



Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, May 7, 2012. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Bob Scott	President/Director
Larry Pelatt	Secretary/Director
Joseph Blowers	Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
William Kanable	Director
John Griffiths	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

Agenda Item #1 – Executive Session (A) Land

President, Bob Scott, called Executive Session to order for the following purpose:

- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

Executive Session is held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2), which allows the Board to meet in Executive Session to discuss the aforementioned issue.

President, Bob Scott, noted that representatives of the news media and designated staff may attend Executive Session. All other members of the audience were asked to leave the room. Representatives of the news media were specifically directed not to disclose information discussed during Executive Session. No final action or final decision may be made in Executive Session. At the end of Executive Session, the Board will return to open session and welcome the audience back into the room.

Agenda Item #2 – Call Regular Meeting to Order

President, Bob Scott, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

There was no action resulting from Executive Session.

Joe Blowers moved the Board of Directors move Agenda Item #5, Board Time, to the beginning of this evening's agenda. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Bill Kanable	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #5 – Board Time

Larry Pelatt requested an update from District staff regarding the youth soccer topic that the Board has received public testimony on during the past few Board meetings.

- ✓ Jim McElhinny, Director of Park & Recreation Services, provided a detailed update on the main topics in the District's continued discussions with representatives from the Aloha United Soccer Club (AUSC), including the following:
 - HMT Synthetic Turf Field #2 Operational and Use Agreement
 - Number of participants affected
 - District control of clubs' recreational vs. competitive play
 - Future steps

Larry asked for an overview regarding the method by which Tualatin Hills Junior Soccer League (THJSL) divides field hours amongst their clubs.

- ✓ Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports, provided a detailed description of the field allocation process, noting that the first step is that each club notifies the league of how many teams they will have for the season, which is then plugged into a standardized formula that generates the number of hours each club will need. Once all of the clubs' needs are known, the league makes one large field time allocation request to the District. That large block of time is then partitioned off by the league to its various clubs. The individual clubs then create their field use schedules and any field hours not being used are returned to the league, which then returns those hours to the District so that they are not billed for them.

Larry asked for confirmation that the clubs decide which of their teams are allocated what hours.

- ✓ Scott confirmed this, noting that the league uses a standardized formula taking into consideration the number and length of the practices, which is constrained largely due to the number of hours of available daylight. It is a league decision to use this standardized formula for all of the clubs and teams within the league.

Larry reiterated that the District does not participate in telling the clubs how many practice or game hours they are allocated per team or player.

- ✓ Scott confirmed this, noting that this is the case for all District sports.

Larry asked, if the District does not have any participation in this process, why is the topic continually brought to the Board's attention?

- ✓ Scott replied that the only control point the District has over this process is who it chooses to affiliate with and therefore receives the priority allocations.

John Griffiths asked for confirmation that AUSC's competitive club receives field allocations from the field time returned by the league.

- ✓ Scott confirmed this.

John asked whether any team or club can sign up for the returned field time.

- ✓ Scott confirmed this, noting that if the teams with priority status have had their needs met, the time is then offered to secondary priority clubs, such as AUSC's competitive club or school district teams, and after that, the time is available to anyone.

Agenda Item #4 – Audience Time

Eric Ufer, 8450 NW Ash Street, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing Milltown United Soccer Club (MUSC). Eric stated that field time is a valuable resource for the community and that the community is grateful for this service the District provides. Field allocation has not been an issue for him; his concerns are regarding the transparency of the field allocation process. He feels that there would have been greater transparency if he had known earlier in the process that Bill Kanable served on the boards for Westside Metros and Westside Warriors. He does not want to see the community limited to one classic club because of an arbitrary 80% rule. He believes choice is a powerful thing and that clubs have different personalities and ways of operating. He asks the Board to please reconsider the process of having only one classic club.

