

Columbia River Gorge Commission  
Vital Signs Indicators Project  
**Community Advisory Team Meeting Notes**  
**January 28, 2008 – 11:00am**  
Hood River, Oregon

Community Advisory Team Members Present: North Cheatham, chair, Susan Crowley, Carol York, Ron Carrol, Jaime Tolfree, Victor Schmidt, Julie Reynolds, Andrew Brahe, and Bob Liepper, Phyllis Thiemann and Mary Repar by telephone.

Staff: Jill Arens, Brian Litt, Diana Ross, Angie Kenney, Jessica Metta, Michele Dailey and Jeff Tryens, indicators consultant.

Other Attendees: Peter Cornelison and two unknown individuals who arrived with Adam Brahe.

---

Chair Cheatham began the meeting by explaining that the purpose of today's meeting was to get an update from Commission staff regarding the progress made by each sub-group of the Technical Advisory Team. He explained that although we do not have time to discuss each group's work in depth, he would like to take a moment to discuss the so called "orphan indicators" that have been discussed amongst several community team members on the wiki site. The orphan indicators included such things as sense of security, night time light pollution, watershed resources, and other quality of life issues.

Jill Arens thanked each of the members for their time and efforts devoted to this project. She briefly read over the Community Advisory Team charter to remind the team of what they have been asked to accomplish. To summarize, the community team has been asked to assist the Gorge Commission in selecting measures (indicators) that will be able to measure the health of the Gorge and can be used later to assess the performance of Gorge Commission and partner agency staff in their implementation of the National Scenic Area Act. Team members should (1) review and develop an understanding of the proposed indicators, (2) provide feedback to the technical team, (3) provide advice to the Gorge Commission and (4) share knowledge with other community members. Jill also explained that January and February would be the busiest time for the advisory groups as they begin to pull together their final lists. Once the list of objectives has been agreed upon by the advisory teams, it will be presented to the Assessment Committee and then the Gorge Commission for approval. She also mentioned that read-only access to the wiki had been granted to the public at large to allow for greater public input and understanding.

Most members agreed that the meetings have been too short to allow for the necessary discussions to occur. The next meetings will be scheduled for at least an hour and a half.

Commission staff provided brief updates regarding the work produced by the technical team sub-groups (information can be found in the outline attached to these notes). There was some discussion revolving around the recreation indicators. It was determined that work was still needed to clarify some of the definitions. Jeff Tryens suggested that there

were a number of inventory problems associated with the recreation indicators. Jessica Metta discussed the need for a possible survey (a developmental indicator) that would be allow us to gain a better understanding of the recreation user's perception of recreation resources.

Jessica then provided a short update on the Future Forum community meetings. She encouraged team members to attend the meetings in their communities.

Jeff reminded the team that not everything will be perfect this first time around with the list of indicators. He explained that they will probably be about 75% satisfied with the list that is taken to the Assessment Committee in March – but to remember that it is not the final list, that it will be a draft for a while and this is just something we can take forward to keep the project's momentum going. He added that the Oregon Progress Board took five years to reach their final list.

Meeting adjourned.

Attachments:

- Community Advisory Team Meeting Agenda for January 28, 2007 Meeting
- Draft outline (clean copy)
- Draft outline (annotated copy)
- Draft natural resources objectives and indicators (supplements the outline)
- Diagram of draft objectives as created by the advisory teams

AK

Columbia River Gorge Commission  
Vital Signs Indicators Project  
**Community Advisory Team Meeting**  
**January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008 – 11:00 am to 12:00 pm**  
Hood River County Building, Hood River, Oregon

---

11:00 – 11:05 (5 minutes)	Welcome from Chair, North Cheatham, followed by introductions
11:05 – 11:10 (5 minutes)	Jill Arens will provide an overview of the day
11:10 – 11:40 (30 minutes)	Update from Gorge Commission staff regarding the progress made by the Technical Advisory Team sub-groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Handout: revised outline containing draft objectives and indicators created by the sub-groups.</li></ul>
11:40 – 11:50 (10 minutes)	Jessica Metta will briefly discuss the Future Forum meetings and opportunities for public outreach
11:50 – 11:55 (5 minutes)	Updated timeline and upcoming deadlines <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Handout: detailed timeline</li></ul>
11:55 – 12:00 (5 minutes)	Confirm the next meeting date (currently set for February 25, 2008 at 11:00 am)

