, site access, trip generation, sight distance, safety and pedestrian issues were also addressed as part of the analysis.

The study concluded that the level of anticipated use that the proposed development for the Natural Area will generate would not result in unacceptable impacts to the existing road classification capacities. Proposed site entrances on Kemmer Road and Grabhorn Road were
also examined to determine if adequate site distances existed for safe egress and ingress. The study concludes that entrances on both roads can be safely accommodated with an adjustment of the proposed driveway on Kemmer Road to approximately 390 feet east of the existing house on site. The Master Plan is consistent with Policy 2.

### 4.0 SYSTEM FUNDING POLICY

It is the policy of Washington County to aggressively seek adequate and reliable funding for transportation facilities and services, and to ensure that funding is equitably raised and allocated.

Metro will incorporate transportation and street frontage improvements that are a requirement of the development review into the facility improvements for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Metro will pay any Traffic Impact fees that may be required through the development review of the proposed project.

### 10.0 FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION POLICY

It is the policy of Washington County to ensure the roadway system is designed and operates efficiently through the use of a roadway functional classification system.

Access to the site will be provided from Kemmer Road and Grabhom Road. Both roads are classified as collector streets. Collector streets provide both access and circulation between residential, commercial, industrial and agricultural community areas and to the arterial streets. Commercial, industrial and institutional uses (of which Cooper Mountain Natural area is considered) are eligible for direct access to collector streets.

The results of the transportation analysis reveal that all the study area intersections on adjacent collector streets operate within acceptable level-of-service (LOS) and volume to capacity (v/c) ratio for all future use scenarios. The additional traffic from the proposed development does not impact the level of service at any of the study intersections.

### 19.0 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT POLICY

It is the policy of Washington County to coordinate its transportation planning with local, regional, state and federal agencies and to provide opportunities for citizens to participate in planning processes.

Metro consulted with Washington County Planning and Transportation Division from the initial scoping stage of the master plan to ensure that the process and product would fulfill the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Planning Division was represented on
the Project Advisory Committee, which provided input, review and recommendations throughout the course of the master planning process. Metro submitted a Traffic Impact Statement Request to the County in July 2004 to identify traffic related development requirements.

Consistency of the Cooper Mountain Master Plan with the applicable provisions of the State Transportation Planning Rule as set forth in OAR 660-12-060 is demonstrated in the Transportation Impact Analysis, which was conducted as part of the master planning process, and which is addressed in earlier sections of these findings as well as below.

Citizens provided input and weighed in on transportation issues throughout the Master Plan public involvement process, which is described in detail under Policy 2 of the Rural Natural Resource Plan findings. Public review comments on the Draft Master Plan were received between October 20, 2005 and November 11, 2005. Public notice followed by a public hearing was held before Metro Council on December 1, 2005 to consider approval of the Master Plan. Public hearings will also be held before the Washington County Commission on March 15, 2006 and before the Board of Commissioners on April 4, 2006.

## STATE TRANSPORTATION RULE OAR 660-012-0060

Under Goal 12, the Oregon Transportation Rule, OAR 660-012-0060 requires an analysis of the impact of a proposed plan amendment on the planned transportation system to determine whether the proposal will "significantly affect" the planned transportation system in the area. Pursuant to the OAR, the proposed plan amendment would "significantly affect' Kemmer Road and Grabhorn Road if it does any of the following:
(a) Changes the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
(b) Changes the standards implementing a functional classification system; as measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP (year-2020);
(c) Allows types or levels of land uses which would result in levels of travel or access which are inconsistent with the functional classification of a transportation facility; or
(d) Would reduce the performance standards of the facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the Transportation System Plan; or
(e) Would worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the Transportation System Plan.

The results of the transportation impact analysis show that the proposed development of facilities for Cooper Mountain Natural Area will not cause any of the above significant effects; therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the State Transportation Planning Rule.

## COUNTY STATE AND REGIONAL PARK OVERLAY DISTRICT

At Metro's request, Washington County amended the State Park Overlay District to include Regional Parks. On October 5, 2004, the Board of Commissioners adopted Ordinance 628, which amends the Rural/Natural Resource Plan and the Community Development Code to amend the Park District Overlay. This amendment allows regional park planners to use the master planning criteria and process identified in Oregon Administrative Rule 660-034, to develop conceptual site plans for future regional parks. The completed master plans will allow park uses on resource land without requiring an exception to Statewide Planning Goals.

Metro adopted a master planning process for Cooper Mountain Natural Area that adheres to the master planning criteria contained in State Park Rule OAR 736, Division 18. This planning process includes a thorough resource inventory of natural, cultural and scenic resources, and an analysis of those resources to determine land suitability classes or capability for accommodating development. In addition, surrounding areas of concern were evaluated to determine the opportunities and constraints that nearby and adjacent properties represent to the planning of the Natural Area. Finally, an analysis of recreation needs and demand was conducted by using several methods: 1) reviewing regional needs defined by SCORP, 2) evaluating surrounding recreation providers, 3 ) evaluating existing use patterns at Cooper Mountain, and 4) conducting an extensive public survey by mail and website to determine citizen interests and concerns. The inventory and analysis done for Cooper Mountain, which follows the State Park Master Planning criteria, provides the foundation for decision-making and the resulting proposed master plan concept.
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February 28, 2006

Jane Hart
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

## Subject: Cooper Mountain Natural Area Transportation Impact Analysis

## Dear Jane:

DKS Associates is pleased to submit this final transportation impact analysis for the proposed Cooper Mountain Natural Area in Washington County. This study addresses all comments received to date on the draft reports that have been submitted. One bound and one unbound copy has been provided for your use. Please feel free to call if you have any questions or comments regarding this study.

Sincerely,
DKS Associates


## Chapter 1 <br> Executive Summary

Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces have been working on a master plan to build a visitor facility on its 231-acre natural open space located on Cooper Mountain, in Washington County. The project site is generally located west of the City of Beaverton between Farmington Road and Schoils Ferry Road at approximately $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The site is south of the Kemmer Road $/ 190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection and is east of Grabhorn Road. The Cooper Mountain Master Plan identifies improvements to the natural area to provide for public access and use with proposed improvements that include: 3.5 miles of new trails, a nature house with meeting/classroom space, a children's play area, a ranger's residence and two parking areas with facility for parking approximately 60 vehicles.

The purpose of this report is to provide a transportation impact analysis of the proposed 231-acre Cooper Mountain Natural Area. This report is intended to fulfill the Washington County requirements necessary to receive a comprehensive plan amendment and development approval for the proposed project. This report analyzes the transportation impacts as a result of the proposed development.

## Transportation Impact Analysis Summary

The analysis includes the evaluation of the existing and future (year 2007 and 2020) traffic conditions, with the added project trips for the AM (7:00am to $9: 00 \mathrm{am})$ and PM (4:00pm to 6:00 pm) peak period traffic. Traffic signal wartant and turn lane warrant analysis was also carried out to identify turn lane requirements (if any) for existing and future years. In addition site access, trip generation, sight distance, safety and pedestrian issues were also addressed as a part of the analysis.

The proposed facility will generate approximately 322 daily trips during the peak summer season, with 33 trips in the AM peak and 33 trips in the PM peak period ${ }^{1}$. The trip distribution is based on the Metro's Regional Travel Demand forecast model and the existing travel patterns in the study area.

To evaluate the traffic operating conditions at intersections, the concept of level-of-service has been developed. Level-of-service categories are similar to report card ratings for traffic performance. Levels of Service A, B and C indicate conditions where traffic moves without significant delays over periods of peak travel demand. Level of service $D$ and $E$ are progressively worse and $F$ conditions represent where demand exceeds the capacity of an intersection. Washington County sets level of service E as the minimum acceptable level of service for peak hour operation. Results of the existing analysis show that all of the study intersections ${ }^{2}$ operate with a level-of-service of ' C ' or better. Evaluation of the future traffic conditions (for year 2007 and year 2020) with the added project traffic show that all of the intersections would operate at level-of-service of ' $D$ ' or

[^0]better during the AM and the PM peak periods. None of the intersections drop below the acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours as per Washington County's standards ${ }^{3}$.

Speed surveys conducted on SW Grabhorn Road and SW Kemmer Road adjacent to the proposed project site indicate that the $85^{4}$ percentile speed ${ }^{4}$ on SW Grabhom Road is slightly lower then the posted speed of 45 mph and the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed on SW Kemmer Road is slightly higher than the posted speed of 40 mph . Data obtained from the Oregon Department of Transportation indicate that no crashes (accidents) have been reported at the study area intersections ${ }^{5}$ from 2001 to 2003. The pedestrian activity at the study area intersections is generally very low.

An evaluation of traffic signal warrants indicate that none of the study intersections (Kemmer Road/ $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Kemmer Road/ $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Grabhorn Road/Gassner Road) need to be signalized in either the short term or the long term (year 2020). A left turn lane warrant analysis was also conducted for the proposed site access points and the study area intersections (Kemmer Road/175 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Kemmer Road/190 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Grabhorn Road/Gasner Road) and the analysis indicates that there is no requirement for left or right turn lanes at the study area intersections.

The State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule does not specifically apply to this proposed project. Under Goal 12, OAR 660-12-060 (1) (Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments), only amendments which "significantly affect a transportation facility" must be analyzed. A significant effect on a transportation facility occurs only if it: (a) changes the functional classification; (b) changes the standards implementing the functional classification; (c) allows land uses which would result in levels of travel inconsistent with the facilities classification; or (d) would reduce the level of service below the minimum acceptable level. This proposed project will not cause such impacts, therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660, Division 12, section 060). The proposed project is also consistent with the Washington County Transportation System Plan and does not violate any transportation policies and/or goals of the plan. The first page of the technical appendix has a map that indicates the parcels for this project that are outside the UGB along with their tax lot number.

## Recommendations

The results of the transportation analysis reveal that all the study area intersections operate within acceptable level-of-service (LOS) and volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio for all future scenarios ${ }^{6}$. The additional traffic from the proposed development does not impact the level-of-service at any of the study intersections. Furthermore, traffic signals, left turn lanes and right turn lanes are not warranted at the study area intersections. The following recommendations should be implemented to meet Washington County standards:

- To ensure that adequate sight distance is met at the proposed access to SW Kemmer Road, it is recommended that the currently proposed location of the driveway be shifted approximately 390 feet east from the edge of the existing house located at the site. The new access point will be approximately 745 feet east of $S W 190^{\text {ti }}$ Avenue, which will provide adequate sight distance that meets Washington County standards. This proposed location on Kemmer Road is directly across the street from a blue house with an address

[^1]of 18701 SW Kemmer Road. Based on field measurements, this location will maximize the sight distance in both directions.

- Provide tree/bush trimming on the east and west sides of the proposed access point on SW Kemmer Road (south side only) and on the north and south sides of the proposed access point on SW Grabhorn Road (east side only) to provide adequate sight distance.


## Chapter 2 <br> Existing Conditions

This chapter discusses the existing roadway conditions in the vicinity of the project area, including roadway geometrics, traffic volumes, traffic characteristics, traffic operations, posted speed, transit operations and pedestrian/bicycle facilities on the roadway.

## Study Area

The study area is located to the west of City of Beaverton between Farmington Road and Scholls Ferry Road near $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (refer Figure 1). It is a low-density residential area that includes Cooper Mountain and surrounding areas. Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces have developed a master plan to enhance the natural area and provide visitor facilities on this 231 -acre natural open space. The proposed facilities will include a $3-1 / 2$ mile trail system, a Nature House with meeting/classroom space and a children's play area. Approximately 145 acres of the 231 acre natural area is located outside the Urban Growth Boundary (see zoning map in first section of the technical appendix).

Access to the proposed facility is provided via SW Kemmer Road, SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and SW Grabhom Road. There are two separated parking areas located at the trailheads near these access points. One parking area is located off Kemmer Road east of $190^{\text {di }}$ Avenue. The second parking area is located off Grabhorn Road south of Stone Creek Drive. The SW Kemmer Road entrance provides parking for approximately 35 vehicles and the SW Grabhom Road entrance provides parking for 25 vehicles. The key intersections in the study area that are identified for detailed analysis are listed below. These intersections were selected because they are the key collector/collector or arterial/collector intersections in the vicinity of the project site.

- SW Kemmer Road/SW 190 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
- SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
- SW Grabhorn Road/SW Gasner Road

As described in Chapter 3 of this report, the estimated trip generation from this site will be low (approximately 33 trips during the AM and PM peak hours). In general, the study area extends to the nearest collector/collector intersection from each of the two project site access points. Therefore, for the site access on SW Kemmer Road, the study area was extended to the SW Kemmer Road/SW 190 Avenue intersection and the SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection. For the project access on SW Grabhorn Road, the study area was just extended north to SW Gasner Road. Due to the low volumes to the south on SW Grabhorn Road, the study area was not extended to the south. The proposed project trips do not increase traffic volumes at any study area intersection by more than four percent. The SW Gasner Road/SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection was not included in the analysis because of the small amount of traffic that would be added to the intersection.

## Roadway Network E Traffic Control

Some of the key roadways in the area are SW Gasner Road, SW Kemmer Road, SW Grabhorn Road, SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Washington County functional classification system has identified all of these roadways as collectors except SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue that is an arterial
roadway ${ }^{7}$ (refer Table 1). As shown in table 1 currently there are no bike lanes on any of the roadways. All of the roads have two travel lanes and the average roadway width is approximately 20 to 22 feet.

All of the study area intersections are unsignalized. The SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection is a 4 -way stop controlled intersection and the other two junctions are $t$-intersections with stop control on the minor approach. The SW Kemmer Road/ $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection is stop controlled on northbound SW $190^{\text {dh }}$ Avenue. The SW Grabhom Road/SW Gasner Road intersection is stop controlled on westbound SW Gasner Road.

| Roadway | Washington <br> County | Road Geometrics |  | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Functional <br> Classification | Travel <br> Lanes | Approximate <br> Roadway <br> Width |  |  |
| SW Kemmer Road | Collector | 2 | $22^{\prime}$ | No bike lane or sidewalks |
| SW Grabhorn Road | Collector | 2 | $20^{\prime}$ | No bike lane, fog line, or <br> sidewalks |
| SW Gasner Road | Collector | 2 | $21^{\prime}$ | No bike lane or sidewalks |
| SW 175 ${ }^{\text {h }}$ Avenue | Arterial | 2 | $22^{\prime}$ | No bike lane or sidewalks. |
| SW $190^{\text {ah }}$ Avenue | Collector | 2 | $22^{\prime}$ | No bike lane, fog line, or <br> sidewalks |

## Table l: Roadway Characteristics

SW Kemmer Road is a two-lane collector roadway with a posted speed of 40 mph . The intersection of SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {di }}$ Avenue is a four-way stop controlled intersection with a southbound right turn slip lane on the northwest comer of the intersection. The roadway is approximately 22 feet wide with no bike lanes or sidewalks.

SW Gasner Road is a two-lane collector roadway with a posted speed of 40 mph . The roadway is approximately 21 feet wide. There are no bike lanes or sidewalks on either side of the roadway. The intersection of SW Grabhom Road/SW Gasner Road is a stop-controlled intersection with a stop sign on SW Gasner Road.


Intersection of SW Gasner Road/SW Grabhorn Road looking east on SW Gasner Road
$\boldsymbol{S W}$ Grabhorn Road is a two-lane collector road that provides access to the proposed site. There are no bike lanes on either side of the roadway and there is no fog line to the south from the intersection of SW Gasner/SW Grabhorn Road. The posted speed is 45 mph . The roadway is approximately 20 feet wide near the project site.
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$S W 190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is a two-lane collector roadway with a posted speed of 40 mph . The intersection of $S W 190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/SW Kemmer Road is a stop controlled tee intersection that has a stop sign on the south leg of SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.

SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is a two-lane arterial roadway that has a posted speed of 35 mph north of Kemmer Road and 45 mph south of Kemmer Road. The roadway is approximately 22 feet wide with no bike lanes or shoulders. A sidewalk is provided on the westside side of $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue north of Kemmer Road. There is a


Intersection of SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/SW Kemmer Road looking south towards SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue pedestrian sidewalk only on the north leg of the roadway.

## Traffic Volume Profile and 85th Percentile Speed

To determine the traffic volume profile in the study area a 24 -hour bi-directional traffic volume count was conducted on both SW Grabhorn Road and SW Kemmer Road ${ }^{8}$. The count point on SW Grabhorn Road was located south of the Stone Creek Drive/SW Grabhorn Road intersection and the count point on SW Kemmer Road was located between SW Kemmer Road/SW 190 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ intersection and the proposed access on SW Kemmer Road.

Figure 2: Daily Traffic Volume Profile on SW Grabhorn Road s/o Stone Creek Drive


The daily traffic volume on SW Grabhorn Road is approximately 2,500 vehicles per day and on SW Kemmer Road is approximately 3,700 vehicles per day. Figures 2 and 3 show the 24 -hour volume profile at these two locations. The PM peak volume on SW Kemmer Road is higher than the AM peak. The AM and PM peak traffic volume on SW Grabhorn Road is comparable for both the time periods.

[^3]Figure 3: Daily Traffic Volume Profile on SW Kemmer Road e/o SW 190 Avenue


Bi-directional speed data was collected on both SW Grabhorn Road and SW Kemmer Road near the project site. From this speed data the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed was identified. The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is the speed at which 85 percent of vehicles are traveling at or below and 15 percent of vehicles are traveling at or above. It is commonly used in traffic engineering as a measure of roadway travel speeds. As shown in Table 2 the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed in both directions at the SW Grabhorn Road location is lower then the posted speed of 45 mph . The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speeds in both directions on SW Kemmer Road are higher than the posted speed of 40 mph .