Agenda Item #6 – Consent Agenda

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of April 2, 2012 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Resolution Appointing Natural Resources Advisory Committee Member, (E) Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County for Construction of a Multi-Use Path on Bethany Boulevard and Bronson Road, and (F) Design/Build HVAC Solicitation for Garden Home Recreation Center. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**.

Agenda Item #7 – Unfinished Business

A. Bond Program

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding bond program efforts, including an upcoming Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee meeting and an updated capital projects construction schedule. Hal offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

- ✓ Hearing none, President, Bob Scott, requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

B. General Manager's Report

Doug Menke, General Manager, provided a detailed overview of the General Manager's Report included within the Board of Directors information packet, which included the following topics:

- Sunday Trailways
- Art in the Community Award
- Elsie Stuhr Center Expansion
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule
- Memorial Day Event

Doug offered to answer any questions the Board may have regarding the General Manager's Report.

- ✓ Hearing none, President, Bob Scott, requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

Agenda Item #8 – New Business

A. Vertical Housing Development Zone Proposal

Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that the City of Beaverton has approached the District regarding their plans to create three Vertical Housing Development Zones (VHDZ's) within city limits. While the District has the option to opt out of the property tax exemption, the City has requested that the District not exercise this option in order to maximize the benefits of the zone by having all taxing agencies participate. Staff has determined that the tax impacts based on potential or likely loss of existing assessed value are fairly minor. Keith introduced Steven Sparks, Planning Division Manager, and Alma Flores, Economic Development Manager, both with the City of Beaverton, to present an overview of the VHDZ proposal, as well as a proposed Enterprise Zone (although there is no requested Board action on this item), and to offer any questions the Board may have.

Steven provided a detailed overview of the proposed VHDZ's, including the following key points:

- The City is attempting to provide as many development incentive programs as possible and most of the tools available to them are property tax driven.

- A VHDZ enables a developer to request to the State of Oregon a property tax exemption, the maximum being an 80% exemption over 10 years.
- In order to qualify, the ground floor of the development needs to be for non-residential use and for each floor of residential housing above, the developer can get an up-to 20% property tax exemption (up to 80%).
- The City is charged with creating the zones, but the actual program is administered by the State's Oregon Housing and Community Services Department.
- Service agencies within the proposed zones have the ability to opt out of the program.
- Next steps include City Council consideration of the proposal in early June, followed by submission of the proposal to the State for certification, which will then open a 45-day window to the service agencies to opt out of the program.

Steven offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked for confirmation that the tax exemption is on the building improvements only.

- ✓ Steven confirmed this, noting that there is an option to request an exemption on the land as well, but in order to qualify there must be an affordable housing component associated with the project. He noted that for the approximately 10 years since this program has been in place, around 12 communities have participated and none have included the affordable housing component.

Bill Kanable asked whether this exemption includes System Development Charges.

- ✓ Steven replied it only applies to the structural assessment value for the property taxes.

Larry asked whether the developer could be awarded an exemption over 20% per floor.

- ✓ Steven replied that 20% is the maximum, although the Oregon Housing and Community Services Department could choose to award the exemption at less than 20% per floor.

Alma provided a detailed overview of the proposed Enterprise Zone (EZ), including the following key points:

- Since its 1985 inception, there are currently over 60 EZs within the state.
- The program offers an up-to three-year property tax abatement, with a possible extension to five years, within specified industrial areas for improvements to existing buildings or new development on previously vacant or underutilized lots, including new equipment needed for the business.
- A consultation meeting was held in April with all of the potentially impacted taxing districts. The information packet and minutes from that meeting were provided to the Board, a copy of which was entered into the record.
- Two other areas within Washington County offer an EZ, and the City of Beaverton is considering this in order to stay competitive.
- The City expects to hear whether their application has been approved by July 1, 2012, at which point the program would take effect on that day.

Alma offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Joe Blowers commented that Beaverton Creek wetland is in the middle of one of the proposed EZs, as is a portion of the Tualatin Hills Nature Park and Westside Trail. He asked if the proposed EZ would have any negative impact on these areas.