1.23.2008

## Columbia River Gorge Commission Goals, Draft Objectives and Draft Indicators

### SCENIC RESOURCES

*(Draft derived from January 22 TAT sub-group)*

**Goal 1: Protect and enhance the scenic<sup>1</sup> resources of the Columbia River Gorge region**

**Objective 1.1: Protect and enhance the scenic quality of the Columbia River Gorge visible from public vantage points<sup>2</sup>.**

- 1.1.a) Average number of discordant or visually dominant<sup>3</sup> features visible from public vantage points OR number/percent of public vantage points with increased number of discordant or visually dominant features.
- 1.1.b) Percent of existing development that highly contrasts with its surrounding landscape as seen from public vantage points.
- 1.1.c) Percent of new development that highly contrasts with its surrounding landscape as seen from public vantage points.
- 1.1.d) Number/percent of public vantage points with significantly increased amount of visible infrastructure<sup>4</sup>
- 1.1.e) Percent of new development<sup>5</sup> visible from public vantage points:  
(i) within ½ mile; (ii) between ½ mile and 1 mile; and (iii) beyond 1 mile AND/OR Average number of development sites visible from public vantage points.
- 1.1.f) Number/percent of public vantage points with significantly impaired panoramic views due to the growing in of vegetation.
- 1.1.g) Percent of highway miles with significant graffiti or litter
- 1.1.h) Number of landscape mitigation, enhancement and restoration projects completed.<sup>6</sup>

**Objective 1.2: Protect the visual character of the diverse landscapes of the Columbia River Gorge**

- 1.2.a) Percent of change in vegetation patterns, structure and species composition<sup>7</sup> by landscape setting<sup>8</sup>. *(Tryens comment: Not yet a useable measure. Needs work.)*

---

1 Scenic means of or relating to landscape scenery; constituting or affording pleasant views of natural landscape attributes or positive cultural elements [agriculture] (USFS, 1995, *Landscape Aesthetics*).

2 Public vantage points are public roads, parks, trails or locations within the Scenic Area from which the public views the Scenic Area landscapes.

3 Visually dominant is when human alterations contrast highly with the surrounding landscape and are very noticeable.

4 Examples include the enlargement of roadways, additions of off ramps on freeways, upgrades to railroads, etc.

5 Development (and developed) means any structure, including but not limited to new construction of buildings and structures, and mining dredging, filling, grading, paving and excavation (2004 Management Plan for the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area).

6 Enhancement is a management practice with the express purpose of improving the scenic quality or visual condition of a degraded site (partially derived from USFS, 1995, *Landscape Aesthetics*).

7 Change would include both natural successional change and human caused change. Human caused would include change such as clearing trees for agriculture or the introduction of invasive species. Natural change would include fire, floods and disease etc.

8 *Landscape setting is the combination of land use, landform, and vegetation patterns that distinguishes an area in appearance and character from other portions of the Scenic Area.*

## FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- 1.2.b) Percent of Gorge agricultural landscape that has changed in purpose and/or pattern.
- 1.2.c) Percent of developed acreage for each landscape setting.

### **NATURAL RESOURCES**

*(Draft from the January 14th TAT sub-group meeting)*

**[NOTE – THE NATURAL RESOURCES SUB-GROUP IS STILL WORKING ON ITS INDICATOR SET. STAY TUNED FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS.]**

**Goal 2: Protect and enhance the natural resources of the Columbia River Gorge region**

**Objective 2.1 Protect natural plant and animal communities of the Columbia River Gorge by protecting and enhancing the habitats which support them.**

Potential Indicator Topics:

fragmentation, patch size, connectivity, travel corridors, linkage, levels of disturbance and invasive species.

