

Rivergrove Public Meeting with Oregon Marine Board at Heritage Park

July 19, 2022

Council President Dave Pierce (CPP) opened the session with Councilors Barhyte, Lahsene, and Tuttle in attendance. Mayor Williams could not attend.

Guests included Brenda Ruble and Carolyn Bahrman. Mike Salch, Kurt Taylor, Byron Kibbey, Brett Egusa, Charles Faulk, and others (the iPhone recorder did not pick up)

Janine Belleque and Josh Tacchini represented Oregon Marine Board (OMB).

CPP began by having everybody introduce themselves. He then stated that the City Council had decided to explore other possible water access points. Nothing has been decided; the CC is merely investigating potential opportunities; OMB can tell us about these and what the restrictions are. It was noted that water access does not necessarily mean launching of watercraft, either motorized or non-motorized.

CPP noted to Kurt Taylor that he is in the process of getting bids to remove the “widow makers” on the property (Heritage Park).

It was noted that there is a sunken, apparently metal, object just off the bank to the left of the bench.

Janine observed that the area had a steep bank, there was limited parking, and no restrooms. She did not recommend the site as an access for motorized watercraft. Digging into the bank for boat ramp access would take an onerous amount of regulatory compliance and likely not be approved anyway.

For nonmotorized boating, angling or other uses, a gangway could be installed to create the connection between the uplands and water. The gangway would be connected upland by a concrete abutment and water would land on a dock.

If an access point were to be built, OMB would want to see a focus on recreational boating use, plan to maintain the site, seasonal sanitation and the site to have parking for at least six vehicles.

There was a question about ADA compliance. Janine stated that there are exceptions to that for this type of facility, but once proposed, it would need to be investigated.

There was a question about who was behind this. CPP stated this was merely an exploratory investigation based upon the list of items submitted to CC. CPP also noted there is no formal park plan for Heritage Park, and that would have to come first.

Someone suggested providing extra parking at Lloyd Minor Park, but the CC had investigated that and determined that was not an option.

Brenda Ruble stated that the CC had looked at this six years ago and it was \$185,000 for a significant portion of this, and the cost likely would go up to the order of \$300,000, which assumed cutting into the bank.

Janine stated they (OMB) are familiar with several possible resources out there to help with funding. She also noted that the gangway option would minimize earth work.

One person suggested providing a floating dock for fishing and swimming at Lloyd Minor to ease the situation. Councilor Lahsene felt that would only aggravate the existing situation.

Janine stated that they like to see communities separate water activities when the access is small and does not have capacity to separate use in order to reduce conflict and promote positive water recreation experience.. She said the access at Stark boat ramp is narrow with a fair amount of conflict among uses. She described a recent study completed in Washington, that examined the relationship between designated swimming areas and allowing nonmotorized boating in the area and indicated a significant number of head injuries associated with mixing the two uses.

Someone then asked if we could prohibit some activities on the ramp. Janine then said City's can control the access to the water and some communities have limited activities on a ramp (it is city/community property), but off-ramp, in the water, the local government does not have jurisdiction. . If we were to limit activities at the ramp, , we should consult with our City Attorney or other legal resources. She noted the example of significant costs of court challenges to prohibiting activities, such as the case involving Lake Oswego. She expressed extreme caution in attempting to limit certain activities.

Headgate Property

After moving to the Headgate property, two immediate concerns were raised. Do we have access (e.g. right of way) and parking seems limited. It was also mentioned that the adjacent parcel was for sale, but at \$750,000. It is not waterfront property and may have issues in developing it for a house

A possibility would be to sell our parcel and use funds for other things, but this would mean giving up a public river access point.

Janine noted that the location could be a spot for fishing, particularly if the brush area behind the river access could be cleared away.

Council President Pierce mentioned he had seen people fishing here. Janine thought this would be a good spot for that and a bench or two for sitting. She did not recommend the site for boating because of safety associated with the Lake Corp adjacent infrastructure. Additionally the steep terrain and parking were also a concern.

It may be we could partner with Lake Corp to develop something they would like to see the property used for.

Councilor Tuttle moved to adjourn, Councilor Lashene seconded and the motion passed 3-0.