Table 2: Speed Profile Data

| Locatiou | SW Grabhorn Road ${ }^{*}$ |  | SW Kemmer Road** |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $N B$ | $S B$ | $E B$ | $W B$ |
| Posted speed on roadway (mph) | 45 | 45 | 40 | 40 |
| $85^{\text {dh }}$ Percentile Speed (mph) | 41 | 40 | 41 | 44 |

* Speed count taken on SW Grabhorn Road 500 feet south of Stone Creek Drive/Grabhom intersection
** Speed count taken on SW Kemmer Road 600 feet east of Kemmer Road/190 Avenue intersection


## Existing Traffic Operating Conditions

In order to understand traffic operating conditions in the study area, the current operating conditions of the study area intersections were quantified based on the concept of level-of-service (LOS). This is a quantitative measure that defines the intersection operating conditions within a range from A to F that have been standardized by Transportation Research Board and is documented in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual. Level-of-service A represents a free flowing condition where the other motorists on the roadway affect the driver very little. This condition gradually declines as we proceed from a level-of-service A to a level-of-service F. Level-ofservice $F$ is represents a congested condition with the motorist having to experience high stoppages and significant delays.
The concept of level-of-service (LOS) is applicable to both signalized and unsignalized intersections. The only difference is, for signalized intersections, the LOS is defined on the basis of average control delay for all movements at the intersection and for an unsignalized intersection it is based on approach delay for the minor street approach. The average control delay on a
signalized intersection is the delay that a motorist experiences as a result the traffic signal and the vehicle queue, averaged for the whole intersection for all approaches. For unsignalized intersections the delay is the result of time spent at the intersection (to stop \& go), and delay due to the vehicle queue. This value is determined only for the highest delay on the major approach and the minor approach. For a signalized intersection LOS represents the operating condition for the whole intersection and for unsignalized intersections LOS is reported for the highest delay on the minor and major approach. These level-of-service definitions and criterion are based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual. In our study area all the intersections are unsignalized so the LOS is based on the concepts applicable for unsignalized intersections.

Intersection turn movement counts were conducted during the morning and the evening peak hour (7:00am-9:00am and 4:00pm-6:00pm respectively) ${ }^{9}$ at the study area locations. Figure 4 summaxizes the existing AM and PM peak hour turn movement data collected and the intersection geometry. Based on the level-of-service criterion as discussed above the current performance for the study intersections is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Existing AM and PM Peak Hour Intersection Level-af-Service

| Intersection | Control | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (sec) | LOS | Delay (sec) | LOS |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {lin }}$ Avenue | Unsignalized <br> (4-way stop) | 12.1 | B/B | 11.4 | B/A |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Unsignalized (2-way stop) | - | A/A | - | A/A |
| SW Grabhorn Road/SW Gasner Road | Unsignalized (2-way stop) | - | A/B | - | A/B |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: } \\ & \text { X/X }=\text { Major street/minor street LOS } \\ & \text { LOS }=\text { Level-of-service } \\ & \text { Delay }=\text { Average stopped delay/vehicle } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

As per the Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan the minimum acceptable standard is LOS ' $E$ ' ${ }^{10}$ and it can be observed that presently none of the intersections drop below the acceptable LOS standards during the AM and PM peak hours.

## Accident Record

A safety assessment was done by reviewing the collision data for the intersections in the study area for a three-year period (2001-2003) ${ }^{11}$. Table 4 below shows the type and the number of collisions reported at the study area intersections. There are no crashes reported in the last three years for the three study area intersections.
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| LEGEND |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (6) - Study intersection | AM (PM) - Peak Hour Trafic Volumes |
| sof - Stop Sign Controlled Intersection <br> $\leftarrow$-Lane Configuration | RT - Right Turn Movement <br> - Through Movement <br> - Left Tum Movement |

Table 4: Traffic Collision Data 2001-2003

| Intersection | Fatal <br> Crashes | Non-fatal <br> Crashes | Property <br> Damage | Total <br> Crashes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW 175 $5^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW 190 Avenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SW Grabhom/SW Gasner Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit
Washington County maintains a Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) that ranks intersections using accident data over a three-year period. A SPIS value is calculated if there are three or more accidents over a three-year period and/or one fatality over a three-year period. Since there are no reported crashes on these intersections there is no SPIS value assigned for these intersections.

## Transit Facility

Currently there is no available public transit facility to the site and the nearest TriMet bus route is along SW $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and SW Farmington Road (route \# 88) which is approximately 1.5 miles to the north of the study area.

## Pedestrian Activity

There are limited pedestrian facilities within the study area, with sidewalks provided on the west side of $175^{\text {dh }}$ Avenue north of Kemmer Road only. No other pedestrian facilities are provided within the study area. Pedestrian data was collected during the AM and PM peak periods at the study area intersections ${ }^{12}$. Table 5 shows the peak period pedestrian activity at these locations that shows there were not more than five pedestrians per hour crossing any of the study area intersections. However, pedestrian facilities will be provided near the site frontage along both SW Kemmer Road and SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue as shown in the proposed site plan that is provided in the appendix.
Table 5: Peak Hour Pedestrian Activity at Intersections

| Intersection | Number of Pedestrians |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM peak hour | PM peak hour |
| SW Kemmer Road/ SW 190 Avenue | 1 | 3 |
| SW Grabhom Road/SW Gasner Road | 1 | 2 |

[^5]
## Chapter 3

## Impact Assessment

This chapter reviews the impact of the proposed project on the existing transportation system. The analysis includes the assessment of the trip generation and distribution, capacity analysis of the study area intersections with future traffic and sight distance.

## Trip Generation and Distribution

The proposed Cooper Mountain Natural Area will consist of 3.5 miles of new trails, a nature house with meeting/classroom space, a children's play area, a ranger's residence and two parking areas with facility for parking approximately 60 cars. The 231 -acre natural area in Washington County is proposed to be developed as a nature park. Typically trip generation ratios for new facilities are determined by using the ITE Trip Generation Manual. However, for this project the ITE Trip Generation Manual does not provide us a similar use. Therefore, the daily trip generation was determined based on traffic count data for the Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreational District's (THPRD) Nature Center, which is a similar facility in terms of size and usage in the region ${ }^{13}$. However in actuality, the scale of proposed facilities at the Cooper Mountain Natural Area will be significantly smaller and the level of use proportionately lower. The weekend and weekday average daily trips during the peak summer season for THPRD's Nature Center was used to estimate the trips for the proposed facility in Cooper Mountain. Peak season data from the THPRD Nature Center was applied for the weekday AM and PM peak period for this project to represent a worst-case scenario. A summary calculation sheet is provided in the appendix. The total peak hour trips have been broken down into entering and exiting trips based on the in/out percentage provided by Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook ${ }^{14}$, for a 'County Park' (ITE Code 412) facility.

Table 6: Trip Generation

|  | Peak Hour Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daily Trips | AM peak hour |  |  |  | PM peak hour |  |  |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| 322 | 24 | 9 | 33 | 12 | 21 | 33 |  |

As seen in Table 6 the proposed facility will generate approximately 322 daily trips during the peak summer season, with 33 trips in moming peak and 33 during the evening peak period. The trip distribution is based on Metro's Regional Travel Demand forecast model and the existing travel patterns in the study area. In the appendix a 'Select Zone Plot' from the 'West-Side Focus Model' is provided along with vehicle turn movement counts at study area intersections. Figure 5 shows the trip distribution pattern in the study area.

## Future Intersection Operation

The study area intersection capacity was assessed for the AM and PM peak for the following scenarios:

- Existing conditions (as discussed in the previous section)
- Existing plus background traffic plus project trips (year 2007)
- Future 2020 traffic volumes plus project trips (year 2020)
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## Existing plus background traffic plus project trips (year 2007)

It has been assumed that the proposed project will be completed by the year 2007. Based on the expected built-out year a 3\% growth rate was applied on to the existing traffic volumes on the study intersections to account for the background growth till the horizon year $2007^{15}$. The growth rate was determined using the Washington County (west-side focus) travel demand forecast model. Table 7 summarizes the intersection operating conditions and Figure 6 shows the future traffic volumes. Washington County has identified a level-of-service ' $E$ ' as the minimum acceptable standard for intersection performance ${ }^{16}$ and none of the intersections fall below the acceptable standards for analysis year 2007.

Table 7: Year 2007With Project AM and PM peak hour Intersection Level-of-Service

| Intersection | Control | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {dh }}$ Avenue | Unsignalized (4-way stop) | 13.3 | C/B | 12.3 | B/B |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW $190^{\text {4/ }}$ Avenue | Unsignalized (2-way stop) | - | A/A | - | A/A |
| SW Grabhorn Road/SW Gasner Road | Unsignalized (2-way stop) | - | B/A | - | B/A |
| Note: <br> $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{X}=$ Major street/minor street LOS <br> LOS $=$ Level-of-service <br> Delay $=$ Average stopped delay/vehicle |  |  |  |  |  |

Future 2020 traffic volumes plus project trips (year 2020)
The future intersection operating conditions were evaluated by adding the project trips to the 2020 forecasted traffic volume (using the Washington County travel demand forecast model) at the study area intersections. Table 8 summarizes the intersection future operating conditions and Figure 7 shows the projected year 2020 traffic volumes at the study intersections. As shown in Table 8 the level-of-service for all study area intersections does not drop below the minimum acceptable standards.

Table 8: Year 2020 With Project AM and PM peak hour Intersection Level-of-Service

| Intersection | Control | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW $175^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Unsignalized (4-way stop) | 20.5 | D/C | 21.0 | D/3 |
| SW Kemmer Road/SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Unsignalized (2-way stop) | - | B/A | - | B/A |
| SW Grabhorn Road/SW Gasner Road | Unsignalized (2-way stop) | - | B/A | - | C/A |
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## Site Distance Requirements

The minimum sight distance criterion is based on Washington County ordinance 501, section 501-8.5 F. (1), (2), (3) and (4). As per the ordinance the sight distance requirement is ten times of either posted speed or the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed, whichever is the highest. Based on this criterion Table 9 shows the required sight distance at the proposed access points and the SW Gasner/SW Grabhorn intersection in the study area.

Table 9: Required Sight Distance at Proposed Access Points and Study Intersection*

| Location | Posted <br> Speed | $8^{\text {th }}$ Percentile <br> Speed $^{17}$ | Required Sight <br> Distance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SW Kemmer Road <br> Proposed Access | 40 mph | 44 mph | 440 feet |
| SW Grabhom Road <br> Proposed Access | 45 mph | 41 mph | 450 feet |
| SW Gasner/SW <br> Grabhom Intersection | 45 mph | - | 450 feet |

* Actual sight distances to be measured after the proposed driveways are built

The minimum sight distance required at the access on SW Kemmer Road is 440 feet that is based on the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of 44 mph . The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed at this location is higher than the posted speed hence the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is chosen to identify the sight distance requirement. The minimum requirement on SW Grabhom Road access is 450 feet that is based on ten times the posted speed of 45 mph , which in this case is higher than the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of 41 mph as seen in the table above.

Based on field observations, the sight distance at the proposed access point on the SW Grabhorn Road is 550 feet to the north and 700 feet to the south. The required sight distance is 450 feet (see table 10 above), and therefore the proposed access point meets the required criterion.

Based on field observations, the available sight distance from the current location of the proposed access point on SW Kemmer Road is only 390 feet to the east. The required sight distance is 440 feet (see table 10 above) and therefore the available sight distance is not adequate and does not meet the minimum required criterion. Considering this, it is recommended that the site access point on Kemmer Road be relocated directly across the street from a blue house with an address of 18701 SW Kemmer Road. This proposed driveway would be located approximately 745 feet east of SW 190th Avenue. At this proposed location there is 1,000 feet of sight distance to the east and 500 feet of sight distance to the west, both of which will meet Washington County standards. The new location of the access point is approximately 390 feet east of the eastern edge of the green house that currently is on the site. Some of the mitigations that are required to put the new driveway location at place are:

- Provide minor tree/brush trimming on the south side of Kemmer Road both to the west and to the east of the proposed driveway.
- Relocate the mailbox for 18701 SW Kemmer Road.
- Relocate the mailbox (to improve sight visibility) for 18749 SW Kemmer Road.
- Construct a driveway approach that has a flat grade or slopes upwards away from the edge of pavement, for the first 10 feet from the edge of pavement.
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## Parking

There are two proposed access points to the site, one on SW Grabhorn Road and the other on SW Kemmer Road. The south entry off SW Grabhorn Road provides parking for 25 vehicles and the entry off SW Kemmer Road provides parking for approximately 35 vehicles ${ }^{18}$. A site plan is provided in the appendix.

## Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic signal warrants were evaluated for the AM and PM peak hours for the forecasted year 2007 with project related traffic for the unsignalized intersections. Peak hour traffic signal warrants were evaluated based on Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) ${ }^{19}$ guidelines. None of the study intersections meet signal warrants so none of these intersections will need to be signalized.

## Tum Lane Warrant Analysis

Left turn lane warrants were evaluated at the project site intersections for the future year scenarios and no left turn lanes were found to be warranted.

[^9]
## Chapter 4

## Recommendations

The results of the transportation analysis reveal that all the study area intersections operate within acceptable level-of-service (LOS) and volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio for all future scenarios ${ }^{20}$. The additional traffic from the proposed development does not impact the level-of-service at any of the study intersections. Furthermore, traffic signals, left turn lanes and right turn lanes are not warranted at the study area intersections. The following recommendations should be implemented to meet Washington County standards:

- To ensure that adequate sight distance is met at the proposed access to SW Kemmer Road, it is recommended that the currently proposed location of the driveway be shifted approximately 390 feet east from the edge of the existing house located at the site. The new access point will be approximately 745 feet east of SW $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, which will provide adequate sight distance that meets Washington County standards. This proposed location on Kemmer Road is directly across the street from a blue house with an address of 18701 SW Kemmer Road. Based on field measurements, this location will maximize the sight distance in both directions.
- Provide tree/bush trimming on the east and west sides of the proposed access point on SW Kemmer Road (south side only) and on the north and south sides of the proposed access point on SW Grabhorn Road (east side only) to provide adequate sight distance.
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constraints, shaped six broad goals for the natural area: with assessments of the site's resources, opportunities and creating a viable long-term vision for the site. This input, combined governments, recreation groups, and natural resource specialists in The Cooper Mountain Natural Area Master Plan is the result of a
public involvement process that engaged neighbors, local

## Process and Goals

views of the valley.
endangered. The site also contains the headwaters of Lindow Creek
(a major tributary of the Tualatin River), and offers commanding ene the site also contains the headwaters of Lindow Creek concern" - species at risk of being listed as threatened or homes for nine plant and wildlife species that have been identified
at the state and federal level as "sensitive species" or "species of

Cooper Mountain, located on the southwest edge of Beaverton, was
development and management, the plan also identifies long-term opportunities. For example, if adjacent properties come up for sale in the future by willing seilers, consideration will be given to purchasing these parcels in order to expand habitat protection goals, recreation uses (including regional trail connections), and
buffers between the natural area and surrounding neighbors.

## Conclusion

In 1995, voters approved a bond measure to acquire regionally significant natural areas, parks and other greenspaces throughout the metropolitan area. Cooper Mountain Natural Area is one of these regional treasures - a place where nature is flourishing in the midst of our neighborhoods. In 2004, the Metro Council dedicated resources to develop Cooper Mountain Natural Area for public use. This master plan is a key step toward responsible management of this resource, while providing the public with a safe enjoyable experience of one of our region's great resources.

## Recommendations

The master plan recommendations are an attempt to balance the need for protection and enhancement of the unique natural resources present on the site, with the public's use and enjoyment of nature-based recreational activities. The preferred site design concept includes the following elements:

## - A 3.5-mile trail system, marked by interpretive signs, to

 accommodate hikers, wheelchair users, and equestriansA nature house that will provide environmental education classrooms for school groups and meeting space for community groups.

- Two parking areas and trailheads - one on the north edge of the site at Kemmer Road and the other at the southeast corner of the site at Grabhorn Road. Trailhead facilities will include restrooms, shelter, picnic tables, drinking fountain, interpretive signs and other facilities.
- A children's play area designed with natural elements of sand, rock, water and plants to accommodate educational activities and neighborhood use.
- A caretaker residence and maintenance yard to provide a
management presence and to oversee facilities.

In addition, a Natural Resource Management Strategy and an
Interpretive Program Concept are being developed to help guide the habitat management and educational programming that will occur
on site. A phased implementation plan is recommended for the development of the facilities in order to consider visitor needs and minimize construction costs and operational impacts.

This Master Plan represents today's vision for an important regional natural area that provides an exciting opportunity for habitat enhancement and compatible public use within a neighborhood context. In addition to providing a framework for future
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 Mountain

- Protect spectacular scenic vistas "out from and in to" Cooper of tributaries including Lindow Creek Protect water quality of Tualatin River by protecting headwaters Mountain's unique biological diversity
 acquisition goals:
Mountain Target Area Refinement Plan included the following Measure provided funding for the acquisition of land in the Cooper
Mountain Target Area. The bond measure and the Cooper The 1995 passage of Metro's Open Space, Parks and Streams Bond County as a regionally significant natural area Master Plan of 1992 identified Cooper Mountain in Washington greenways for wildlife and people. The Metropolitan Greenspaces quality of life for the region by protecting natural areas, trails and Department is to work cooperatively with the public to maintain the A primary mission of Metro's Regional Parks and Greenspaces
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## Master Plan Purpose

The purpose of this master plan is to provide a long term collective vision and implementation strategy to guide future public use and
enjoyment, development and natural resource management of Cooper Mountain Natural Area. This master plan establishes goals, and provides recommendations and a site concept for future trail design, facility development and vegetation management.
It also lays out a framework for addressing natural resource
management and future maintenance and operations needs; and for implementing future development by identifying required project permits and approvals, cost estimates, phasing and potential funding sources. Most importantly, this master plan is a guiding vision that reflects the community's desires. The completed plan can also serve as a useful tool in obtaining future funding.

## Public Involvement

 the Cooper Mountain Natural Area planning process involved interested citizens, neighbors, natural resource and recreation groups, businesses and local governments. The purpose of such broad involvement was to:

- Draw upon local knowledge, interest and experience to provide a variety of perspectives on the use of Cooper Mountain; Build a public understanding of the issues related to natural resource management of publicly-owned land on Cooper Mountain;
- Build a public understanding of the final plan recommendations; and
Produce a master plan that best serves the entire community. 2W Section 25 on the southwest slope of Cooper Mountain The site offers a commanding view of the Tualatin River Valley and the Chehalem Mountains. It also contains the headwaters to Lindow Creek, a major tributary of the Tualatin River. The site features shallow, rocky soils; small, seasonally-perched seeps; oak and madrone woodlands; and a diverse prairie community of wildflowers - habitats that are primarily defined by the site's geomorphic origins and southern exposure.

The project study area includes the Metro-owned property and the lands immediately surrounding it in order to identify the opportunities and constraints represented by the Natural Area.