**Objective 2.2 Protect and enhance quality of water and aquatic habitat in the Columbia River Gorge.**

Potential Indicator Topics:

Not clear on potential indicator topics yet. Might want to include a place holder indicator to address the main stem of the Columbia River<sup>9</sup>

**Objective 2.3 Protect and enhance air quality of the Columbia River Gorge<sup>10</sup>**

Potential Indicator Topics:

Indicators not clear yet

### **ECONOMIC RESOURCES**

*(Draft derived from January 7 TAT sub-group meeting)*

**Goal 3: Protect and support the economy of the Columbia River Gorge region.**

**Objective 3.1: Enhance and sustain the economic vitality of the urban areas<sup>11</sup>.**

- 3.1.a) Per capita income as a percent of state non-metro per capita income: i) total, ii) Oregon side; iii) Washington side.
- 3.1.b) Net job growth: i) total; ii) Oregon side; iii) Washington side
- 3.1.c) Average wage by business type: i) total; ii) Oregon side; iii) Washington side
- 3.1.d) Unemployment as a percent of the state non-metro unemployment rate: i) total; ii) Oregon side; iii) Washington side
- 3.1.e) Percent of Gorge residents aged 18 – 34.
- 3.1.f) Number of building permits by urban area: housing, commercial, and industrial.

---

<sup>9</sup> Possible to use data from other agencies as it becomes available -it would be a developmental indicator

<sup>10</sup> This is a placeholder for addressing air quality. The Commission could use data from projects currently being conducted by other agencies to address air quality at some point in the future. This is a highly developmental indicator that may not be available for quite some time.

<sup>11</sup> Collect all data by urban area over time to the extent possible

## FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- 3.1.g) Average number of buildable sites by urban areas: i) housing, ii) commercial, iii) industrial.
- 3.1.h) Average commercial rental vacancy rate by urban area.
- 3.1.i) Total assessed value of residential, commercial and residential property by state.
- 3.1.j) Percent of Gorge residents at or below median income spending 30% or more on housing (including utilities).
- 3.1.k) Number of tourists visiting the Scenic Area per year.
- 3.1.l) Average expenditure per tourist visit to the Scenic Area.

### **Objective 3.2 – Protect and enhance agriculture and forestry<sup>12</sup>.**

- 3.2.a) Total number of agriculture and forestry enterprises
- 3.2.b) Total revenue and payroll of agriculture and forestry enterprises
- 3.2.c) Agriculture and forestry revenue as a percent of total Gorge revenue
- 3.2.d) Total acreage by crop type in agriculture and forestry
- 3.2.e) Total crop production amount and value by crop type
- 3.2.f) Total processed agricultural output amount and value by type (e.g. juices, fruits, wines)

### **Objective 3.3 – Allow economic development in rural centers and non urban areas consistent with the protection and enhancement of the scenic, cultural, recreational and natural resources of the Columbia River Gorge<sup>13</sup>.**

- 3.3.a) Total number of rural and rural center enterprises by type (by state).

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

*(Draft derived from January 22 TAT sub-group meeting)*

### **Goal 4: Protect and enhance cultural resources<sup>14,15</sup>.**

#### **Objective 4.1: Protect and enhance significant<sup>16</sup> archeological resources<sup>17</sup>.**

- 4.1.a) Percent of monitored archeological sites that are undisturbed each year.
- 4.1.b) Percent of all monitored archeological sites that have been damaged by human activity
- 4.1.c) Percent of monitored, damaged archeological sites where mitigation or enforcement has occurred.
- 4.1.d) Number of archeological resources enhanced<sup>18</sup>.

---

12 Collect all values over time for Scenic Area as a whole

13 Collect all values over time, as possible, for Scenic Area as a whole

14 Cultural resources are defined as evidence of human occupation or activity that is important in the history, architecture, archaeology or culture of a community or region. Cultural resources include, but are not limited to, archeological resources, historic resources, and traditional cultural properties.

15 Enhancement examples include: listing an archeological site on the National Register of Historic Places; restoring native plants to an area; cleaning or restoring rock art; and providing new interpretive opportunities.

16 Cultural resources are "significant" if they are: a) included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places; or b) determined to be culturally significant by a state, local or Indian tribal government, based on criteria developed by that government and filed with the Gorge Commission

17 Archeological resources are defined as physical evidence or ruins of human occupation or activity located on or below the surface of the ground and are at least 50 years old.

18 Enhancement examples include: listing an archeological site on the National Register of Historic Places; restoring native plants to an area; cleaning or restoring rock art; and providing new interpretive opportunities.

## FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- 4.1.e) Percent of archeological resource stakeholders<sup>19</sup> with high awareness and understanding of the importance of archeological resources.
- 4.1.f) Percent of residents of and visitors to the Gorge with an understanding of the importance of archeological resources.

