

Lake Oswego Natural Resource Inventory

SITE SUMMARY

SITE NO.: TG-17 SIZE: ≈ 1 acre

HABITAT CLASS: Upland Forest

LOCATION: Schukart Lane

SEC. MAP NO.: 9 DNA #: 45

DATE OF INVENTORY: 10-10-91

ZIEGDA 1300-1900, 0800

Habitat Assessment Score: 33

Range for Upland Forests: 12 - 76

Resource Value Assessment*

Education Potential	<u>L</u>	Undisturbed Condition	<u>L</u>
Slope Stability	<u>M</u>	Vegetation Diversity	<u>L-M</u>
Scenic	<u>L-M</u>	Wildlife Habitat	<u>L</u>
Recreation	<u>L-M</u>	Size/Connectivity	<u>L</u>

GENERAL DESCRIPTION This site is a deciduous\evergreen forest remnant of DNA Site #45. It is located on top of a rocky hill, and is located southwest of Schukart Lane. The site is surrounded by back yard fences and residential development. The canopy is dominated by second growth Douglas fir and big leaf maple. Madrone and white oak are also present. The shrub understory includes a variety of seed- and berry-bearing bushes. The herbaceous understory is dominated by sword fern and patches of English ivy.

NATURAL RESOURCE VALUES Isolation from other natural areas and lack of water sources limits the wildlife habitat value of this site. Vegetative structure and shrub diversity provide food and cover for wildlife. Rocks provide cover and perches for small wildlife species.

IMPACTS\DISTURBANCES Dogs were barking from every yard during the site visit. Domestic animals reduce wildlife habitat value. English ivy dominates the understory in patches, and should be removed before it spreads throughout the site.

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS Remove ivy.

* Based on best professional judgment and field assessment methods

SITE TG-17





W-93

LAKE

LAKE

OSWEGO

CALIFORNIA

L-18

L-4

W-88

W-87

PAGE 3

L-49

LOST DOG

CREEK

EXHIBIT F
LU 12-001

Supplemental Field Ratings for Education, Scenic, and Recreation Values

FES/WPS ID# TG-17/17

Photo # 92

Observer BN

Date 29 July '02

Circle rating and make notes in or below each table as needed.

1. EDUCATIONAL POTENTIAL

(See sketch w/TG-18)

Factor	Low	Medium	High
proximity to schools (walking vs. busing, # of schools nearby)	bus 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> 1	walk 6 7 8 9 10	2 adjacent 11 12 13 14 15
feasibility of access (adj. to good road, bus turnaround/parking, trails) <i>PRIVATE</i>	no access 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5	limited access 6 7 8 9 10	good access 11 12 13 14 15
educational value (diverse or unique wildlife or plants, flood or water quality education, compatibility/incompatibility issues, etc.)	not special 1 <u>2</u> 3 4 5	somewhat special 6 7 8 9 10	very special 11 12 13 14 15

Notes:

Education Rating L

2. SCENIC VALUE

Factor	Low	Medium	High
visibility from large population and or major transit route <i>across lake</i>	limited visibility 1 2 3 4 5	somewhat visible 6 7 <u>8</u> 9 10	very visible 11 12 13 14 15
unique features: large trees, open water, cliffs, wildflower displays, etc. <i>private</i>	not present 1 2 3 4 5	limited 6 7 <u>8</u> 9 10	present 11 12 13 14 15
offers views to other scenic sites, and/or screens unsightly area from view	no 1 2 3 4 5	limited 6 7 <u>8</u> 9 10	yes 11 12 13 14 15
neighborhood aesthetics: probable importance to surrounding area	low 1 2 3 4 5	moderate 6 7 8 9 10	high 11 12 13 <u>14</u> 15

Notes:

Scenic Rating M

3. RECREATION OPPORTUNITY

(Tree Groves only; wetlands function rating already includes recreation.)

Factor	Low	Medium	High
accessibility (good street access, public ownership) <i>PRIVATE</i>	neither 1 2 3 4 5	one 6 7 8 9 10	both 11 12 13 14 15
passive recreation opportunities	no 1 2 3 4 5	limited 6 7 8 9 10	yes 11 12 13 14 15
sensitivity to recreation impacts	highly sensitive 1 2 3 4 5	mod. sensitive 6 7 8 9 10	low sensitivity 11 12 13 14 15

Notes:

Recreation Rating X

Wildlife or unusual plant species noted during visit:

L.O. GOAL 5 FIELD PROCEDURES

1. Check resource site boundaries against existing mapping. Map new (potential) Goal 5 sites, if any. Notes:
2. Map existing and/or probable conflicting uses based on surrounding land use, transportation, and topography. Notes: *NE pt. developed (PD-11); Add portion to N.? (PA-26)*
Residential
3. Map impact area boundaries (where resource impacts extend beyond boundary of protected resource or where impacts of potential conflicting use extend beyond development boundary into protected resource area). Circle any of the following applicable numbers, and letters ("E" denotes existing, "P" denotes potential):