- ✓ Alma replied that although the land around these areas may develop, the City does not anticipate any impact to those specific areas.

Joe asked for confirmation that the constraints on development within wetlands would not change with this proposal, nor would the City's trail requirements.

- ✓ Alma confirmed this, noting that none of the City's underlying development codes would change.

- ✓ Steven confirmed that both programs discussed this evening are purely financial incentive programs; neither changes any of the City's land use policies or zoning codes.

John Griffiths asked what criterion businesses need to meet in order to be granted the tax abatement under the EZ.

- ✓ Alma replied that it would need to operate within the designated EZ and be a manufacturing business in one of the five target industries identified by the State of Oregon for the City of Beaverton.

John noted that there have been many incentive programs coming from the City recently, including Urban Renewal, which indicates that the City is actively trying to revitalize Beaverton. He suggested that it would be beneficial for the Board to receive a complete overview of the City's vision and how all of these programs fit together, rather than the programs being presented individually. This would better enable the Board to understand the overall vision, provide feedback, and understand how the District can support and enable that vision.

- ✓ Steven confirmed that this could be provided.

Bill asked how the City determined which areas should be designated as an EZ.

- ✓ Alma replied that the State of Oregon has criteria that must be met, which are provided in more detail in the information packet distributed this evening, including that 50% or more of the households within the EZ have incomes below 80% of the state's median income.

John asked how programs such as the VHDZs and EZs would benefit the District.

- ✓ Keith replied that the staff perspective is that of the three VHDZs, there is only one that is significant. Looking at the detail of the assessed value for this area, the land value constituted the major share, which would be excluded from the VHDZ, unless the development includes an affordable housing component. The building value was fairly low and the potential impact is summarized within the staff memo. Although the VHDZ itself is fairly large, the likely sites where such development could occur is much smaller, and the target sites smaller yet. The rationale behind recommending to not opt out is a long-term view that opting out might impinge the ability to incentivize this type of development, so although the District may save some tax dollars today by opting out, it could be forgoing much larger tax dollars in the future when the tax exemptions expire and the new value comes onto the property tax roll. Additionally, most of the VHDZs are within the Urban Renewal District, so the amount the Park District would be forgoing would likely not impact the Park District, but rather the Urban Renewal District, since the Park District would already not be receiving tax value on the incremental growth. Since the Park District already approved its inclusion within the Urban Renewal District, the VHDZ proposal seemed consistent with that thought process.
- ✓ Larry reiterated that the incremental give-back of tax dollars for the Park District via the VHDZ is pretty insignificant, because the Park District, being part of the Urban Renewal District, had already given up those tax dollars.

John agreed, noting that what he is referring to is the payoff. He gathers that the payoff is that the area will have relatively low property taxes in combination with the free programs so that industrial and residential consumers will come to the area, driving the economy up.

- ✓ Larry expressed agreement with this assessment.

President, Bob Scott, asked for confirmation that System Development Charges would stay in place under both of the programs.

- ✓ Keith confirmed this.

John asked if nearby cities are also offering these programs and are just as likely to draw potential customers, with the end result being that everyone's property taxes are lower without any real change for one specific area.

- ✓ Steven replied that there is certainly a lot of competition amongst cities for scarce employers and a lot of jurisdictions are trying to make themselves that much more competitive than the other. The City of Hillsboro has recently enacted a VHDZ, as well as Urban Renewal. The Cities of Tigard and Portland also have Urban Renewal. Although perhaps the City of Beaverton dilutes the pool by becoming a part of it, the City also has other things that are of benefit to companies wanting to locate in Oregon, such as an excellent school and park district, which contribute to quality of life issues that the City heavily promotes.
- ✓ Alma added that the proposed EZ allows the City to stay in the game, especially when considering that both the Cities of Portland and Hillsboro have EZs. It is a primary tool that companies look for on a national level.