### **Objective 4.2: Protect and enhance significant historic resources<sup>20</sup>.**

- 4.2.a) Percent of monitored historic resources that are not adversely impacted each year.
- 4.2.b) *Percent of all monitored historic resources that have been damaged by human activity.*
- 4.2.c) Percent of historic resources damaged where mitigation or enforcement occurs each year.
- 4.2.d) Number of historic resources rehabilitated<sup>21</sup> each year.
- 4.2.e) Percent of historic resource stakeholders<sup>22</sup> with high awareness and understanding of the importance of historic resources.

### **Objective 4.3: Protect and enhance significant traditional cultural properties<sup>23</sup>.**

- 4.3.a) Percent of monitored traditional cultural properties that are undisturbed each year.
- 4.2.b) *Percent of all monitored traditional cultural properties that have been damaged by human activity.*
- 4.3.c) Percent of monitored traditional cultural properties damaged where mitigation or enforcement occurs each year.
- 4.3.d) Number of traditional cultural properties enhanced per year.
- 4.4.e) Percent of traditional cultural property stakeholders<sup>24</sup> with high awareness and understanding of the importance of traditional cultural properties.

## **RECREATIONAL RESOURCES**

*(Draft derived from January 22 meeting)*

### **Objective 5.1: Protect and enhance the diversity<sup>25</sup> of recreation opportunities.**

- 5.1.a) Number of recreation sites per recreation activity type by geographic sub-area.
- 5.1.b) Number of existing recreation sites that have been improved or expanded per recreation activity type per year.
- 5.1.c) Number of recreation sites per recreation activity type per 1,000 potential recreation users<sup>26</sup>.
- 5.1.d) Number of users per year per recreation activity type by geographic sub-area.
- 5.1.e) Percent of visitors and residents rating the diversity of recreation activity types as good or better.

---

<sup>19</sup> *Need definition or examples*

<sup>20</sup> Historic resources are defined as standing or above-ground buildings, structures, objects, sites or districts that are at least 50 years old.

<sup>21</sup> Rehabilitation is the act or process of making possible a compatible use for cultural resources through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

<sup>22</sup> *Need definition or examples*

<sup>23</sup> Traditional cultural properties are locations, buildings, structures, and objects that are associated with cultural beliefs, customs, or practices of a living community that are rooted in that community's history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.

<sup>24</sup> *Need definition or examples*

<sup>25</sup> *Does the Commission need to define diversity?*

<sup>26</sup> *This term would have to be defined and data developed.*

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

5.1f) Number and percent of recreation sites that are ADA accessible, by type of recreation activity

5.1g) Percent of total recreational activity occurring at developed recreation sites.

**Objective 5.2: Protect and enhance the quality of recreation experiences.**

5.2.a) Number/percent of recreation sites per recreation activity at or above capacity more than X percent of the time on high season days.

5.2.b) Percent of site users by recreation activity type rating their experience as good or better for:

- Available parking
- Parking lot condition
- Cleanliness of restrooms
- Condition of the natural environment
- Condition of developed recreation facilities
- Availability of information on recreation
- Feeling of safety
- Adequacy of signage
- Value for fee paid
- Accessibility for those with disabilities
- Opportunity to recreate without feeling crowded
- General information about the area
- Nature/historical information about the area
- Sufficient number of ramps/ parking areas/ camping areas/ etc.
- Appearance and maintenance of the area
- Ease of obtaining information
- Compatibility of recreation activities at the area
- Overall Satisfaction

5.2.c) Percent of Gorge visitors and residents<sup>27</sup> (or *potential recreation users*) rating the recreational qualities of the Gorge as good or better for:

- Available parking
- Parking lot condition
- Cleanliness of restrooms
- Condition of the natural environment,
- Condition of developed recreation facilities
- Availability of information on recreation
- Feeling of safety
- Adequacy of signage
- Value for fee paid
- Accessibility for those with disabilities
- Opportunity to recreate without feeling crowded
- General information about the area
- Nature/historical information about the area
- Sufficient number of ramps/ parking areas/ camping areas/ etc.
- Appearance and maintenance of the area
- Ease of obtaining information

---

<sup>27</sup> Or "potential recreation user." See footnote 26.

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- Compatibility of recreation activities at the area
- Overall Satisfaction

5.2.d) Number and type of reported conflicts<sup>28</sup> relating to recreational uses.

5.2.e) Percent of visitors who submit complaints.

5.2.f) Percent of recreation sites that are environmentally degraded.

---

<sup>28</sup> Need to define reported