View from the meadow overlooks the Tualatin River Valley
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 plan for the natural area that integrated public use opportunities Metro staff. Each team was charged with developing a conceptual landscape architects from other agencies and non-profits, as well as
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Metro's web site proved to be an effective tool in engaging
interested citizens in the project planning process. Citizens were
able to gather information about the project, review documents, be
regularly notified and updated, submit comments and complete
public opinion surveys. Over 5,000 visits to the Cooper Mountain
web pages were made during the planning process.
Copies of the Project Advisory Committee meeting notes and of the Cooper Mountain Chronicle newsletter are included in the appendix of this plan. A complete record of the public involvement process and design refinement process for the Cooper Mountain Master Plan is also available for public review upon request.
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 surveys conducted by the General Land Office. Vegetation notes presettlement vegetation was noted in the township and section line The oldest record of vegetation cover on Cooper Mountain is from
the 1852 General Land Office Land Cover records. This ио!ұеұәбәл ұиәшәןұәsəлд quickly in some locations than in others. permits surface water to percolate down through the bedrock more or cracked than flows at lower elevations. This network of fractures
 different rates of weathering. The uppermost basalts, which are part differing characteristics due to the degree of fracturing, as well as Multiple layers of the basalt can be observed within the Cooper
formed most of the higher hills in the Portland area subsequent folding, fracturing and uplifts of this lava layer have also with a nearly level surface up to 100 feet thick in places. The flows originally covered much of the Northern Willamette Valley flows that shaped the landscape over millions of years. The fluid lava Cooper Mountain was formed by the ancient Columbia River basalt
was the Atfalati, commonly known as the Tualatin or Wapato Lake Indians. The Atfalati lived in about 24 villages on what is now the Tualatin River Valley, in the hills around Forest Grove, along the
shores of Wapato Lake, along the north fork of the Yamhill River, in Hillsboro, and in Portland. One of these Atfalati villages was named Cha-kepi, "Place of Beaver," which is the present-day location of Beaverton.

The Atfalati roamed between the Willamette River and the slopes of the Coast Range, and from present day Wilsonville to the Columbia River. These seasonal movements were tied to variations in food sources during different seasons and at different elevations. For instance, the Willamette floodplain provided camas, wapato and
marsh birds, while the higher elevation valley margins (which
Cooper Mountain represents) provided stands of acorn oaks, abundant mammals, and upland bird species such as grouse and
 of semej lof puel fo sasuedxa uado əul mauad pue дəəp puny of
 face of Cooper Mountain overlooking the Tualatin Valley was
partially comprised of oak woodlands and open prairie amidst the conifer stands, thus indicating that Native American burning
practices may have extended up the southern slope of the mountain.

Warm weather months were used to hunt, gather and store food, and obtain provisions for clothing, shelter and tools. Tribal members camped in smaller family groups and moved to places where plants could be harvested or animals hunted. Important staple foods such as camas (bulb of the wild lily), wapato (Indian potato or arrowhead), acorns, hazelnuts and tarweed seed were usually gathered by women. Cooper Mountain was likely used by tribal members for hunting and gathering.

During the winter months tribal families came together in more permanent large plank houses. The Atfalati used this time to keep their culture alive by story telling, and making and repairing tools for the next season.
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Mountain School location. larger one-room schoolhouse in 1912 at the present Cooper

 present school (which is at 170th and Hart Road). It was a one-


 The original Cooper Mountain School circa 1892

Metro acquired the property, most of the land was clear-cut from logging. Slash remained on the ground and invasive non-native vegetation had taken hold. Informal public use (hiking, dog
walking, bicycling, and horseback riding) along the site's logging
roads and on many social trails was heavy.
Metro's interim management activities on the site over the course of the last eight years have included: access control, slash removal, invasive plant removal, reforestation of clear cut areas with the planting of approximately 60,000 native trees, native seed collection, prescribed burns to keep fuel loads down, plant its restoration and monitoring activities.


Recreation Context Land Use

Scenic \& Cultural Resources
Natural Resources
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deer, western gray squirrel, fox and coyote. the white-breasted nuthatch. Mammals using this habitat include Americal such as warblers and vireos, and resident species such as

 shrubs such as Indian plum, snowberry, and poison oak. Over 200 white oak and madrone with an open understory dominated by
 Approximately 44 acres of the site is in open oak habitat. Oak species. supports a wide variety of wildife, including many rare and sensitive invasive non-native shrubs. This is a valuable plant community that agriculture, exclusion of fire, and competition from Douglas fir and
 Once abundant in the Willamette Valley, Oak woodland is now a
rare habitat in the region. Over 80 percent of the oak woodlands in Oak Woodland
Plant and Wildlife Communities on site. topography adds to the diversity of plant and wildlife communities with broader, flatter ridges between the stream corridors. This mixed River. The streams are at the bottom of narrow, steep-sided ravines


 in addition to the thin soils, has resulted in a unique mosaic of of Cooper Mountain from 550 to 755 feet elevation. This exposure, Cooper Mountain Natural Area is located on the southwest slopes

## suo! !!puo) 6u!łs!xヨ


native grasses (e.g. California oatgrass, California brome, junegrass) and native wildflowers, including several regionally rare and uncommon species. Healthy populations of white rock larkspur (state endangered, federal species of concern) and meadow sidalcea (state candidate) both occur in the prairies along with many other native wildflowers such as Oregon sunshine, clarkia, Oregon saxifrage, and a large variety of native lilies. The prairies of Cooper

Mountain provide their strongest wildflower bloom displays in spring and early summer. Because of the thin soils and southern aspect of the site, the prairies become dry and largely dormant by mid summer.
 from surrounding oak woodland habitat, competition from non'səu!bad aวuequms!p ןeaneu ayt u! suo!ndnaəatu! pue 'sque|d ən!teu such as fire and grazing, that maintain the plant communities. Non-
 variety of non-native annual grasses. Metro has utilized a variety of practices, including controlled burns, to manage this habitat.

## Riparian Areas

Approximately 30 acres of Cooper Mountain are in the riparian
corridor. This habitat is dominated by an open canopy of 50 to 100 year old trees such as big leaf maple, black cottonwood, alder, Douglas fir, and western red cedar. Numerous cottonwood and alder trees, most between five and ten years old, can be found along the riparian corridor. The understory includes sword fern, snowberry, Indian plum and Oregon grape. The streams on the site are intermittent and nearly dry up during the summer months. Most
 areas for breeding, feeding, resting or traveling. Some areas of the riparian corridor are invaded by Himalayan blackberry and Scotch broom.



Quarry Pond
A small excavated quarry located adjacent to the primary logging road seasonally ponds water providing a refuge for resident wildlife and breeding habitat for northern red-legged frogs and other amphibians. The northern red-legged frog is a state-sensitive species and a federal species of concern.
Quarry pond provides habitat for the red legged frog
not grassland has been planted by Metro for reforestation. While not native habitat, the open grasslands give visitors the opportunity to take in views over the Tualatin River Valley and Chehalem
Mountains beyond. They are also important habitat for deer, birds of prey and the Western bluebird in particular. Nesting boxes for the Western bluebirds have been placed near the edges of the meadow.

## Meadow

## Mixed Forest

Approximately 136 acres of mixed forest habitat occur on the property. This forest habitat is distributed in the northeast, central patsarofad s! eare s!
 where there is a stand of closed mixed forest consisting of 30 - to
 red cedar. Ground cover consists of sword fern and native trailing blackberry. Deer and red fox use this habitat along with birds such as the pileated woodpecker, downy woodpecker and olive sided flycatcher. There is a minimal invasion of exotic species because of the closed forest canopy.
 Metro planted 60,000 trees including Douglas fir, madrone, red alder, western red cedar, ponderosa pine and grand fir. The future forested areas will enhance the valuable wildlife habitat and scenic value of the property. The management challenge to the replanted areas will be to control the invasion of non-native plants such as hawthorn and blackberries until the tree canopy is well established.


Closed mixed forest stand of 30.40 year old trees
 - Exising Condions
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dominance by preventing the establishment of trees and shrubs. protect views, control non-native vegetation, and maintain grass



Table 1: Sensitive Species Documented in Cooper Mountain Natural Area
Federal "Species of Concern" are taxa whose conservation status is of concern to the U.S. Fish and Wibdife Service, but for which further information is still needed. They are not
recognized/defined/regulated per the Endangered Species Act. Many were previously known as "Category 2 Candidates". listing by the ODA under the OESA.

At the state level, "sensitive species constitute those
Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) as follows:
高

- Vulnerable:
© Nas:
$1=$ Critically imperiled because of extreme rarity or because it is somehow especially vulnerable to extinction ( 5 or fewer occurrences)
$3=$ Rare, uncommon or threatened, but not immediately imperiled (2i-100 occurrences)
$5=$ Demonstrably widespread, abundant and secure
*     *         *             * 

*** At the state level, "sensitive species constitute those naturally-reproducing native animals which may become threatened or endangered...in Oregon." They are categorized by the Oregon

- Peripheral or Naturally Rare: species whose populations are on the edge of their range or which have had low numbers historically in Oregon.
$2=$ Imperiled because of rarity or because other factors demonstrably make it very vulnerable to extinction (6-20 occurrences)
$4=$ Not rare and apparently secure, but with cause for long-term concern ( $>100$ occurrences)
SOURCE: Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species of Oregon
 (uolit! Sodino vegetative cover and narrow-stemmed plant material for provide optimal breeding habitat (e.g., clean water with ample these breeding pools or ponds must be a meter in depth and characterized as small, shaded standing pools or ponds. Generally,
 forested uplands. From a life history perspective, red-legged frogs
 in seasonal pools during February to April when water temperatures

 Northern red-legged frog population has been regularly documented has bred successfully. bluebird nest boxes in the upper prairie of the site. At least one pair
 ear $V$ ןennen u!equnow dadooj pa!!! quap! paroid Kıanojay pu!qən|g
 above 600 feet in elevation. They prefer open habitat where habitat loss and cowbird parasitism areas of willow and alder patches. One of its biggest threats is Mountain's riparian areas to nest and feed. It prefers open shrubby

percent. Runoff is slow to medium according to slope and erosion
hazard is slight to moderate.
Saum silt loam series, Cascade silt loam series and the Cornelius and Kinton silt loams.
The Saum series occupies most of the western half of the site, most of which falls within the 12 to 20 percent slope range. This series consists of well-drained soils that formed in mixed eolian material, old alluvium, and residuum from basalt on uplands. The top horizon of scil is silt loam to silty clay loam texture; lower horizons have increased clay contents ranging from 30-50\%. Slopes vary from 2 to 60 percent and elevations of this soil range from 250 to 1,200 feet. Where these soils are not cultivated, the vegetation is typically siod ‘x to 40 inches. The depth to bedrock is typically 40 to 60 inches. Runoff is medium to rapid depending upon the slope, with corresponding erosion hazards that are moderate to severe.
The Cascade series exists along the several intermittent streams on site on moderately steep slopes ranging from 12 to 20 percent. This series consists of somewhat poorly drained soils that formed in silty loess and old mixed alluvium on uplands. A fragipan exists at a depth of 24 to 48 inches. Where these soils are not cultivated, the vegetation is typically Douglas fir, western red-cedar, big leaf maple, salal, red huckleberry, vine maple, swordfern, grasses, and forbs Permeability is slow. Effective rooting depth is 20 to 30 inches. Runoff is medium and erosion hazard is moderate.

The Cornelius and Kinton loams series primarily occurs on the eastern half of the site. Slopes generally range from $5-12$ percent. This soil group is generally comprised of about 50 to 65 percent Cornelius soils and 25 to 35 percent Kinton soils occurring in a variable pattern. This soil consists of moderately well drained soils that formed in loess like material over fine-silty, old alluvium of mixed origin on uplands. Permeability is slow. Effective rooting depth is 30 to 40 inches. Depth to bedrock ranges from 40-60 inches. The top horizon ranges in texture from silt loam to silty clay loam. Clay content in the lower horizons ranges from 30-50


## Historic and Cultural Resources

No historic or cultural resources have been designated for this site in the County's Rural/Resource Plan or in its immediate vicinity in the
 the State Historic Preservation Office records reveals that there are also no known archaeological sites on this property or in either of the sections it occupies. Dennis Griffin, archaeologist for the State
 cultural resource surveys in this area so the potential for sites to exist remains largely an unknown. However, due to the steepness of terrain over much of the sections, and the original forest cover, the '5aว The top of Cooper Mountain, however, may have contained rock cairns or other prehistoric objects as it would have provided an excellent view of the surrounding landscape."
While there are no known historic or cultural resources on this site proper, the preservation of the land as a public natural area represents an opportunity to interpret the indigenous cultures and early settlement history of the Cooper Mountain area.

## Land Use

## Zoning

 growth boundary. This area, zoned Future Development 20 (FD-20), requires a minimum lot size of 20 acres and allows park use. This designation was given to a variety of county lands in 2002 and is an 'interim holding zone' until such lands can be master planned per Metro's Title 11 (Urban Area Planning). Surrounding private parcels immediately adjacent to this portion of the site are zoned FD-20 to the west, and Agriculture/Forest (AF-20) to the east, with a minimum parcel size of 80 acres.
## Scenic and Cultural Resources

## Scenic and cultural resources are addressed by policies in the

Washington County Comprehensive Framework Plan.

## Scenic Resources

 of a number of support documents that make up the Comprehensive Plan, states that it is the general policy of
Washington County to protect and enhance its outstanding scenic views, routes and features. No views, routes or features are specifically designated for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area site itself, or for the streets immediately adjacent. However, scenic resources are noted for the neighborhood areas to the immediate north of the site in the Aloha-Reedville-Cooper Mountain
Community Plan, another support document of the Comprehensive Plan.
That plan recognizes the forested slopes on the north side of the mountain as outstanding scenic features as viewed from the valley floor. It also recognizes that "several outstanding scenic views exist at points along roads traversing Cooper Mountain, and that the viewsheds of these points shall be determined through master planning processes. Additionally, road turn out facilities shall be constructed at identified scenic viewpoints in conjunction with improvements to bring roads up to standards."
Although not specifically required, this master plan recommends that vegetation in the natural area be managed in such a way as to protect outstanding views both into the site from Kemmer Road, and from within the site overlooking the Tualatin Valley and Chehalem Mountains to the south. The most significant views on the site are from the existing open meadow and prairie areas. Many of the more detailed scenic features of the site (such as the quarry pond and the two native prairies) are also important interpretive features.


Some of the existing trail network may be incorporated into a future trail system, but many of the trails are redundant and cause erosion and fragmented habitat due to poor locations.

## Access

Currently, there is no established public vehicular access onto the site. There are maintenance and service access gates located at Stone Creek Drive (which accesses the existing logging road), Grabhorn Road, and 190th Ave. Interim informal public access to the site occurs by parking along the shoulder of 190th Street, and along Stone Creek Drive outside the maintenance gate. There are also several informal pedestrian access points from neighboring properties that occur at corners of the property. They pose a
potential problem to both Metro and adjacent property owners and will need to be addressed.


Service access at Stonecreek Drive
Fencing
At the time of purchase, the property was largely unfenced and will remain so to maintain wildlife corridors and allow wildlife passage. Partial fencing exists along the southern boundary of the property. New fencing has been installed around the private in-holding and

The remaining two thirds of the Cooper Mountain site is located outside the urban growth boundary on land zoned Agriculture/Forest (AF-20). This designation is used for Natural Resource Areas within the county. It generally includes lands above 350-feet in elevation that are somewhat limited for farming and forestry due to steep grades and limited water supply. The surrounding parcels immediately adjacent to this portion of the site are also zoned AF-20. A parcel abutting the site's southeast corner is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU).

## Existing Facilities

Existing facilities on the several parcels that comprise the site include former residences, logging roads and informal trails.

## Roads and Trails

The gravel logging road is approximately 1.2 miles. At least 5 miles
of informal trails have been mapped but this is not exhaustive.


Erosion in the upland prairie caused by informal trails

provided on all collector or arterial streets when they are constructed or reconstructed.

## Trails

Several off-street trails exist and are planned near the site. One mile east of the natural area, the Beaverton Powerline Trail, a regional north-south trail is planned to connect a number of other natural areas (i.e. Tualatin Hills Nature Park, Bull Mountain and potentially the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge). The Burlington Northern Powerline Trail, a north-south corridor approximately one mile to the west of the natural area, has recently been nominated as a regional trail corridor. The Cooper Mountain Trail, an east-west route connecting these two north-south corridors has also been nominated as a regional trail. The specific alignment of this trail is unknown but every effort will be made to link it with Cooper Mountain.

## Schools

21 schools are located within a 4-mile radius of the natural area; 14
 schools are located within a 2 -mile radius. The proximity of the natural area to so many schools highlights its potential to provide outdoor education and service-learning opportunities to school groups.

## Parks and Natural Areas

45 smaller neighborhood parks and open spaces (which provide many traditional park facilities such as playgrounds, ball fields and tennis courts), as well as smaller natural areas are located within a 4-mile radius of the site. Larger parks and natural areas in this vicinity are therefore significant for potential regional and local trail connections. (e.g. Bull Mountain, the Beaverton Powerline Trail, Jenkins Estate and Tualatin Hills Nature Park). A quarry operation located directly south of the Jenkins Estate also represents potential long-term future park land.

## Regional Context

The communities of Beaverton, Aloha, Southwest Portland, Tigard, Durham, Tualatin, King City, Sherwood and Hillsboro are all within a 6 -mile radius of Cooper Mountain. Transportation, schools and other parks and open spaces in the vicinity are important considerations in understanding its existing context and in
determining its future. Both regional access and multi-modal ways to get to the natural area are important. Schools and other parks in the vicinity represent potential linkages and partnerships, as well as constraints since there may be no need to duplicate facilities already provided.

## Roads

The site can be reached by several arterial and collector streets. From the south, it can be reached from Scholls Ferry Road to 175th to Kemmer Road. From the north, it can be reached via Tualatin Valley Highway to 185th or 190th to Kemmer Road, and also from Farmington Road to 170th and 175th to Kemmer Road.

## Public Transit

Public transit is currently not available to the site nor planned. There is a light rail stop north of the site at SW 185th Ave and Willow Creek ( 395 SW 185th Ave), which is approximately 4.5 miles from the Kemmer Road entrance. In addition, four bus lines (\#88, 182 \#62 and \#92) run to the north and east of the site along SW 185 Teal Blvd. Each of these lines has at least one stop between 1.5 and 2.5 miles from the Kemmer Road entrance.