President, Bob Scott, asked what action is being requested of the Board this evening.

- ✓ Steven replied that it would be nice, but not necessary, for the Board to make a motion this evening not to opt out of the VHDZ. However, assuming that the City Council authorizes the City to proceed on the initiative, the City will be sending out a letter to all taxing agencies notifying them of the proposal and option to opt out. Ideally, the City would like to know that the District endorses the program and chooses not to opt out.
- ✓ Keith noted that from a staff perspective, since the timeline for opting out is fairly tight, if the Board is willing, staff would like the Board to take action this evening to give staff the direction not to opt out.

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the City of Beaverton's request to not opt out of the proposed Vertical Housing Development Zones. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

President, Bob Scott, asked whether the Board has consensus in support of the proposed EZ.

- ✓ Larry expressed support for the proposal, noting that it is another tool to use in driving growth to certain areas of Beaverton.
- ✓ Bill suggested that a letter of support from the District be drafted and presented to the Board for review at the next Board meeting.
- ✓ Alma noted that due to time constraints, the letter would be needed sooner than that.

Bill Kanable moved that the Board of Directors direct staff to write a letter in support of the Enterprise Zone. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion.

Discussion followed:

John reiterated the desire for a presentation from the City on how it views the economy now, where does it want to be in the future, what are the steps needed to get there, and how these programs fill out those steps.

- ✓ President, Bob Scott, agreed that this presentation would be beneficial.

Roll call proceeded as follows:

Joe Blowers	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

B. Fanno Creek Trail Vision

Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources & Trails Management, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a committee-developed vision for a portion of the Fanno Creek Trail via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record. Bruce noted that last fall, District staff began creating a plan to meet regional trail clearance standards identified in the Board-approved Trails Plan. Some trees and shrubs along the Fanno Creek Regional Trail were encroaching into the safety clearance corridor between Vista Brook Park and SW 92nd Avenue. During the process of identifying vegetation to prune or remove, patrons expressed concerns about a loss of shrubs and tree canopy in the area. The Board directed that a citizens committee be formed to gather community ideas and formulate a proposal for a long-term vision for trailside vegetation and amenities along the Fanno Creek Trail between SW 92nd Avenue and the Garden Home Recreation Center. A committee was formed and developed a proposed vision for that section of trail which will be presented this evening for the Board's consideration.

Bruce noted that the committee met numerous times, including on five occasions with staff, a tour of the trail, and two public meetings. The committee also held work sessions on its own without staff. Ultimately, the committee developed a single vision which they will describe in detail this evening. Overall, there was a lot that everyone agreed on, although there are two areas that had some differing of opinions - trail shoulders and easements along the trail.

Committee members Nathalie Darcy, Cory Samia, Tom Hjort, Lynn Thorsen, and Terry Moore provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, regarding the committee's vision for the trail, including the following key points:

- The history of this portion of the Fanno Creek Trail, which dates to the early 1900's.
 - In the late 1990's, the District pledged to the community that the the tree canopy would be preserved even after the trail was paved.
 - Over time, maintenance and construction projects have caused degradation of vegetation along the trail corridor.
- Retention and enhancement of the tree canopy and providing a healthy wildlife-supporting understory is the community's top priority.
 - The trail's paved pathway is distinctive due to its vegetated edges and the interlacing tree canopy.
- In order to address these community desires, the committee developed some specific visions for trail elements:
 - To achieve the canopy over the trail, specific tree varieties should be planted within five feet of the trail edge.
 - Maintenance to remove and suppress high-priority invasive plants.
 - Delineation of linear park edges and vegetated screening of homes.
 - Signage designating the historic elements of the trail and the clustering of other signage with trash cans at street intersections.
 - An ongoing partnership between the District and community to help with trail monitoring, removal of invasive plants, habitat enhancement, maintenance practices, and historic interpretation.