<u>MIA</u> -- <u>MSA</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>A)</u>	Examples of impact areas created by resource area protection impacting potential conflicting uses:
X	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		1) Protecting site could result in blowdown hazard for nearby residential use.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		2) Site protection could result in reduced solar access for adj. residential.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		3) Protection of NR area with recreation potential could result in noise, trespass, or litter impacts on adjacent uses.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		4) Wildlife damage (e.g., deer browsing or beaver gnawing) could impact nearby flower and vegetable gardens.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		5) Other:
			<u>B)</u>	Examples of impact areas created by potential conflicting uses impacting (or eliminating) resource site:
X	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		1) Stormwater runoff could result in scouring and reduced water quality (thereby degrading habitat).
(X)	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		2) Noise (industrial machinery, automobiles, children playing, lawn mowers) could disturb sensitive wildlife or recreational use.
X	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		3) Development could isolate populations of terrestrial and aquatic wildlife, resulting in local decline or extinction (or reduce available habitat below amount necessary to support viable populations).
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		4) Light pollution could affect sensitive wildlife species.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		5) Children and pets may kill or harass wildlife.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		6) Human presence may disturb sensitive wildlife species and/or trample sensitive vegetation or soils.
(X)	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		7) Dumping can bury or pollute sensitive plant or wildlife habitat, and water resources.
(X)	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		8) Roads and traffic can result in wildlife mortality.
X	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		9) Tree removal associated with development may expose a resource site to increased windthrow.
(X)	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		10) Buildings adjacent to or visible from a resource site could block or degrade views from the site or views of the site from other locations.
	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		11) Non-native, invasive vegetation from adjacent development or agricultural areas can degrade native vegetation of NR site.
X	<u>E</u>	<u>P</u>		12) Development on resource site would result in loss of scenic asset to surrounding area(s).
				13) Other:

: MIA = map impacted area; MSA = map source area; E = existing; P = potential

SITE NUMBER	LOCATION	ACRES	PHOTO #	SEC MAP NO	SCORE
T617	(DNA 45) Schukart Ln.	~1	627	9	33
Observer: <i>C. Galen</i>		Date: 10-10-91		Habitat Class: <i>DF Forest</i>	
Comments: <i>mostly houses - fringe of DF remnant</i>					

Enhancement recommendations:

Component		Degree			Existing Score	Restored Score	Comments
WATER	Quantity & Seasonality	none 0	seasonal 4	perennial 8	0	0	
	Quality	stagnant 0	seasonal flushed 3	contin. flushed 6			
	Proximity to Cover	none 0	nearby 4	imm. adjacent 8			
	Diversity (Streams, Ponds & Wetlands)	(1) present 0	(2) present 4	(3) present 8			
FOOD	Variety	low 0	medium 5	high 10	4		
	Quantity & Seasonality	none 0	limited 4	year-round 8	4		
	Proximity to Cover	none 0	nearby 4	imm. adjacent 8	4		
COVER	Structural Diversity	low 0	medium 5	high 10	8		
	Variety (Nesting, Denning)	low 0	medium 4	high 8	8		<i>Rocks, shrubs trees</i>
	Seasonality	none 0	limited 2	year-round 4	3		
	Escape (Density)	low 0	medium 2	high 4	2		<i>narrow forested area</i>

ADDITIONAL VALUES

DISTURBANCE	Biological	high 0	medium 2	low 4	0		
	Human	high 0	medium 2	low 4	0		<i>Dogs constantly barking</i>
HABITAT LINKAGE		low 0	medium 3	high 6	0		<i>isolated by residential dev.</i>
UNIQUE FEATURES (0-4 points each)		Wildlife _____ Flora _____ Nesting _____			0		
		Educ. potential _____ Hab. stability _____					
		Rarity of habitat type _____ Scenic _____					

I. SITE FEATURES

Topography: Top of Hill;

Water Features:

Major Structures or Roads: Fences - Cyclone to the S - privacy fences
Shed yards

Garbage:

II. VEGETATION (* = Dominate Species > 20%)

<u>TREE SPECIES</u>	<u>SHRUB SPECIES</u>	<u>HERB SPECIES</u>	<u>WETLAND</u>
* DF Madrone Oak	Vine maple Coco (hazelnut) Sconlers Willow Oceanspray Salal Red Hawthorn (cork bark leaf)	* IVY Sword fern Oregon grape Licence fern grass poison oak honey suckle	
* BLM	Rosa gymnocarpa		
SNAGS:			
ROCKS - w/ great cracks for holes			
	Servia berry		

III. WILDLIFE Species/Sign Observed

<u>BIRDS</u>	<u>MAMMALS</u>	<u>HERPTILES</u>	<u>OTHER</u>
C. Crow	<u><u>Dogs</u></u>		

IV. MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.