## Bikeways

In the Washington County Transportation plan, bikeway designations are applied to 185 th Ave., Scholls Ferry and Farmington roads. However, bike lanes do not currently exist on these streets. Oregon statute requires that bicycle facilities be


## Recreation Demands and Issues

The SCORP survey identifies those recreation activities that have the
largest participation levels, and those that have experienced the
largest growth or loss in participation levels for each region over the
past 15 years.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Most notably, of } 40 \text { activities surveyed in Region } 2 \text {, nature study } \\
& \text { possesses the highest participation levels and has experienced the } \\
& \text { largest growith ( } 254 \% \text { ) over the past } 15 \text { years. Other activities that } \\
& \text { have experienced significant growth and may have relevance to } \\
& \text { Cooper Mountain are: playground play ( } 114 \% \text { increase) and } \\
& \text { sightseeing ( } 68 \% \text { increase). Trail walking/running and picnicking } \\
& \text { have not seen large percentage increases over the past } 15 \text { years, but } \\
& \text { they remain in the top } 10 \text { highest participation activities. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Horseback riding has seen a $27 \%$ decrease in participation in this region over the past 15 years. However, according to nearby equestrian users, this decrease may reflect the county's transition from rural to more developed lands rather than reflect a decline in interest.
The top recreation issues that have been identified for this region by the SCORP include several that could apply to Cooper Mountain. These are:
> - The need to acquire more park lands to keep pace with population growth
The need for non-motorized recreational trail connectivity
The need to balance resource protection and recreation
through environmental education

## Existing Recreation Providers

Metro shares responsibility for providing outdoor recreation
opportunities to the public with other providers in Washington County. The following recreation providers are also located within a 6-mile radius of Cooper Mountain.

## Regional Recreation Trends (SCORP)

Oregon's Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) provides an overall understanding of recreation trends, demands and needs for the state as well as for each of 11 region within the state. Washington County and Cooper Mountain Natural Area are located in Region 2. The plan, recently updated by Oregon State Parks, tracks demographic trends and includes in-depth
recreation surveys that identify recreation patterns, issues and needs for the next 5-10 years.

## Demographic Trends

Washington County has experienced the largest growth in the Metro region (43\%) over the past decade. Its population is currently about 500,000. Washington County's age distribution is
comparatively young: $70 \%$ of the total population is 44 or under, and $20 \%$ of the total population is school age children. Only $8.8 \%$ are retirement age. Washington County overall is approximately 85\% Caucasian, although Hillsboro and Beaverton are 80\% Caucasian. Hispanic and Asian populations represent the largest
percentage of minorities. Washington County has the lowest percentage of population below the poverty level in the state
 area consists of single-family homes. Homeowners at the top of Cooper Mountain generally reflect the highest per capita income in the county.
purchase, but has greatly diminished due to fencing and


 . and on the resource






Current and Former Use Patterns
Center was recently opened to support the Preserve's programs. miles of trails and observation shelters. A new Wetlands Education family programs are offered. Facilities include approximately three aquatic education in the region. An array of school, individual and


 Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve
provide traditional recreation activities. to 60 acres. However, Hillsboro's facilities are primarily designed to
 While most of the parks contain more traditional recreation complex and stadium, community centers and aquatic facilities. Hillsboro Parks and Recreation facilities include 20 parks, a sports

Hillsboro Parks and Recreation park in Tigard. which provides boating access to the Tualatin River, is the largest neighborhood parks, creek greenways and natural areas. Cook Park, The City of Tigard has 300 acres of parkland, which include 57
enforcement of pedestrian use only regulations. The site's high enforcement of pedestrian use only regulations. The site's high
elevation and open views also make it a popular spot for stargazing
and viewing fireworks displays. Metro also sponsors guided nature
walks for interested citizens. An array of nuisance activities also occurred on this site prior to
Metro's purchase and to a lesser degree still continue. These have
included: dogs running off-leash, dog hunting training, target
shooting, paint ball gaming, night time activities involving alcohol
and campfires, dumping and itinerant camping. The Stone Creek
Drive service access tended to be the entry point for this kind of use
because it offered a shoulder to park on and a heavily vegetated
edge that reduces visibility into the natural area.

[^11]While there are a number of nature-based recreation and educational facilities in close proximity (e.g., Jackson Bottom Wetlands Preserve, Tualatin Hills Nature Park and the Tualatin River Wildlife Refuge), facilities and environmental education at Cooper Mountain Natural Area could focus on its distinctive upland environmental outreach capacity.
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 Defined by habitat of high quality value, areas with limited or no RSC 2 - Limited Development $25 \%$ ) and unstable, highly erosive soils. species. Some segments also contain steep slopes (greater than
 legged frog, a state listed species. Riparian corridors are habitat to

 ре ро дй
 wildife communities (e.g., white rock larkspur, and western
 RSC 1 areas at Cooper Mountain Natural Area include the oak areas. status, riparian areas, steep slopes and/or geologically unstable Defined by unique and high quality habitats, protected species RSC 1 - Resource Protection/Very Limited Development suoipd!dכseg (JSy) sseן Kl!!qey!ns aunnosey most suitable for development.
 of RSC 1 or 2 are generally least suitable for accommodating use restrictive on any one of the layers. Sub areas with a suitability level
 overlain to produce a composite suitability map for a given site. The Once resource categories are mapped and classified, they are


Presence of Oregon Natural Heritage Program listings 1, 2 or 3 species Presence of state or federally listed threatened and endangered (əวuequnıs!p pasneว-uewny fo 子unowe Quality of habitat (based on existence of non-native species and Uniqueness (rarity or significance to region)
 Gu!bued (כsy) Ki!!!qeit!ns aכnnosad fo sfənə mof fo auo ołu! wayt fo wetlands, geologic hazards) and cultural resources and classification individual natural (plant communities, wildlife habitat, hydrology, suitability assessment procedure. The method includes mapping of
 To determine the site's level and location of suitable uses, the design

Land Use Suitability
RSC 2 designated areas include mixed second growth conifers and
 are mostly free of invasive vegetation in the understory. They have wet soils and moderately steep slopes (12-25\%)

## RSC3 - Moderate Development

Defined by lower quality habitats, more exotic vegetation in the understory and geologically stable areas.
RSC 3 areas include disturbed mixed oak-conifers areas of lower quality, open canopy with exotics in the understory, gently sloping areas with soils with the least erosive properties, and/or moderate slopes of 6 to $12 \%$ in most areas.

> RSC4 - Intensive Development
Defined by minimal and Iow habitat quality, disturbed edge areas,
RSC 4 areas include open areas of non-native grasses that are mowed or restored with little or sparse vegetation. These areas are

 appropriate for accommodating development.


Public opinion and input was solicited on a variety of issues related to the future of the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. One-on-one interviews, stakeholder meetings, open houses and a general public interest survey (completed by over 400 people) were used to
identify existing uses, concerns and desires for the site. The survey results provided below, help provide a picture of local community desires, concerns and values for Cooper Mountain.
Residents unamimously value having a natural open space in their community and provided the following reasons for making
improvements at Cooper Mountain Natural Area (in order of most listed reasons to fewest):
To allow public access and use by residents and visitors
To preserve the natural beauty and limit development To protect and improve habitat
To manage and restore the ecosystem
To control invasive vegetation
To balance recreation opportunities with preserving habitat To be able to experience nature close to home
To provide opportunities to learn about natural systems To provide a place to be active outdoors To accommodate all trail users
To provide parking and sidewalks along Kemmer Rd.
People's concerns about public use at Cooper Mountain Natural Area include the following (in order of most listed concern to fewest):
Increased traffic
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the degree to which resources can be protected and restored. Need to balance cost/benefit of resource protection \& recreation opportunities.

Vegetation management is limited by available funding and staff resources.

Using controlled fires as a habitat management tool may concern some neighbors.

## Providing For Recreation Needs

> Opportunities
> - Site offers the potential to provide for a variety of trails featuring views, loop options, challenge levels, and other
> nature-based recreation activities. - Site offers potential for public gathering space (e.g., picrics and
> other group events).
> - The northern third of the property provides gentle grades for
> universal accessibility.
> - Site has high potential to provide nature interpretive experiences.
> - Site has outstanding views of the Tualatin River Valley. - There is sufficient "suitable" land (gently sloped with low
> habitat value) to provide recreation support facilities.
> - Even limited equestrian trails will provide a valuable experience for young, beginning riders and people with disabilities. - There is good potential for trails within the natural area to connect to regional trails to the east and west of the site.
> - Public input revealed broad support for a 3-4 mile trail system. Constraints
> - The site has limited capacity to accommodate public use, with respect to quantities of trails, due to its size, slopes and natural resources.

## Opportunities \& Constraints

 Opportunities and constraints for Cooper Mountain were distilledfrom the collective information gathered which included public survey results, input from the project advisory committee and resource and site technical information. The opportunities and

 and recommendations outlined in the following chapters.
 categories:

## 1) Natural Resource Protection and Management 2) Providing for Recreation Needs 3) Interpretation and Education 4) Operation and Management <br> 5) Transportation and Neighborhood Impacts

## Natural Resource Protection and Management

## Opportunities

Preservation/restoration of unique oak/madrone habitat. Preservation/restoration of unique meadow habitat. Protection/restoration of habitats for sensitive species.
Restoration of conifer and mixed conifer forest in logge Control and removal of invasive vegetation.

## Constraints

- Reforestation efforts need to accommodate and protect important views. as a result of logging and reforestation practices.
- Large areas of natural resources are currently in poor condition

The site's relatively small size, combined with public use, limits

 suonet!u!! adojs pue sueans urof sxjeqzas ‘sə!うəds paraбuepua pue Trail design will need to consider presence of any threatened of the property due to steep slope gradients.
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## Operations And Management

## Opportunities

- Management efficiencies may be optimized by a shared management role between Metro and Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District.
- Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue station is in close proximity to site and equipped to respond to wild - Public access to the site can be managed and controlled with the installation of entry gates.
- House and garage on site provide potential for a more constant management presence on site. In addition, they offer a combination of office, storage area, and nature house
- Existing logging roads provide sufficient access for service and emergency vehicles. All trails can serve dual function as fire breaks.
- The former residence site along Grabhorn Road is suitable for accommodating a maintenance yard and caretaker residence.
Volunteer partnerships can provide valuable assistance in
expanding maintenance and operations capacity.
Providing for public access to the site creates an opportunity for revenue generation to support operations and management.


## Constraints

- Metro park rangers do not currently have the authority to enforce park rules in Washington County.
- Need to secure sufficient funding for long-term maintenance and management.


## Impacts to Neighborhood

Opportunities

- Preserve the scenic quality of Cooper Mountain.
- Provide access to nature and trails close to home.


 long-term habitat protection, it makes sense to either purchase the


 easements or acquisition from a willing seller through planning, education stewardship assistance, conservation

 However, as zoning allows, these properties may be developed. It is properties as well as public lands if doing so is a goal of the owner. ownership. Habitat values can be maintained on rural private and south of the property. Presently, these properties are in private important to retain connections to natural areas to the north, east To maintain viability of habitat and wildlife movement, it is
suo!łวәuиoう ұeң!qeH/adeכspueך
resources, thus facilitating future land transactions in the area areas, supporting biodiversity and protecting unique biological parcels included those linking the site with other trails and natural for land acquisition in the Cooper Mountain Target area, targeted measure's approved work plan (Cooper Mountain Refinement Plan) easements or acquisitions with willing sellers. In the 1995 bond In addition, Metro may discuss potential management agreements, design, resource management and zoning strategies

 impacts from the site. Any area considered for one or more of recreation opportunities, existing and planned uses, and potential the natural area with respect to habitat connectivity, potential A review of surrounding properties identifies their relationship to


## sead甘 Gu!punoduns


 วul uof u!efunow radooj of kauł puel sumo kifuadan onfow




 Mountain Natural Area represents the single largest potential for The 300+ acre property to the immediate south of Cooper west of the site connect both of the north-south regional trails located east and envisioned to pass through Cooper Mountain Natural Area and accommodate THPRD's proposed east-west regional trail, which is
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## 

also be considered to address these issues. Relevant changes to Washington County's Community Development
Plan, Development Code, and Transportation System Plan should Road to protect wild life. or wildlife crossing signs be installed on that section of Kemmer slopes of the mountain. It is recommended that either speed bumps पluou aut uo seare ajeds uado palsanof aut pue peor ayt fo ytuou

 highway accident survey (2002) documented substantial deer kills along this improvements made on Scholls Ferry Road. Metro's deer/elk
Scholls Ferry and the current southern boundary of the natural area ultimately become developed, Metro should consider the Scholls Ferry property as surplus and sell it in order to redirect public funds.



Goal 5: Minimizing Impacts to
Surrounding Neighborhoods
Goal 3: Interpretation
Goal 4: Operations
Goal 2: Access \& Use
Goal 1: Natural Resource
Protection \& Management
Goals \& Objectives species and expand oak woodland and prairie habitat
 Employ the best practices (such as mechanical and chemical Manage habitats to increase diversity of native plants and
animals including migratory songbirds Restore an oak-prairie habitat at Cooper Mountain Maintain ridge-to-ridge view of the Jualatin River watershed Locate and design proposed improvements and public uses to
avoid significant impacts to important natural resources area. Protecting important riparian areas, plant communities, habitats and
views is the number one goal for the management of this natural wildlife to thrive. natural and scenic resources and create a place for Protect and enhance Cooper Mountain's unique Goal 1: Natural Resource Protection
and Management actions to carry out each goal. management. The objectives identify specific short- and long-term broadly shared values about public use and natural resource Advisory Committee and Metro planning team. These goals reflect The following goals and objectives for management and design of
the Cooper Mountain Natural Area were developed by the Project

 Gu!pun」: 9
 Work with the community to provide financial support for the
ongoing management of Cooper Mountain - Apply for available capital improvement and restoration grants
for Cooper Mountain the site
ore and implement opportunities for revenue generation at areas like Cooper Mountain. Creative funding options and
partnerships should be explored. Both public and private funds are available for restoration, capital
development and ongoing maintenance of public parks and natural
areas like Cooper Mountain. Creative funding options and Both public and private funds are available for restoration, capital
and ongoing management. private funding for master plan implementation





Operations \& Maintenance
Interpretive Program Concept
Resources Management Plan
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 pass by. This trail connects to other loops that ultimately meander to
 finch or hawk may be seen overhead. Mice, grasshoppers or snakes forest. Here, the sky and field are vast. A Western bluebird, gold

 The first trail that visitors will find at this high elevation, is a gently neighborhood families. facilitate organized education activities and invite casual use by by, an open grassy area, some picnic tables and a nature playground hands-on exploration of "nature finds" at the Nature House. Near may see a group of school children engaged with a naturalist in the Chehalem Mountains in the distance. Next to the trailhead they expansive views southward to the Tualatin River Valley framed by tall grasses at the top pf the mountain. There they will have Those entering at Kemmer Road will arrive at an open meadow of highlight the site's unique habitat and wildlife features. amenities and welcoming signs designed to orient them and able to arrive at one of two trailheads. Each offer essential comfort It is envisioned that visitors to Cooper Mountain Natural Area will be Concept for the Master Plan natural area. development, vegetation management and operations of the the public's enjoyment of nature-based recreation. The following
master plan concept and recommendations guide the future the unique natural resources of Cooper Mountain Natural Area with
the public's enjoyment of nature-based recreation. The following fo uo!perofsad pue uolpozadd ajuejeq of stdmatte ue|d datsen s!ut

## Master Plan Recommendations

be used to minimize trail impacts on the site's natural resources (e.g. appropriate paving materials and bio-swales to drain stormwater).

The planning team reviews a proposed trail network
Trail layout will include setbacks from private properties, streams,
and prairies, and discourage shortcuts. Interpretive points and distance markers will be incorporated throughout the trail systern. "You are here" orientation maps and messages to help minimize impacts to the resources will be incorporated into interpretive signage. Trailheads will be located at the Kemmer Road and Grabhorn Road entrances. It will be necessary to obtain a trail easement from one of the adjacent property owners in order to provide a trail connection through the natural area parcel along Grabhorn Road that is not contiguous to the remainder of the site.

## Vegetation Management

 Vegetation management is the single greatest habitat restoration challenge at Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Vegetation management of the natural area will aim to achieve the following results:
## - The existing independent oak woodland patches will be

 consolidated into one contiguous patch. This consolidated area will be slightly expanded for management efficiency and to improve habitat quality.Most of the upper, non-native meadow will remain to retain field habitat and provide views from the site.

Mixed forest habitat will expand in most of the clearcut areas. Native prairies will be protected and restored by relocating trails away from their centers.

- A wet meadow in an existing seep area is proposed along the ADA trail for interpretation and to increase habitat diversity. Native screening will be established along 190th Avenue to provide a buffer to nearby residents, but still allow views into the natural area.

Vegetation buffers will be maintained along all property edges to minimize potential user impacts on neighbors.

## Trails and Trail Use

Given that nature study has experienced the largest growth of any system that connects visitors to nature and wildlife will be the primary focus of the natural area. Habitat protection will be
compatible with trail use if the quantity and lay out of trails limit fragmentation of habitat.

A proposed 3.5 -mile trail system will be designed to preserve views
and pass through or by a variety of habitats. The trails will support a
variety of uses but emphasize hiking. "Green Trails" guidelines will



Equestrian Trails
Equestrian trail use is compatible with natural resource protection in the Cooper Mountain Natural Area if trails are sited away from
 trails are designated along the existing gravel service road and the lower portion of the site. This 1.75 mile equestrian trail loop can be reached from the Grabhorn Road trailhead. The trailhead will provide horse trailer parking and a loading ramp for persons with disabilities.

## Regional Bike Trail

Because of its size, the site does not have the capacity to
accommodate mountain biking and other trail uses without creating user conflicts and resulting in resource degradation. The relatively small size of the natural area also does not adequately provide the recreational experience desired by most mountain bikers. However,
 regional trail connection between the two north-south regional trails
 the proposed east-west regional trail alignment is sited inside the natural area.

## Access and Parking

Two parking areas will distribute vehicle impacts - one at the Kemmer Road trailhead and the other at the Grabhorn Road trailhead. Both entrances will be controlled with gates that will be
closed and locked in the evenings. A completed traffic study indicates that both Grabhom and Kemmer Road sight distances and road classifications are sufficient to accommodate new entrances to the site.

## ADA Accessible Trails

The northern third of the property provides gentle grades suitable for less challenging hiking. A .5-mile paved interpretive trail loop can be accessed from the Kemmer Road trailhead and will ADA accessibility standards. This loop will connect to a second, 7 -mile, higher-challenge ADA trail loop that will take visitors to the native prairie and oak woodland habitats and offer views of the Tualatin River Valley. A portion of trail from the Grabhorn Road trailhead could also be designed to provide higher-challenge ADA access.

improvements and landscaping will be provided along 190th only if required by the Washington County Development Code.

Grabhorn Traihead - Preliminary Concept Sketch
Facilities and Amenities
and on-site storage of education supplies and operation
a large, covered deck for school programs and community

tours and field trips. It will provide indoor meeting/classroom space, equipment. The facility is not likely to compete with other education facilities in the vicinity.
Play Area
A "naturalistic" children's play area providing a hands-on, exploratory nature experience for younger children and augmenting education programs is proposed. Such a play area will be designed for durability and low maintenance, and will be located near the Nature House.

The Kemmer Road trailhead will provide parking for up to 30 vehicles and a bus drop-off. An overflow parking area is also
 Kemmer Road to provide pedestrian access.


Kemmer Trailhead - Preliminary Concept Sketch

The Stone Creek Drive gated entrance, which accesses the existing gravel road, will serve maintenance and emergency access only. Turnarounds will be provided along the existing gravel road for emergency vehicles.

The end of 190th Avenue will remain barricaded and will serve as secondary emergency vehicle access to the site. Formal sidewalk
activities like playing catch or tossing a Frisbee.
 or recreational activities. trailhead. This shelter would also be used for organized educational

Shelter
and oversight of the trailhead facilities. on the north side of the Grabhorn Road trailhead to provide privacy provide on-site management. It is recommended that it be located A caretaker residence and maintenance storage area is proposed to Caretaker Residence
Mountain. The western gray squirrel also uses this site for foraging. The small artificial quarry within the oak woodland habitat provides breeding habitat for a sensitive species - the red-legged frog.
Metro will use prescribed burns, oak plantings and snags to create
and expand a viable oak community. Metro will also use cutting, mowing and chemical applications to control invasive species such as Scotch broom and Himalayan blackberry. Tree canopy and woody structure will be increased in the vicinity of the quarry pond to protect the native red-legged frogs. Finally, social trails will be closed and restored to minimize habitat fragmentation and provide better connections for wildlife.

## Upland Prairie

The prairies are a high priority for management because 1) Prairies are a "conservation priority habitat" for the Willamette Valley (Campbell 2004), and 2) Increasing the viability of rare habitat on site (and thereby increasing the white rock larkspur habitat) is one of the Master Plan's overall goals.

upland prairie


Scotchbroom removal in oak woodland
Thinning is crucial in mixed forests, to recreate old-growth characteristics such as snags, multistory layers and woody debris. These characteristics facilitate the presence of wildlife and possess reduced fuel loads, decreasing the potential for wildfires.

## Oak Woodlands

Oak woodlands are a high priority for management and
maintenance because 1) Oak woodlands are, in general, a
"conservation priority habitat" for the Willamette Valley (Campbell 2004), and 2) Increasing the viability of a rare habitat on Cooper Mountain is one of the Master Plan's overall goals.

A variety of wildlife use the oak woodland habitat. Twenty-six of
the 118 neotropical species are associated with this habitat. Of
these, 12 species of neotropical birds have been spotted at Cooper
 canopy layer. be used to help create snags, down logs and a multilayered forest IIM бu!uu!
 Metro will use both spot treatments and thinning to enhance this habitat. black tailed deer, coyote and red fox footprints have been spotted in

 has a minimum level of invasive species in its understory. It is a 30-40 year old forest with a 60-70\% canopy cover, and 2) It


## Closed Mixed Forest (Northeast Section)

 bank stability, and stream nutrients. the riparian habitat as a healthy functioning system providing shade, willow flycatcher have been seen using this habitat. foraging and breeding. The state-listed yellow-breasted chat and are critical to small non-game birds such as neotropical birds A majority of mammals and birds use this habitat. Riparian habitats
intensive management as some of the other areas species cover only portions of this habitat, and do not require as The streams are seasonal and not fish bearing, and 2) Invasive The riparian forest is a medium priority for management because 1)
emphasis will be to enhance these rare plant populations. species on site is located in the prairies, a major management species have been observed. Since the only federally-listed plant because of their relative small size at this site (six acres), few wildlife
 Many species of wildflowers, birds, amphibians, reptiles and

There is strong public support for environmental education activities at Cooper Mountain Natural Area. The varied natural resources
present on Cooper Mountain and the expansive views of the
surrounding landscape offer opportunities for a variety of education and interpretive programs. Programs and self-guided interpretive signs will make the rich multi-faceted qualities of the site come alive for its visitors.

Interpretive topics were developed based on the natural resources present on the site, the expected audience, and the high demand in the region for opportunities to learn about nature. The topics, locations to interpret the topics, and program delivery methods are summarized in the following table.


Hikers identify wildiffe tracks near a puddle

## Interpretive Program Concept

Metro's education programs serve two important goals: To provide quality environmental education services and to promote the general public Metro provides environmental education
programs that enhance an awareness and understanding of the ecology, resources and values inherent in our regional parks and


Metro provides tools for experiential learning from nature, and focuses on low-impact behavior and sensory awareness skills that help program participants enhance their experiences with wildilife
 audience by providing environmental education opportunities to all
 impacts by providing the information needed to insure appropriate, safe use of an area, and to convey management goals and policies to park visitors. Metro works with both public and non-profit partners to meet education goals and provide education opportunities to the public.

Metro offers programs to the following audiences:
For General Public

- Interpretive signing
- Interpretive walks, talks, demonstrations


## For Groups

- Guided group tours


## For Students

- Independent on-site studies (by high school students)
- Service learning (by high school students)


| Topic | Detail | Location |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tualatin River Watershed | Ridge-to-ridge view of over 700 square miles of <br> watershed | Top of mountain; north side of the site |
| Diverse habitat | Wet areas next to dry, oak/madrone woodland next to <br> riparian forests | Trails throughout the site |
| Biodiversity | 278 species of plants (including 184 native species). <br> Red-legged frogs. | Trails throughout the site |
| Wildflowers | Primarily April - June | Closed mixed conifer forest (Northeast section |
| Rare Species | White rock larkspur | Closed mixed conifer forest (Northeast section); <br> Upland prairie |
| Rare habitats | Prairie, elfin oak forest, oak/madrone woodland | Center of site |
| Geologic history | Basalt shield cone | Quarry |
| Diverse bird community | Western bluebird; Lazuli Bunting | Quarry |
| Fire ecology | Prescribed burns integral to ecosystem heath | Numerous locations incl. upland prairie |
| Exotic species management | Control non-native, invasive plants | Numerous locations incl. upland prairie |
| Reforestation | Helps control invasive species | Closed mixed forest |
| Forest succession | Large stumps | Closed mixed forest (Northeast section) <br> Wildlife and animal tracksSand/ dirt substrates ("tracking boxes") that clearly <br> register recent animal tracks |

controlled with gates. These will be locked daily at park closure times by either ranger staff, the park caretaker or other contracted service provider. Boundary markers will be installed along the perimeter of the natural area to clearly delineate the public/private edge. Fencing will be considered and installed only on an asneeded basis to control access in problem locations where other measures are not sufficient

## Incident Response and Enforcement

Currently, the Washington County Sheriff can respond to 911 calls or all other violations of the law that may occur on site. However, Metro's Title 10 regulations currently only apply in Multnomah County, so Metro rangers do not have the ability to issue citations in Washington County. In addition, Washington County Sheriffs do not have the ability to enforce Metro's regulations (unless the violations in question are also illegal in Washington County). To address this concern, Metro is working with Washington County to develop a plan that will allow Metro Park Rangers and Washington County Sheriffs to enforce specific park regulations.


Tualatin Valley Fire \& Rescue truck at Cooper Mountain

## Operations \& Maintenance

The following recommendations for future operations and
maintenance of Cooper Mountain Natural Area are based upon the assumption that Metro will remain the site manager. However, this does not preclude the possibility that management responsibilities could be shared with Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District or could be transferred to another agency or organization in order to realize optimum management and operational efficiencies. Metro and THPRD are continuing discussions to determine the most
efficient and effective way to manage the Cooper Mountain Natural Area for the public.

## Park Regulations

All rules and regulations at Cooper Mountain Natural Area will be consistent with Metro's Title 10, which outlines regulations "governing the use of Metro owned and operated regional parks and greenspaces facilities by members of the public in order to provide for protection of wildlife, plants and property, and to
protect the safety and enjoyment of persons visiting these facilities.
 signs will be installed at each access point. An orientation map of
 and emergency and police response teams with way-finding.

Regulatory signs will include public use restrictions on dogs, fires, camping, motorized vehicles, firearms, hunting, smoking, intrusive noise, plant collecting and other uses outined in Metro's itie 10. Due to conflicts with wildlife, a no-dogs policy will be enforced consistent with all other Metro-managed natural areas.

## Safety and Security

 Access ControlVehicle access will be controlled to prevent after hours use. Each of the vehicular entrances to Cooper Mountain Natural Area will be

## Assuming Metro has the lead management role, a caretaker <br> Caretaker Residence and Maintenance Yard

 an added management presence on site. on a reservable basis. Ongoing use of the Nature House will provide organizations and will be available as a community meeting space serve as a venue for education programs sponsored by other area, and will likely be staffed part time. The nature house will also also serve as office and supply storage for operations of the natural it will not be open and staffed on a full time basis. However, it will community environmental education programs. It is anticipated that The Nature House will be used to accommodate school and Nature House
## asn Kl!!!e』

 of an emergency provided to the 911 system in order to aid responders in the event support. A grid map of the natural area will be prepared and unlikely event of a larger fire, the fire station will dispatch air hoses can reach up to 1000 feet from their trucks or from the street suited to the service roads, terrain and conditions of the site. Fire department contains keys to the site and has smaller equipment Emergency response time is estimated at five to seven minutes. The and SW Weir, about a mile away from the Kemmer Road entrance. Area. Metro has added a no-smoking policy at Cooper Mountain Natural event that a fire occurs. As an additional fire prevention measure, әчд u! sәр!



parks. Metro aiso has a team of scientists and expert land managers who are responsible for overseeing monitoring, restoration and
enhancement projects on Metro lands
When Cooper Mountain Natural Area is open to the public, the estimated increased staffing needs include 0.5 FTE Regional Park Supervisor, 1.0 FTE Park Ranger, and Seasonal Employees (equivalent to approximately .5 FTE ). This does not mean that there will be a ranger staffing the site full time throughout the year, or throughout each day. Instead, staffing hours at Cooper Mountain Natural Area will fluctuate according to seasonal use and demands. Summer months will have more hours and staff on site than the projected average, and winter months will have less.

In addition to ranger staffing, a 0.5 FTE naturalist will be devoted to education and interpretive programming at Cooper Mountain Natural Area.

Further detail regarding the estimated costs of these proposed staffing additions can be found in the next chapter on Implementation.

## Volunteer Partnerships

Volunteer partnerships have proven valuable in all aspects of park management throughout the region and are essential in leveraging limited public funds. There will be a number of ways that volunteers can become involved at Cooper Mountain Natural Area to enhance habitat quality for wildlife and help ensure a quality experience for the public.

## Site Stewardship Program

Site Stewardship provides "eyes and ears" above and beyond what staff can provide. Through routine walking and monitoring of the trails, Volunteer Site Stewards can alert staff early to issues that need addressing. They can also serve as "ambassadors" for Cooper
early, and to catch and address "sociat" or "demand" trails.
Monitoring can be a time consuming task. Trail volunteer groups will provide vital assistance in monitoring the site above and beyond what staff can provide.

Both paved and unpaved trails will be developed on site. Unpaved trails will require greater attention than paved trails. During the first year after construction, and after the first heavy rains, close attention should be paid to drainage and erosion patterns. Ongoing trail maintenance activities will typically include vegetation clearing and pruning along trails to keep passages and selected views open, erosion control measures, trail pavement surfacing and stabilization, bridge and culvert clearing and upkeep, litter and illegal dumping clean up, signage replacement, and closing of social trails foot

 that must accommodate emergency vehicles.

## Staffing

As the Cooper Mountain Natural Area opens, additional staff will be required in three distinct areas to ensure successful maintenance and operation of the site:

## Rangers

- Manage day-to-day operations of the site; assist with habitat restoration

Scientists \& Land Managers

- Oversee monitoring, restoration and enhancement projects Educators
- Interpret the resource for visitors

Currently, Mietro staffs four full time rangers who are responsible for managing Cooper Mountain Natural Area in addition to 5,200 acres of undeveloped natural areas and 2,155 acres of developed

trained volunteers to lead natuse walks for the general public and program in place and relies on these very dedicated and highly



## иопеұәддәұи в иопеэпрђ

 equestrian trail segments. partners in helping construct, monitor and/or maintain the Oregon Equestrian Trails, could also become valuable stewardship monitor trails on an ongoing basis. Equestrian groups, such as, and Established trail groups bring volunteers to help build, maintain andGu!loquOW pue əכueuzluew 'bu!pl!ng l!eı

Mountain Natural Area, answer questions and ensure that visitors


 management activities. Other volunteer activities will include assess and evaluate the success of restoration and other Many of these volunteers perform ongoing monitoring to help Currently, Metro uses volunteers to assist in restoration efforts. Vegetation Restoration
school field trips.
civic groups, and to deliver outdoor education programs, such as

site improvements
Habitat Restoration
ongoing operations \&
Naintenance

## Cost Estimates

Cost estimates have been developed for the design, engineering, and construction of site improvements. These costs are preliminary estimates
and subject to revision during the design and engineering phase of development. They are based on 2005 dollars and are expected to
appreciate. The estimates account for all potential required development, some parts of which may not be necessary (i.e., sidewalks on 5 W
190 th Ave. and irrigated landscaped areas). The following table provides a summary of estimated phased costs, and an estimated total for all
completed phases.

## Cooper Mountain Master Plan Preliminary Development Cost Estimates

| ITEM | QUANTITY | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | TOTAL PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE I - KEMMER RD TRAILHEAD |  |  |  |  |
| NATURE HOUSE RENOVATION | 1150 | SF | \$30.00 | \$34,500 |
| COVERED DECK (15'X32') | 480 | SF | \$18.00 | \$8,640 |
| PARKING LOT ( $25 \mathrm{SP}+\mathrm{BUS}$ ) |  |  |  | $\$ 0$ |
| ASPHALT | 20,000 | SF | \$3.00 | \$60,000 |
| LANDSCAPE (10\%) | 2,000 | SF | \$5.00 | \$10,000 |
| STORM WATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES | 1 | LS | \$20,000.00 | \$20,000 |
| ELECTRONIC GATE | 1 | LS | \$22,000.00 | \$22,000 |
| KEMMER RD SIDEWALK ( 1240 ' $8^{\prime}$ ') | 9,920 | SF | \$5.00 | \$49,600 |
| KEMMER RD LANDSCAPE (TREES @30') | 42 | EA | \$150.00 | \$6,300 |
| 190TH ST SIDEWALK (900' ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}$ ) | 7200 | SF | \$5.00 | \$36,000 |
| 190TH ST LANDSCAPE (900 Lf) | 7200 | SF | \$5.00 | \$36,000 |
| TREES @ 30' O/C | 30 | EA | \$150.00 | \$4,500 |
| SHRUBS @ 10' O/C | 90 | EA | \$25.00 | \$2,250 |
| CONCRETE WALKWAY (400' $5^{\prime}$ ') | 2,000 | SF | \$5.00 | \$10,000 |
| STORM WATER COLLECTION SYSTEM FOR KEMMER \& 190TH | 2,140 | LF | \$18.70 | \$40,018 |
| CHILDREN' NATURE PLAY AREA ( $25^{\prime} \times 335^{\prime}$ ) | 1250 | SF | \$10.00 | \$12,500 |
| RESTROOM (2 UNIT FLUSH) | 1 | LS | \$40,000.00 | \$40,000 |
| FURNISHINGS (DRINK FTN, BENCHES, ETC) | 1 | LS | \$8,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| ENTRY SIGN | 1 | EA | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$415,308 |
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Cooper Mountain Master Plan Preliminary Development Cost Estimates (continued)

| ITEM | QUANTITY | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | TOTAL PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PHASE II - GRABHORN RD TRAILHEAD |  |  |  |  |
| ASPHALT PARKING LOT ( $16 \mathrm{SP}+4$ TRAILER ) | 18,000 | SF | \$3.00 | \$54,000 |
| LANDSCAPE (10\%) | 1,800 | SF | \$5.00 | \$9,000 |
| STORM WATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES | 1 | LS | \$20,000.00 | \$20,000 |
| ELECTRONIC GATE | 1 | LS | \$22,000.00 | \$22,000 |
| RESTROOM (2 UNIT VAULT) | 1 | LS | \$26,000.00 | \$26,000 |
| FURNISHINGS (DRINK FTN, BENCHES, ETC) | 1 | LS | \$8,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| PICNIC SHELTER | 1 | LS | \$35,000.00 | \$35,000 |
| ENTRY SIGN | 1 | EA | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| ADA EQUESTRIAN RAMP | 1 | EA | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| PHASE II CONSTRUCTION COSTS |  |  |  | \$194,000 |
| CONTINGENCY @ 25\% |  |  |  | \$48,500 |
| DESIGN \& PERMIT COSTS @15\% |  |  |  | \$29,100 |
| PHASE II TOTAL. COST |  |  |  | \$271,600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| PHASE III |  |  |  |  |
| RANGERS RESIDENCE \& STORAGE SHED | 1200 | SF | \$200.00 | \$240,000 |
| CONTINGENCY @ 25\% |  |  |  | \$60,000 |
| DESIGN \& PERMITS @15\% |  |  |  | \$36,000 |
| PHASE III TOTAL COST |  |  |  | \$336,000 |
| GRAND TOTAL COST |  |  |  | \$1,750,711 |

the creation of a State Park Overlay District (Section 383 of the panoldde (pleog) sızuolss!umio) to preog kuno uotbu!ysem aul State and Regional Park Overlay District: Washington County Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt a Urban Growth Boundary Approvals and Permits Required for Lands outside of the Development 20 Acre District (FD-20).

 Type I or Type II Administrative Review: Urban Growth Boundary Approvals and Permits Required for Lands within the Cooper Mountain Master Plan: and county land use approvals will be required to implement the Department of Land Use and Transportation, the following state

 outside of the UGB Approvals/requirements that pertain to the portion of the site gon 2ut uiulu

Approvals/requirements that pertain to the portion of the site follows rural lands. For purposes of this discussion, land use approvals and
permits needed to implement the master plan will be categorized as and rural lands, some requirements are specific only to urban or state and county land use requirements apply equally to both urban outside (rural) of the urban growth boundary (UGB). While some


Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Certified Local Government Grant Program
www.prd.state.or.us/grants-localgov.php Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Small Grant Program http://egov.oregon.gov/OWEB/GRANTS/smgrant_main.shtml

Recreation Trails Program Grants
(SAFETEA-LU funding administered by Oregon Parks and Recreation Department)
http://egov.oregon.gov/OPRD/GRANTS/about_us.shtml
Habitat Restoration
Restoration by habitat type is described in the Natural Resources Management Plan Summary (see Chapter 6). Considerable
vegetation management activities were initiated prior to phase of reforestation efforts in the mixed deciduous/conifer forest area is approaching completion toward the "free-to-grow" stage.

Once completed, annual maintenance will be relatively minimal and primarily focused on invasive plant removal, with periodic activities such as thinning of the developing forest. It is anticipated that active restoration of the forested areas will continue up to 2011. Costs of these improvements range considerably, depending on availability of native plant material, success of controlling exotic and noxious weeds, annual weather variations, and availability of personnel and other resources. The maximum cost anticipated for implementing habitat restoration is $\$ 375,000$, approximately.

Impacts to Surrounding Farm or Forest Practices - (ORS 215.296) Proposed master plan improvements will need to be consistent with ORS 215.296 which requires an analysis of the impact of a proposed plan amendment on the surrounding farm and forest practices to determine whether the proposal will "force a significant change" in accepted farm and forest practices. This analysis will be prepared for the entire site when the Comprehensive Plan amendment is filed for the Master Plan approval.

Both a Traffic Impact Statement and Transportation Analysis have been conducted in anticipation of development review and master plan approval by Washington County.

## Funding Sources

In 2003, the Metro Council approved raising some fees in order to provide funding for the development and operation of new natural area sites around the region. These funds will be expended at
 Oaks Natural Area and Willamette Cove. It is anticipated that this funding will not be adequate to implement all projects at these four
 will be sought by Metro and partner agencies from a variety of sources, including but not limited to the following:

## Land and Water Conservation Fund Grants

(National Park Service funding administered by Oregon Parks and Recreation Department)
www.prd.state.or.us/grants_Iwcf.php
U.S. Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service

North America Wetlands Conservation Act Grants (NAWCA) www.tgci.com/fedrgtxt/o4-2717.txt
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# Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee Meeting Notes 

Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2004<br>Time: 6:00-8:00 p.m.<br>Place: $\quad$ Tualatin Hills Nature Center, Robin's Nest Room, 15655 5W Millikan Way, Beaverton<br>Attending: Barbara Fryer, Aisha Willits, Mark Charleston, Joan Andersen-Wells, Steve Gulgren, Megan Garvey, Judy Fox, Larry Fox, David Green, Ryan Durocher, Brian Harney, Lori Smith, Debbie Chin, John Chin, Heather Kent, Lora Price, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Ron Klein

Metro staff presented the following overview and site information in the first hour of the meeting:

- Background and overview of the planning process
- Existing conditions and recreation context
- Natural resource features
- Public involvement process and preliminary results of the Cooper Mt. opinion survey

Written summaries and accompanying resource maps of the above site information will be provided to PAC members.

The second hour was devoted to questions, comments and discussion by committee members to address overall concerns, values and desires for the site:

- Lori Smith indicated a strong interest in serving on the Cooper PAC, representing Teal Ridge/Cairn Heights neighborhoods.
- Members requested interest in receiving reduced copies of the natural resource maps for their notebooks.
- Joan Andersen-Wells said that the Tualatin Hills Nature Park does not have locked gates at the entrance and most of the illicit activities/problems have significantly diminished over the years with ongoing use and management of the park.
- Because preliminary public opinion survey results show a fairly strong lack of support for park facility features that would attract or accommodate groups, Megan Garvey expressed concern that the park needs amenities such as a shelter and bus turn around to accommodate school groups on field trips. The survey does, however, indicate support for using the site for school field trips.
- Larry Fox and David Green stated they thought most of the concern around accommodating groups to the site is about the associated traffic.
- Joan Anderson-Wells indicated that THPRD has used Metro's Cooper Mountain property for some group programs. She also noted that at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park there are designated off-trail areas for environmental education activities and should be considered when planning for Cooper Mt.
- David Green said that a small natural greenspace exists in the Kemmer View Estates neighborhood. A majority of residents support maintaining the area as a natural space with minimal amenities. Green expects these values would also hold true for Metro's Cooper Mit. property.
- Larry Fox said that one of the most valued attributes of the Cooper Mt. property is its quiet ambiance. A quiet, outdoor environment for visitors should be recognized as one of the distinct qualities to protect in planning for the park. His observation of the site's use to date is that it is predominantly one or two people having a quiet experience. However, the site also been used by Volkswalk groups.
- Lori Smith said that maintaining a feeling of being in the country is important. Street lights, for
example, don't contribute to that quality. Another concern is that infrastructure such as off-street parking should properly accommodate and manage public use and not to rely on street parking capacity.
- In consideration of how existing gravel road and trails might be removed or changed, several committee members stressed the importance of keeping the existing gravel roads (i.e. logging roads) for continued fire management access and other park maintenance activities.
- David Green asked whether it was possible to consider the nearby public water reservoir property to accommodate parking. Barbara Fryer indicated that because of increased security requirements around public facilities, it may be difficult to accommodate public parking adjacent to a water tank. However, Fryer said she would look into the feasibility of the idea. Larry Fox supported the idea of moving access to the park in that direction (away from 190th) because of improved traffic sight lines along Kemmer Rd. It would improve the safety of people getting in and out of the park. There are a lot of accidents at the corner of SW Kemmer Rd. and 190th.
- Committee members suggested that Metro staff look at other relevant natural area models (e.g. Tom McCall Nature Preserve in the Columbia Gorge, Powell Butte Nature Park, Tualatin Hills Nature Park, Mt. Pisgah in Eugene) to help determine the appropriate mix and balance of recreation amenities and natural resource protection.
- Steve Gulgren explained that at his former agency, the policy for providing minimum support facilities in conservation districts included a 20 -car parking lot, restroom(s), drinking fountain and trails.
- Tentative dates for future meetings were presented and discussed. Wednesday evenings seemed to be the best time to hold Cooper Mt. PAC and other related public meetings. Ryan Durocher, however, had an ongoing conflict with Wednesday evenings.


# Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee Meeting Notes 

Date: Wednesday, March 31, 2004<br>Time: $\quad$ 6:00-8:00 p.m.<br>Place: Tualatin Hills Nature Center, Robin's Nest Room, 15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton<br>Attending: Cooper PAC members: Joe Reeves, Jody Newberry, Mark Charleston, Doug Myers, Joan Andersen-Wells, Steve Gulgren, Kyle Spinks, Larry Fox, David Green, David McClain, Tim Morgan, Lori Smith, Debbie Chin, Bryan Pasternak, Eric Meckel. Metro staff: Heather Kent, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Ron Klein. Citizens: Boyce Smith, Eric Squires, Ed Bartholemy, Kathy Bartholemy.

No corrections or additions were suggested to the February 4, 2004 meeting notes of the Cooper Mt. PAC.
J. Budhabhatti presented an assessment of the Cooper Mt property for recreational use. Metro used the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department's method of land assessment that recognizes four levels of suitability for recreational use. The resource inventories that were assessed for suitability analyses included habitat for wildlife, protected species, water and geologic hazards (slope and soil) and cultural resources. No significant cultural resource was found on site. Each resource category was mapped and classified with respect to the four suitability levels, based on the following criteria:

- Uniqueness and quality of habitat
- Federal/state listed threatened, endangered or sensitive wildlife species
- Oregon Natural Heritage Program listings 1,2 or 3
- Riparian and wetland areas
- Geologic instability
B. Pasternak asked what other planning projects used the Oregon State assessment method. Oregon State Parks used the model for the proposed Hares Canyon State Park in Washington County. Washington County also requested that Metro use this model for the Cooper Mt planning process. K. Spinks asked if Oregon Land Use Goal 5 would affect the suitability results. Metro staff noted the Goal 5 findings would likely be consistent with the suitability assessment results.
R. Klein presented a summary of 385 public opinion survey returns for Cooper Mt. Klein noted that the survey was not a scientific poll or was meant to convey the types of public facilities that would be developed in the natural area. The survey was one of many tools Metro used to help identify issues, concerns and natural area facilities and experiences to consider in the planning process. Survey returns mostly came from residents of zipcode 97007. Equestrian use and mountain bike use were considered important uses. Representatives of these recreational uses were invited to serve on the Cooper Mt. PAC. Consideration of equestrian and mountain bike use will be carried through the master planning process. Trails and improved habitat for wildlife were highly-demanded natural area features.

The survey also asked if people agreed with Metro's 'no dog policy' in its parks and natural areas. About $59 \%$ of the respondents strongly or somewhat agreed with Metro's policy. Klein distributed a handout explaining the Metro 'no dogs allowed' policy and noted that such a policy is important to assure the
protection of wildife habitat. Such a policy also helps provide visitors a quality experience in nature.

The top three concerns expressed in the survey were: 1) :lificit activities, vandalism and loitering, 2) litter and 3) traffic or parking issues. Many thought a group shelter would become an attractive nuisance for these problem activities. Metro staff noted that the existing house on Kemmer Rd. could possibly serve as a shelter with more controlled access for appropriate activities. H. Kent said there would be a transportation analysis when the planning process gets closer to a preferred facility concept design.
H. Kent reviewed the draft Planning Goals and Objectives for Cooper Mountain Natural Area. The eight goals are direction-setters and intended to reflect Metro's general natural area management policies against which decisions about public use and natural resource management can be assessed. The planning objectives listed under each goal are specific short and long-term tasks. Generally, the Cooper Mountain PAC supported the draft Planning Goals and Objectives with the following additional comments:
D. Green recommended that the first goal should be worded stronger to better reflect Metro's role to protect, enhance and manage habitat for wildlife. Adding the phrase such as "...a place for wildlife to thrive." was suggested. Being more clear in the first goal may help in better understanding Metro's policy relative to no dogs in its parks and natural areas.
D. McClain explained to achieve the habitat management objectives, Cooper Mt. will need to be actively managed, including selective removal of trees (i.e. logging). A long-term management plan ( 60 -year cycle) could also be a possible revenue source for the natural area. An April 1, 2004 memo from D. McClain provides details of a forest management approach to the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. H. Kent acknowledged that the site will require active management to achieve the desired habitat objectives and that natural resource management will be a component of the master plan.

Goal 2 relates to public access and recreational use. K. Spinks asked if Metro's "green street guidelines will be a planning reference. H. Kent said yes along with recently developed "green trail" guidelines. Poorly planned trails can do a lot of natural resource damage and as well as increase maintenance costs if not carefully considered for placement, materials and maintenance. J. Reeves said that ADA access should be considered in a broader sense to accommodate a variety of people with timited mobility (e.g. disabled horse riders, strollers, wheelchairs, waikers, canes).
M. Charleston emphasized the need to have good orientation signs (e.g. trail mileposts, you are here maps, etc.). It is important for visitors to have a reasonable sense of where they are in the natural area as it relates to safety and rescue. D. Meyer pointed out that emergency access was important, but if TVFR cannot gain access the regular way, they will make a way that will likely cause habitat damage. J. Reeves said that a volunteer trail patrol is effective in Tillamook State Forest. J. Anderson-Wells said the Tualatin Hills Nature Park is mapped with a grid for emergency purposes and they also have a volunteer "park watch" team that patrols the park.

Signs, trail location and vegetation barriers should be used to help assure that visitors remain on public property.
B. Pasternak suggested that an objective be added to Goal 3 engaging volunteer in stewardship activities. Environmental education and interpretation of the natural area should lead to a growing number of people who want to volunteer at Cooper Mountain and other places.

Related to Goal 6 and minimizing impacts to surrounding neighborhoods, L. Fox said that any communication tower leases should be limited and not to turn the top of Cooper Mountain into a "cell tower farm". D. McLain added that any revenue generated from a communication tower lease should be dedicated to Cooper Mt. Natural Area.

Other comments included a recommendation $\frac{f}{f} r o m$ L. Fox that Metro should be clear about what facilities and activities that will not be considered in the planning process (e.g. motorized vehicles, dogs, field sports) to avoid pubiic misunderstanding of the expected use of the natural area. In addition, T. Morgan supported quality, on-site interpretive features (e.g. interpretive signs, well-designed trails that highlight natural area attributes) as visitor attraction. Morgan asked how people were going to be directed to the natural area. H. Kent said Metro will work with Washington County and ODOT to determine what is possible for directional road signs.
R. Klein said he would look into using Southridge High School in Beaverton for the remaining Cooper Mountain PAC meetings and public open houses.

## MEMORANDUM

## Date: April 1, 2004

## To: Ron Klein, Metro

## From: Dave McClain, Kemmer View Estates

## RE: Cooper Mountain Natural Area Planning Goals

One of the goals and objectives for Cooper Mountain should be to reestablish the fir forest ecosystem. The majority of the property area once was a western Oregon fir and cedar mix conifer forest ecosystem with riparian areas that included a mix of alder, vine maple and other deciduous trees and riparian shrubs.

Go and look at a mix conifer old growth stand and picture what this area may have looked like in 1860 . To get this area to start to progress toward this objective will require a long range ecosystem recover plan that is generational in scope (200 years).

To understand how to plan for this objective, one must first understand the dynamics of the mix conifer fir forest system in this area. The site has been logged multiple times over the past 100 years. It is not a pristine area that needs to be preserved. It is a forest piantation that needs to be replanted, managed and nurtured along 50 that in 20 to 60 years it will be a unique complex fir forest ecosystem that is rapidly approaching a natural function condition that will result in a significant old growth stand of trees in about 100 years.

The area is currently in various stages of stand (forest) replacement and the site has various potential for regeneration of the forest based on soil, moisture and nutrient availability. To understand these conditions and to prepare a plan the following steps need to be taken:

- Map/assess the size, basal area requirements, density of the existing plantations. The Oregon Department of Parks classification system does not provide Metro with the level of detail that is needed. A more detailed map of the existing forest conditions is needed.
- Estimate the regeneration rate for the fir forest areas and open areas that have been converted to grass (pasture areas). A great deal of the "open grass areas" could be replanted and would support healthy stands of fir.
- Understand the basal area requirements and site classification of the area with regard to the potential of the site to grow trees through time.
- Estimate the thinning program needed to keep the forest moving toward a healthy climax forest condition.

This last point is very critical to the basic planning process. A qualified forester needs to make a site classification of the area based on Oregon Department of Forestry Site Classification system. Site class is a way to classify forest according to how well trees grow. Trees grow fast in forest with fertile soils and plenty of moisture and this forest have higher "site classifications". Trees grow slowly in rock soils and dryer climates where the site class is lower. Oregon Department of Forestry can provide this information based on a site review. Usually at no cost or you can hire a consulting forester.
You need to know the basal area of the reforestation areas and any riparian management areas. Because of higher moisture content, riparian area will have different site classifications that the rest of the park. These riparian forest areas will need a different plan for ecosystem recovery and in general the width of these areas will be 250 feet or greater depending upon slope and soif moisture content.

The Basal Area is the cross sectional area of a tree stem at 4.5 feet above ground. If you know the basal area of the existing trees and the site class, you can generally calculate the number of trees per acre that the site is capable of producing. Basal area in a reforestation unit can be determined by sampling stands with plots spaced evenly over the area along compass lines. There are standard methods for doing this.

The survey will tell you the basal area and this will tell you how many trees per acre are growing on the site (or could grow on the site) and what the general spacing should be between trees.
As the trees grow over a 100 to 200 year cycle, the number of trees that a given acre can sustain reduces with increased basal area. For example a typical fir forest acre covered with 6 inch trees would grow about 400 trees per acre. The same area with 24 inch trees would grow 25 to 50 trees per acre. This density difference reflects productivity over approximately 20 year period to grow trees from 6 inches to 24 inches. This simple example also illustrates the planning problem in that 375 trees per acre may need to be removed from every acre of the fir forest area over the next twenty years.

This information then takes the planner to the next level of planning. If the objective is to manage the forest to recreate a functioning old growth stand in 100 year, then numerous trees will have to be removed at various stages of growth.

To accomplish this activity, adequate maintenance and harvest roads must be built into the plan to accommodate the removal of the trees cut to make room for the remaining trees to grow. The roads need to be stable, have adequate drainage control and stream crossings (bridges, fords, culverts). I prefer fords in intermittent stream areas. These roads can double as walking trails, emergency access, fire breaks, equestrian area, and mountain bike areas.

The need to thin can be easily modeled and the cycle of thinning predicted based on the existing stand density and size of the stand. The plan should allow for the use of the full range of silvaculture activities to achieve the ecosystem recovery goal. If the fir forest ecosystem is not managed for occasional removal of overstocked trees, then disease, root rot, stress and insects will flourish and this will result in dead and dying trees and considerable higher wild fire potential.

Also the trees that are removed will have value. The volume of trees can be modeled with some standard Oregon Department of Forestry models and the economic value can also be estimated in present value terms. The ability of this park to generate revenue from ecosystem management thinning programs should be discussed in the management plan.

Public perception of this concept is another planning issue. The concept must be explained as biomass recovery from ecosystem restoration work. The plan is not intended to treat this site as a forest plantation with a rotational cut every 20 to 35 years. Regular thinning will be required to achieve the ecosystem recovery goals and the material that is thinned will have economic value. Good public policy would require that economic recovery of thinned material is an established goal of the management plan. Also the plan should provide for a program that will re-invest the revenue from biomass recover back into the park improvements and ecosystem recovery.

The basic planning approach must first consider the dynamics of this site as a forest ecosystem which will be growing trees. These trees will, if left alone, create an overstocked condition. Such conditions will result in marginalized ecosystems, and increased risk for stand replacement fire. Prudent planning must design a
recreation management plan based on the site requirements for a 20 to 100 year recovery program for the forest ecosystem. This changes the paradigm regarding how to plan this park. Roads, trails, riparian areas, habitat areas and recreation improvements must be designed around the basic requirements of the forest recovery program.

I recommend that Metro call the Oregon Department of Forestry and ask for a consultation. You may want to consider asking Oregon State University, Coliege of Forestry if they would like to take on this site as a field laboratory for their forestry program. The park site is in reality an arboretum in the early stages of development and the basic recreation management plan must be based on the forest recovery plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

## Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, May 12, 2004<br>Time: $\quad$ 6:00-8:00 p.m.<br>Place: Southridge High School, Community Room, 9625 SW 125th Ave., Beaverton

Attending: Cooper PAC members: Joe Reeves, Jody Newberry, Leigh Crabtree, Mark Charleston, Joan Andersen-Wells, Steve Gulgren, Kyle Spinks, Larry Fox, Judy Fox, David Green, Megan Garvey, Tim Morgan, Lori Smith, Debbie Chin, Bryan Pasternak. Metro staff: Heather Nelson Kent, Lora Price, Ron Klein. Citizens: Beth Webber, Debbi Bethel, Boyce Smith, Carol Robillard, Ray Wold, Diana Hammer, Ed Bartholemy, Kathy Bartholemy.

No corrections or additions were suggested to the March 31, 2004 meeting notes of the Cooper Mt. PAC.
H.N. Kent introduced the process that led to drafting three design concepts for Cooper Mt. After Metro staff and the Cooper PAC established planning goals for the project, a design workshop was held on April 14, 2004 to develop a variety of design concepts for Cooper Mt. Natural Area. Workshop attendees included landscape architects, planners, natural resource/land managers, environmental educators and trail experts. Design concepts were based on five scenarios:

- Minimal Development / Maximum Conservation
- Maximum Environmental Education and Interpretation / Maximum Habitat Diversity
- Maximum Recreation and Trail Opportunities / Minimum Habitat Conservation
- Focus on Very Important Features and Activities Identified in the Public Survey
- Fully Integrated Recreation / Interpretation and Habitat Conservation

Metro staff developed three design concepts from the workshop results for public review. Lora Price presented these concepts (see concept summaries) to the Cooper PAC for discussion and refinement before presentation at the open house on May 19, 2004. The Cooper PAC was asked to fill out an evaluation and comment form (see evaluation summary). The following are notes from the Cooper PAC meeting discussion.

Concept 1- B. Smith noted the limited access to the upper meadow for emergency vehicles. J. Reeves said natural area expansion to the south should be noted (missing in Concept 1).

Concept 2- D. Green said that maintenance and emergency roads in the natural area should be better indicated. Even though equestrian use is not indicated for Concept 2, J. Reeves pointed out that the Grabhorn Rd. parking location would be best for horses as this is the primary rural interface with the property.

Concept 3-K. Spinks noted that because Concept 3 indicates the most visitor use, one can expect the most bad or inappropriate use on the property. An on-site ranger is most important to monitor and correct park use in a timely fashion. J. Reeves said a volunteer trail patrol could be an effective management partner. D. Green said to locate the ranger residence where the most anticipated problems would occur.

Other comments-S. Gulgren said trail surfaces can vary depending on anticipated user and location (i.e. ADA hard surface or compact gravel; regional trais $8^{\prime}$ to $12^{\prime}$ wide hard surface or combo to accommodate horses; smaller soft surface trails for more sensitive areas). H.N. Kent said that specific trail design and surfaces will be identified during the construction design phase of the project. L. Crabtree said that Goal 5 results may limit development on the property. The city of Beaverton's adjacent water tower property is not "off the table" for associated planning considerations. M. Charleston said, in general, the fire/safety infrastructure needs to be improved (e.g. lower east spur needs upgrading; better access at Kemmer Rd., accommodate emergency vehicle access). Residential areas are the top priority; natural areas are secondary for emergency response. J. Anderson-Wells suggested a $5-\mathrm{ft}$ minimum width on any trail. Bikes and pedestrians can be a dangerous use mix if the trail are not designed properly. B. Pasternak said trail surfaces can be on site, natural based if it is hard surface like clay or rock. R. Wold suggested consideration of one-way trails to reduce safety risk among different trail uses.

## Summary of committee members evaluation sheet responses to alternative design concepts presented Wednesday, May 12, 2004

## Trail Features

Of the four design components evaluated (i.e.habitat types, trail features, facilities \& amenities and site management), the preponderance of comments addressed the issue of trails, specifically trail uses and lengths.

A significant number of respondents supported trails for all three user types (hikers, bikers and equestrians), with most of those preferring separate single-use trails, expressing a concern for safety on combination trails. Although multi-user inclusiveness was frequently referred to as desirable, that was not consistently matched by respondents' ratings of importance in those categories.

An even larger number of respondents, however, preferred single-use, hiking-only trails in the park. Reasons listed for this preference included:

1) Better supports planning goals for the Cooper Mountain Natural Area, particularly goals 1 and 2 :

Goal 1-Protect and enhance Cooper Mountain's unique natural and scenic resources and create a place for wildlife to thrive.
Goal 2-Encourage community access and recreational use that is compatible with natural resource protection.
2) The site is not large enough to accommodate exclusive trails for a!l three types of activities.
3) Appropriate trails for bikers and equestrians likely would not be long enough for a satisfying experience.

Loop trails and distance markers received positive responses from most survey participants. The numbers favoring increased trail lengths were nearly matched by those preferring no increase or shortening trail lengths fearing increases in site degradation.

The need for ADA trails was uniformly agreed upon, although the gradient of the site was seen as a possible impediment. Other comments related to ADA trails included the hope they could include areas of
multiple park features to provide users with a more varied nature experience.

Interpretive stations were considered desirable by most, although not given high ratings of importance by all.

Other comments related to trails included the introduction of invasive weeds with trail usage. Those supportive of equestrian trails were consistent in their opinion that horses are not major seed carriers; bikers and hikers are more likely a seed source.

## Facilities and Amenities

The largest number of comments in this category pertained to parking areas and restrooms.

Respondents overwhelming preferred both parking areas/trailheads and restrooms at Kemmer and Grabhorn roads as described in Design Concept 3.

Other suggestions included a drinking fountain in the larger parking area and lighting in both lots

Assuring space enough for trucks and horse trailers also was mentioned by the equestrian trail supporters as very important.
Some respondents rated picnic shelters and/or tables as important amenities. Ratings also were high for a nature-based children's play feature.

The concept of a mowed grass/informal play field received mixed reviews. Some considered it unnecessary; some suggested a meadow area sufficient for such use and others saw no adequate flat area for that purpose.

A terraced seating area also rated high by some for group presentations or scenic viewing and as undesirable by some because of its appeal for illicit activities.

An education center was rated an asset for environmental education activities and public outreach by several respondents. Others thought an education/picnic shelter could serve a similar purpose.

## Site Operation

Less than half of those completing the evaluation sheets commented on this design component. The section on providing access within the site for service vehicles drew multiple comments of concern that there be adequate access for fire and rescue vehicles.

Vegetation buffers were considered by some to be beneficial for defining natural area boundaries while others expressed a concern that maturing vegetation might obstruct views.

The value of a ranger/caretaker residence was described as required for security purposes and to monitor park usage, and by an equal number of survey participants as unnecessary.

## Habitat Types

Very few respondents offered comments on this design component, but those that did were very specific. For example, one reported "Prairies and oak savannahs have decreased significantly in the Willamette Valley making preservation of those remaining very important."

High importance also was given to stream corridors and wetliands for healthy wildife habitat.

Another respondent stated, "All headwater streams in the Metro region are in great need of preservation due to existing and historic impacts." Fewer stream crossings were suggested for better water quality.

# Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee Meeting Notes 

Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2004<br>Time: $\quad$ 6:00-8:00 p.m.<br>Place: Jenkins Estate, $\mathbf{8 0 0 5}$ SW Grabhorn Rd. in Aloha


#### Abstract

Attending: Cooper PAC members: Joe Reeves, Jody Newberry, Barbara Fryer, Mark Charleston, Joan Andersen-Wells, Gery Keck, Kyle Spinks, David Green, Tim Morgan, Lori Smith, Debbie Chin, Bryan Pasternak. Metro staff: Heather Nelson Kent, Lora Price, Ron Klein. Citizens: Sally Rask, Chris Girard, Boyce Smith, Carol Robillard, Ray Wold, Ruth Ann Mask, Ed Bartholemy, Kathy Bartholemy.


No corrections or additions were suggested to the May 12, 2004 meeting notes of the Cooper Mt. PAC.

Before the staff presentation of the Cooper Mt. Natural Area draft preferred design concept, attendees had an opportunity to view the large design concept drawing. L Price presented the elements of the proposal including local access and parking, trails and trail uses, habitat features and other amenities such as the nature house, ranger residence, children's nature-oriented play area and picnic facilities (see summary sheet).

HN Kent reviewed the rationale that led to the draft design concept based on public review and comment, planning goals and objectives, management implications, potential recreation conflicts and quality of visitor experience (see decision matrix). The identified planning goals and objectives, physical and policy constraints helped determine the scale and level of proposed use on the property. HN Kent also introduced the concept of a dog corral on adjacent city of Beaverton property to meet the recreational needs of dog owners as well as maintain the need to protect nabitat areas on Cooper Mt.

K Spinks asked about water resources for the development. HN Kent noted that there were water rights for residential use, but not park use. The restrooms for the natural area will likely be vault toilets and not require water. Metro will explore the possibility of water fountains, but it may not be feasible.

B Smith noted that the design should ciearly indicate fire and safety access to the property.

K Spinks noted that brush removai would likely encourage oak habitat and reduce wildfire risk. He asked if Metro has investigated how changes of habitat patterns would affect the hydrology of the area. HN Kent said changes in hydrology from habitat management applications has not yet been considered.

C Robillard noted that smoke from poison oak burning is toxic and should be considered in controlled burning activities.

G Keck asked about the nature of the horse trail. HN Kent said that the equestrian trail along the existing logging road would remain until the regional trail is established through the natural area. At that time the trail surface would likely change to better accommodate other uses. The regional trail might be eligible for federal transportation funding, but a case needs to be made that it is a commuter trail. THPRD is working
on a community trail update that may speed up the regional trail process.

B Pasternak noted that "extreme" mt bikers require 6 to 20 miles for their activity, sometimes more. Cooper Mt. can not accommodate this kind of use, but some mt biking could perhaps be accommodated along the equestrian trail or other low impact areas for beginners and young families.

D Chin asked for clarification of bike use in the natural area. She emphasized the importance of making it clear to the general public that bike use is a future use and that it may be several years before it is allowed.
$M$ Charleston said that fire trucks are 10 -feet wide with a 40,000 -pound load. The brush rigs are 8 -feet wide. The existing logging road needs to be improved for adequate fire and safety response in the natura! area. With the improvements made to the main service road (i.e. logging road), M. Charleston said the draft preferred design concept would provide the infrastructure necessary to adequately provide for the fire and safety response of the Tualatin Fire and Rescue District. The road spurs off the main service road are adequate for getting to different portions of the naturai area with brush rigs and equipment such as 1,000ft . hoses.

# Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee Meeting Notes 

Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2005<br>Time: 6:00-8:00 p.m.<br>Place: Tualatin Hills Nature Center, 15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton

Attending: Cooper Mountain PAC members: Joe Reeves, Barbara Fryer, Joan Andersen-Wells, Judy Fox, Kyle Spinks, April Obrich, David Green, Tim Morgan, Lori Smith, Debbie Chin. Metro staff: Heather Nelson Kent, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Ron Klein. Citizens: Gery Keck, Boyce Smith, Ed Bartholemy, Kathy Bartholemy.

The Cooper Mountain PAC meeting notes of July 14, 2004 were accepted as amended (i.e. clarification of comments made by Bryan Pasternak and Mark Charleston).
J. Budhabhatti presented an overview of the Natural Resource Management Plan for Cooper Mountain Natural Area including historic cover types and land use and habitat management strategies. Neighboring habitats will be important to establish wildlife corridors. Metro will work closely with adjacent property owners. Oak woodland, prairie and mixed forest will be the primary habitats managed. Controlled burns, mowing, invasive species removal and select herbicide application will be among the management techniques for oak woodland. Small controlled burns, mowing and select herbicide application with be the primary management applications for prairie habitat. The mixed forest will be managed to old growth and the replanted areas wili be managed as 2nd growth forest.
D. Green asked what contingency plans does Metro have in the event that recreation produces adverse impacts to habitat and wildlife populations. J. Budhabhatti said that Metro would employ adaptive management to the natural area and conduct periodic reviews of the compatibility of recreation and habitat condition.

HN Kent noted that DKS (a transportation planning firm) was contracted to do a transportation study for Cooper Mountain. Metro also met with Washington County to discuss transportation requirements for public facilities at Cooper Mountain Natural Area. The county will issue a traffic impact statement and may require modifications including site constraints, sight distance requirements at Kemmer and Grabhorn roads, mitigation measures, refuge turning lane, etc. At this time, Metro does not anticipate a large transportation issue related to building public visitor facilities.

HN Kent discussed operations of public visitor facilities. The master plan will assume Metro will be the manager of the property. However, Metro will discuss partnership possibilities with THPRD. Metro is discussing with Washington and Clackamas counties the possibility of adopting Metro's Title $X$ rules for parks and natural areas. Natural area rules will be posted at the public access points.
L. Smith recommended that "no smoking" be included in the rules, at least for the summer months. JA Wells noted that the Tualatin Hills Nature Park has a no smoking policy.
J. Reeves noted that well-placed signs can go a long way to help people do the right thing.

HN Kent also noted that there will be lockable gates (manual or automatic) at the natural area entrances. Wildfire prevention will be addressed through vegetation management and assuring adequate emergency access to the site. The nature house will be used as an office, classroom and storage. The nature house also could be reserved for community activities. The shelter at Grabhorn will be available on a first come, first served basis, but could be reserved for community activities through Metro's Special Use Permit process. There are no plans for a BBQ at the shelter. There will be no visitor fee at the natural area.

Trail maintenance will be conducted on a seasonal and as needed basis. Staff and volunteers will be involved in trail maintenance.

Metro plans to allocate 2.5 FTE for the operation and management of Cooper Mountain Natural Area including 0.5 Supervisor, 1.0 Park Ranger, 0.5 Seasonal Ranger and 0.5 Naturalist. For FY 08-09, Metro estimates $\$ 260,000$ will be needed to cover the cost of staff, materials and capital reserve.
J. Reeves suggested an "adopt-a-trail" program may work well at Cooper Mountain.

HN Kent reviewed the draft cost estimates for the project. The total cost of the Cooper Mountain Natural Area project construction is estimated to be $\$ 1.5$ to $\$ 2$ million.
B. Fryer asked if alternative parking surfaces were considered. Stormwater management requirements will change depending on the porosity of the parking area. HN Kent said that different surfaces have been reviewed, an asphalt surface costs about the same as maintaining a gravel surface, for example.

The Cooper Mountain facilities may need to be phased in over time, depending on final cost estimates and availability of funds. Opening the Kemmer Road parking area first may be necessary. It also seems prudent to wait to establish a ranger residence to consider a variety of opportunities such as other housing adjacent to the site as a rental or existing housing for sale.
E. Bartholemy pointed out that Grabhorn Road property adjacent to Metro property was for sale.
K. Spinks asked if Metro could build outside the UGB. HN Kent stated that one house could be built on Metro-owned property.
J. Fox said that the proposed children's play yard seemed out of character to a natural environment.
K. Spinks asked about water use on the site. HN Kent summarized that existing water is from a weil. There will be a drinking fountain, but the drain water will be captured as gray water. Any irrigation wouid be limited to the proposed small turf area on Kemmer Road. Final restroom use of water has to been finalized. K. Spinks noted that there is technology available that can use stored gray water first in restrooms. Compost toilets also are a possibility.

HN Kent also said that Metro will pursue grant funds where applicable (especially state grants). The master plan will only depict trails on Metro property; the regional trail connection will be presented conceptually.

One final meeting (TBA) of the Cooper Mountain PAC will invoive the review of the draft master plan before being published for citizen comment.

## Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

## Date: June 30, 2005 <br> Time: 6:00-8:00 p.m. <br> Place: $\quad$ Tualatin Hills Nature Center, 15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton <br> Re: $\quad$ Review Comments on Draft Master Plan

## Comments on TVF\&R issues:

Good idea to use trails as dual fire break/service

Access looks adequate (with the N and SW access points).

Minimum trail width of $15^{\prime}$ is needed for rigs (this includes vegetation clearance and shoulders in addition to pavement width). Rock quarry road has adequate base as is.

Provide turn-arounds for ambulance, pull off or other 3 point turn-around area. 500 ft . is limit of backup.

Most likely that emergency vehicle access will be for medical emergency problems.
General response 5 minutes if in area - 6-7 minutes if out of area.

Provide grid map for to help emergency response locate where accidents are. THPRD Nature Park uses this.

Provide neighborhood notification for controlled burn - if/when used.

Include sufficient liability requirements for operators/contractors during controlled burns.
Coordinate with Tualatin Valley Fire and Water/Fire Marshal's office.

Hydrants in vicinity should provide sufficient access to water supply for fire suppression.

## Additional comments:

Correction - the Nature Park is 222 acres.

Instead of referring to pale larkspur specifically, it may be better to generalize the reference to sensitive species so as not to become a tool used against access and development of the naturai area.

Check document text to clarify future vs. today's vision (in particular with references to bicycling).

Kemmer View Estates Board is universally positive about the plan. However, pedestrian crossing on Kemmer Road is an issue. 182 nd is a problem spot. Strongly advocate for a bike trail or sidewalk along Kemmer Road connecting to the natural area.

There is a sidewalk on the north side of the road along Kemmer View frontage. A safe road crossing point will need to be determined to connect to sidewalks fronting the natural area. It was asked if city of Beaverton could provide a sidewalk aiong the water tower property? A sidewalk is also needed along one private property to compiete the connection.

It was also asked if speed bumps or other traffic calming devices could be implemented on Kemmer Road. There is a lot of concern about kids crossing this busy street. David Green can provide more info on where existing pedestr ian crossing points are.

Turn lane would be useful for both entrances to the natural area in both directions. Should be considered.

Street trees are effective as traffic calmers and should be incorporated even if not required by the county.

A sidewalk along 190th is not desired by 190th Street residents. It is out of character with the neighborhood and not deemed necessary by the PAC. Furthermore there is a large ditch along 190th that is full when the water tower is drained. If necessary, Metro should appeal this county requirement.

The irrigated grassy area shown on the Kemmer Road edge seems out of character with the rest of the natural area. It should not be turf. Lora clarified that it was not intended that it be managed as turf. The character would be more like a back yard or school yard that gets mowed but is not regularly irrigated. It will be an eco-iawn. (It was included in the cost estimate for purposes of noting all potential construction requirements and costs.)
Consensus agreed on keeping unirrigated grassy areas as they support programming with school groups. It was also felt that the grassy area location should be shifted away from the 190th/Kemmer Road corner and traffic edge.

Find ways to ensure meadow access is secure (riders).

It was asked where would irrigation water will come from and how sewer will be handled? Also asked where existing septic field was. We are assuming water will be from the City water line. There is a _ acre limit for irrigation. Not sure at this point if septic or sewer will be used.

Distances in the regional context section should be clarified. "As the crow flies" distances are misleading to real travel distances. Double check light rail distance and add other bus stops nearby.

Correction - Cooper Mountain is not really used that much to watch the Hillsboro Air Show but it is used for star/astronomy events and fireworks watching.

Check Pg. 89, referencing the 2 small acreages.
On pg. 8, Background, clarify where acquisition goals came from for Cooper - bond measure, target areas, refinement plan?

Would like to see a bibliography for the history section.

In Natural Resource Section: Clarify status of Oak Woodland - "rare, threatened" may not be best terminology since it has regulatory meaning.

Be clear that the Acorn Woodpecker is a potential future resident of the habitat. It is not there now.

## Explain Neo-tropical

Double check if Elk have been present on site. P. 16 .

Check vocabulary in hydro wetlands.

Correction - It is Stonecreek Drive - not Road

On surrounding areas map show regional trail entering and exiting park in the likely locations and do not show alignment within property boundaries.

Check that we have made it clear that the current policy is no bikes until a regional trail is designated through the park. The regional trail will also accommodate equestrian use.
Will dogs be allowed on the regional trail? Clarify how Metro's "no pets" policy will be enforced on regional trail.

Include well water constraints 〈this is or should be addressed in the existing facilities section.
p. 36, eliminate "caretakers residence".

In Issues/opportunities \& Constraints section: add neighborhood concerns about on-street parking by natural area users and sidewalk and pedestrian access along Kemmer Road.

O\&M section: Add marking boundaries of property where needed. Fencing is a last resort to control access.
"Warning Poison Oak" signage could be a good deterrent to unauthorized access.

Consider "no exit" signs on dead end trails (specifically for the road that ends at Stonecreek).

On interpretive signs, use a "you are here" trail map insert.

Provide explanatory signage for why people need to stay on trails, particularly at the prairies. Address no collecting policy (e.g., mushrooming, geocashing and flower collection will be a desire).

Add text regarding the trail we show passing between the corner of the two private properties to explain that an easement will need to be granted by one of the property owners to allow this trail to exist.

Under the volunteer partnership section, expand the discussion re: student study and natural resource work beyond restoration.
P. 55 add "such as Oregon Equestrian Trails" when referring to equestrian trail groups.

It is fine to have a dry traifihead at Grabhorn-horse users will pack their own water.
Refer to the horse ramp as an "assisted loading ramp".

# Cooper Mountain chronicle 

Hetro's Regional Parks and Gresuqpases Departmient - Summer 2003


Cooper Mowntain offers spectacular sivera of foc Thekotem Mowntaikst

## What's happening on Cooper Mountain?

I.It has been more than a year aince the last igsue of Cooper Mountain Chroniche. Metro has not added to the 256 -acre property overiooking the Tualatin
Valley, but the greenspace has improved, benefiting the many plants and animalis that call Cooper Mountain home.

Metra staff and huadreds of volunteers have worked to remove invasive weeds, and plarit and care for neariy 60,000 trees to restore the rocentlylogged aite. Pockets of oak and madrone trees balanced with open meadow areas and wetlands now support a faccinating array of plants and widdife. The increased presence of the beautiful rare delphinium and the retarn of the Western bluebind are juts two examples. Cooper Mountain also rerves as one of several buttertly-monitoring sited in the region.

Next year, Metro will begin wark to prepare a master plan to establish a nature park on its Cooper Mountain property. The plam will identify proposed ures fe.g., hiking, picnicking, nature edacation and enjoyment) and amenitica (ce.gn, parking, trails, viewpaints, zestrooms, signs) featured in the nature park. Natural resource protection measures also will be part of the plan. Enterested in partisipating in the planning process? Call Jane Hart at ( 503 ) 797-1585 or send $c$-mail to hartionetro.dstor.us. The Metro Council will approve the plan by December 2004.

For more information about Cooper Mountain, other Metro parks and gremspaces or volunteer opportunities call at (503) 797-18.50 or visit Metro's wab site at mawrmetro-regiod.org/parkos.

## Street of Dreams partnership benefits Cooper Mountain

The 2003 Stroet of Dreama at Renaissance Pointe takes place July 19 through Aag. 17 on Cooper Mountain.

The Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Pordand, whith hasis the event, arranged with Motro to use a grata ficha at the fatersection of Soxthates 190th Avenes and Krmaner Road for parking

The association will providc traffic managa ment, sitc security and restore the aite if necoded. The temporary parking lot in in an area of marginal willife use and avoids areas where sensuitive plants and animals live.

Since the eyeat takes place in mid summer, most wildflowers have gone to seed and wildilife activity is low.

In axchange for tuse of the ficid, the association will heip fund the martes planning for Coopar Mourrain and build creater awarencas of the benefits of Metro's open spaces acquisition program for area residents. Residdeath, buaincescs and toesal governmentia are working together with Metro to assure that the natural environment remains a vital part of our communnitica

## "Lay extmenta in open

 epaces provides important benefits to our commanity," said JIm Desmond, director of Metro's Regional Puiks and Greenspaces Department. -This parmership gets ns one step claser to opening Cooper Moumain as a nature park for the pablic to eniox=
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# Cooper Mountain chronicle 

Planning begins for a nature park on Cooper Mountain

Together with the publicy Metro and its partners will begin preparing a master plan next month for a natural area park an Cooper Mountain. The park will not become a aite for active recreation (for example, aport or ball fields'. Instead, the property will be developed to protect Cooper Mountain's native plants, wildlife and views while providing opportunities for nature-related use and enjoyment by park visitora.

A project aitvisory committee representing intercsted citixens, local government agencies and groups will work with Metro staff to identify issues, develop park deaign alternativea and nameal reaource protection measures. The committec's first meeting will be in early February, Interested citizens will also be invited to attend public meetings, participate in guided tours of the property and get involved in helping shape the elementro of the master plan and park concept designs.

Some 256 acres are protected on Cooper Mowrisin so for - including the bummit and southern slope of the mountain. This area, on the western edge of Beaverton, is home to many native plants and wildilife and offens viewn of the Tizalatin Valley and Chehalem mourtains. Hundreds of volunterer have contributed thousands of hours to improve Cooper Monmtain's natural enviromment The return of Western bluebinds and several species of wildfowers to Cooper Mountain is a good sign that the hard work is paying off.

The Cooper Monatain Manter Plan will be adopecd by Merro Council in spring 2005. "Balancing the protection and enhancement of the property's nataral values with appropriate pablic use requires caneful consideration. It's going to take come time," said Metro Councilor Car' Hosticka. Hosticka reprebents Metro District 3, which indudes Cooper Mountain.

Organizations or rexidents interected in participating in the master planning process or getring on the mailing fist should call Ron Klein at (503) 7971774 or send e-mail to kleinr(memetrodst.oxus.


## Be a part of planning the park on Cooper Mountain

You can hetp us begin the master planning proosss by zaking a few minutes to give us pour thongins about a park on Cooper Miountain. Complete and return this survey by Feb. 27 to Ron Klein, Metre Regional Pakks and Greenspaces Department, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portand, OR 97232

You also can complete the anrver by going on tine at www.metro-region.arg. Go to "Quichdinks" and click on "Cooper Moumtrin masker plan." On the master plan page you can link to the surves in the left colvmn. The wel site alsc containg additional information about the master planning activity schedule, site tours and wolunter opportunities.

1. Do you think having natural open space in your conmunity is valtuable? (cirele one) jus mo
2. What do you think is the most important reason for making improwementr at the Cooper Mountain natural areal
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
3. How important are the following park features and activitics for a park on Cooper Mountain? (cusdedote)

- play atructure for young chuldren

- network of wallking terils

- loop trail with viewpolat

- trails for horgea

noif imetartrust
- mountain bicing in the park

- parleing for at leart 15 vehteles plis one bus

| LAFy imptortisp | samemhat inqortorif | not inmoremat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

- parking for at leags 30 vehtelos plus two buses

- williffe viewing

- Iuelo improve habitat for plants and animais

- bike racks

- reatrooms

- place to spend time with family and friends way inportint somerahest inportant nor inporitant

Regimaty ark and Grengrea
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## Open house offers look at plans for Cooper Mountain natural area

## A

trend an open house to view facilty design options for the Cooper Mountain natural area from 6 to B p.m. Wetheadiay, May 19, at Soutimidge High School, 9625 SW 125th Ave., Beaverton. Three derign options and mape will be on display. Metro staff will be available to answer cuextions and take your cominents.

Miftro and its partners began wrotk carlier this year to prepare a master plan to buidd viaitor facitites on ins 240-aere natural open epace on Cooper Monnain near Reaverton. The plan will reconmend publle usea and amenities to be featured at the natural area. Above all, the plan will address how visitors can enjoy the greengpasx while protecting pative planta, wildife and wieare

Citfzen comments, technical analyain and review by the Cooper Mountaln Project Advisory Comminter and Metra staff will serve to help shape and seleat a terommended natural afea design option. The mecommended design will be featured at another open house in September and pablished in a draft masku plan by the end of 2004. The draft master plan will be subject to public revien and comment. Metro Conncil is cxpected to adopt the final master plan by spring 2005.

Find ont more about the Cooper Mountain natural anes by visiting Matro's web ate at wrwmeten-region.org' partos, by caling Ron Klein at (503) $797-1774$ or by sending an e-mail to beinemmerodst,or.un.

## Public opinion survey belps shape plans for Cooper Mountain

Nearly 400 poopte took the time to complete and return a aurvey posted on Metroy web gite and distributed to 1,800 addresses in the vietnity of Cooper Mountain. The survey is not solentific, But is an important part of the marter planning process to help lidentify possible publie facilities, uses and Fersed associated with the natural area property. Most of the tespondents ( 69 percenti) were from the immediate sarrounding srea of Cooper Monstrain and most 99 percenty yelued natural open epsoe as a commoniry beneft.

Rightoen ponalble public facittries and uksitor experlences wrere rared. Reapondents ranked providing a network of traifo (98 percent), vicwing willilife \{92 persent) and enwironimental education such as school field trips \{81 percent ${ }^{2}$ as wery important or aomewhat important. The top five concerns and imgues induded activites sach as wandalism, Litering, nofec, wildithe, traffic and parking in adjacent neighborhoods. Based on thes strvey and discussions with neighbors; warioua
cortinued
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## Plan taking shape for Cooper Mountain Natural Area




$T$he vision for a public natural area on Cooper Mountain comes into focus this fall with the release of a proposed design concept for trails, access points, a nature bouse and other visitor facilities. Attend an open house in September to see the draft facility design for this 231-acre open space in Washington County. Later this year, the public will review and comment on a draft master plan that will go before the Metro
Council for adoption in spring 2005.

Nearly a year in the making, the proposed design is intended to protect and enhance the natural area for wildlife while offering visitors high-quality experiences in nature. Successfully achieving this balance requires the participation, expertise and leadership of many. Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, the city of Beaverton, a dedicated project advisory committee and hundreds of neighbors and citizens all helped produce the draft design concept.

Under the proposal, visitors will access the natural area from both Southwest Kemmer and Grabhorn roads. Entrance areas will include parking lots, picnic tables and other amenities. With an emphasis on use by hikers, Cooper Moun-
tain will feature a $31 / 2$-mile trail network that will include an equestrian loop and a 1/2-mile ADA accessible summit trail with views of the Tualatin River Valley. In the future, a nature house will be the staging area for a variety of environmental education activities, including school field trips and guided nature tours. When complete, regional trail connections to the natural area will offer opportunities for bicycle use.

More information about the natural area and the master planning process is available on Metro's web site at www.metro-region. org/parks. Get on the Cooper Mountain mailing list by calling Ron Klein at (503) 797-1774 or sending e-mail to kleinr@metro.dst.or.us.

Come to an open house on Sept. 22
See inside for details
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## Get to know Cooper Mountain

$I_{\mathrm{t}}$ is likely to take a few years for Cooper Mountain Natural Area to officially open to the public. Design, permitting and construction take time. But you don't have to wait to enjoy the nature of Cooper Mountain. Take advantage of one of the many opportunities that Metro offers to explore and experience this unique natural area.

Metro naturalists lead nature tours highlighting the wild side of

Cooper Mountain throughout the year. Discover the many plants and animals that call Cooper Mountain home, including rare birds and wildflowers. Public tours are listed in the Metro GreenScene and on Metro's web site. For groups of 10 to 25 people, Metro will arrange a private tour. Call Metro naturalist Deb Scrivens at (503) 797-1852 for group tour details.


Cooper Mountain visitors examine wildlife tracks.

Since Metro purchased the Cooper Mountain property in 1997, dozens of volunteers have helped with a variety of habitat restoration and management projects. Volunteers are needed to continue in the restoration effort and help monitor plant and wildlife populations.

If you would like to get involved in habitat improvement projects for wildlife or have special skills in identifying native plants, birds, mammals, reptiles or amphibians, call Mary West at (503) 797-1814 for more information
about becoming a Cooper Mountain volunteer.

Until facilities are developed and adequate access and protection of natural resources is ensured, the public is asked to limit their use of Cooper Mountain Natural Area to these guided tours and volunteer activities. In the meantime, Metro has posted signs on the property that prohibit dogs and the use of motorized vehicles, firearms and bikes (Metro Regulatory Code, Title 10.01.220). These interim policies are critical to the success of restoration efforts.

## Learn about the nature of Cooper Mountain

## Naturalist guided tours

11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Sunday, Sept. 19, and 10 a.m. to $12: 30$ p.m. Saturday, Sept. 25

Join a Metro naturalist on a guided tour of the Cooper Mountain Natural Area. Learn about the interesting geologic history of the site, and see forests of different ages, as well as many rare species of plants and trees, including the Willamette Valley ponderosa pine. Much of the Tualatin River watershed can be viewed from the site. Bring a snack and plenty of water. Terrain is steep in some places. All ages are welcome, but an adult must accompany children. Free. Advance registration required; call (503) 797-1850 option 4.

## METRO <br> people places. open spaces

Regional Parks and Greenspaces
Department
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232


## Cooper Mountain chronicle

sus) $8 \leq z \nmid 0$
2oded nomuor-papioven wo poutid

био'ио!бад-одәш"MMM

$\forall d D$ 'MOg sixelv- 10lupn $\forall$ 9
 ס'









ease uet





sajeds uado - sajeja चjdoad
OHEW





- back 10.mabN




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vehicle trip generation for the proposed site was based on traffic count data obtained for the Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreational District's (THPRD) Nature Center which is a similar facility in terms of size and usage. However in actuality, the scale of proposed facilities at the Cooper Mountain Natural Area will be significantly smaller and the level of use proportionately lower. Peak season data from the THPRD Nature Center was utilized to develop the weekday trip generation estimates for the proposed project.
    ${ }^{2}$ The study intersections include: Kemmer Road/175 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Kemmer Road/ $190^{\text {dh }}$ Avenue, Grabhorn Road/Gassner Road and the two project site access points located on Kemmer Road and Grabhorn Road.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The minimum acceptable standard is LOS 'E' (Ref: Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan. Table 5; page11, Washington County 2002.
    ${ }^{4}$ The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is the speed at which 85 percent of vehicles are traveling at or below and 15 percent of vehicles are traveling at or above. It is commonly used in traffic engineering as a measure of roadway travel speeds.
    ${ }^{5}$ Accident data obtained from ODOT Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit on 03/21/05 and represents data from 2001 to 2003 at the Kemmer Road/175 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Kemmer Road/ $190^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Grabhom/Gassner Road intersections.
    ${ }^{6}$ The acceptable standards as per Washington County, is a LOS E and a V/C ratio of 0.99 (Ref: Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan, Page 11, Table 5).

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan, Washington County, 2002.

[^3]:    ${ }^{8} 24$ hour bi-directional tube count conducted by All Traffic Data Services Inc., on March 09, 2005.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Turn movement counts conducted by All Traffic Data Services Inc., on March 09, 2005.
    ${ }^{10}$ It is assumed that the "other urban area" - 1 1s highest hour LOS and V/C standards defined in Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan are applicable for the study area intersections.
    ${ }^{11}$ Data obtained from Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

[^5]:    ${ }^{12}$ Traffic Survey Conducted by All Traffic Data Services Inc., on March 09, 2005.

[^6]:    ${ }^{13}$ Trip generation data provided by Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District.
    ${ }^{14}$ ITE Trip generation Handbook, $7^{\text {h }}$ Edition Vol. 3, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2003.

[^7]:    ${ }^{15}$ Based on conversation with Jinde Zhu, Washington County 2005. No in-process trips were identified by the County staff, therefore model forecast rates were used.
    ${ }^{16}$ Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan, pg. 11, Table 5

[^8]:    ${ }^{17}$ The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed is based on speed survey conducted by All Traffic Data Inc., on March 09, 2005, (refer attached speed data sheets appended along with the report).

[^9]:    ${ }^{18}$ Parking information provided by Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces department.
    ${ }^{19}$ Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Part 4, 2000 Edition.

[^10]:    ${ }^{20}$ The acceptable standards as per Washington County, is a LOS E and a V/C ratio of 0.99 (Ref: Washington County 2020 Transportation Plan, Page 11, Table 5).

[^11]:    Defining a Recreation Role for Cooper Mountain
    Because city municipalities and service districts such as THPRD provide many traditional park facilities (ball fields, basketball courts, etc.) relatively close by, such facilities are not needed at Cooper Mountain Natural Area.