- The committee also developed recommendations and some phasing timelines specific to the individual needs of certain sections of trail.
 - SW 92nd Avenue to Vista Brook
 - Removal of non-native, invasive plants (Spring 2013).
 - Installation of new vegetation, including native and appropriate ornamental plants (November 2013).
 - Pump station to SW 76th Avenue
 - Introduction of erosion-controlling plants to prevent continuing erosion along the trail and fence in partnership with City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services (BES).
 - Augmentation of BES plantings (November 2012).
 - SW 76th Avenue to Garden Home Recreation Center
 - Maintenance to remove and suppress high-priority invasive plants.
 - Replant understory.
 - Advocate for trail widening.
- Safety on the trail was also a major concern of the community. The committee recommends measures to slow bicycle riders in order to provide a safe trail for all users.
 - Small signage showing priority to pedestrians or other visual cues.
- The community expressed the desire that utilities be restricted from further encroaching and degrading the trail and its surroundings.
 - The committee recommends that no easements be granted for overhead utilities aligned with the trail or for underground utilities or vaults that would "materially impact" (the definition of which would be determined by the Board of Directors) the closed tree canopy or understory vegetation.
 - In particular, Portland General Electric's proposed pump station electrical connection.
- Lastly, the committee's membership has differing opinions regarding its vision for the trail's shoulder:
 - Two-foot gravel, non-vegetated shoulders are recommended by committee member Tom Hjort and the District's Trails Advisory Committee.
 - The standards that are set forth in the District's Trails Plan should be adhered to, which increase the durability of the trail and promote safety.
 - Two-foot vegetated shoulders with low-growing herbaceous plants are recommended by the majority committee members and preferred by most participants of the public meeting.
 - Low-growing, native ground cover along the shoulder of the trail would keep with the original look and feel of this historic trail and for the most part, this portion of the trail does not come up to regional standards.
- In conclusion, the committee is pleased with the outcome of this public process as it provided an opportunity for the community to come together to review its past commitments to the broader community as well as the trail users.
 - The committee feels that, when compared to past cost estimates for similar work along the trail, the budget amount in the proposed phasing plan is extremely modest and the committee hopes that the Board will take action to fund it.
 - In addition, the committee hopes for further work and clarification regarding what defines a hazardous tree so that the District does not incrementally cut down trees in the guise of hazards when they are not truly hazardous.
 - The community should not forget that this section of the Fanno Creek Trail is the reason that the Fanno Creek Trail Regional Trail exists today as it was the impetus for getting the trail on the regional map and driving the funding to the District and others for construction.

- The committee requests the Board adopt the vision statement as proposed by the committee: *“embrace and improve the trail as a lush area giving users the sense of being lost in a woodland even though they are in an urban neighborhood.”*

Bruce offered clarification regarding a few issues in order to fully enable the Board’s discussion of the proposed Fanno Creek Trail Vision this evening.

- There have been a number of questions regarding the removal of invasive plants along the trail, and one question in particular has been regarding the trees that are still marked with orange dots. Staff’s definition of a hazard tree is based on the International Society of Arboriculture’s standards. Staff performed an evaluation based on those standards and removed a number of trees. Remaining trees that are marked, but are not hazardous based on those definitions, will stay in place until they become hazardous, even if located within the two-foot shoulder of the trail.
- Some of the trees that are within that area and are invasive, non-native species will also remain. For example, the English Hawthorn, which is a dominant tree along the trail, will be left until they die naturally. When that happens, they will be replaced with native or appropriate ornamental trees outside of the trail shoulder.
- There have been a few reports recently of trees being cut along the trail. Staff does not have any knowledge of cutting these trees and they may have fallen over naturally.
- Ultimately, staff would like to move all of the District’s trails, including this one, closer to the standards set in the Trails Plan, although it is a choice of the Board’s whether to allow variations to those standards.
- Bruce showed two pictures, one taken at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park of a paved trail with a soft surface shoulder with no gravel, and the other taken along the Westside Trail with a gravel shoulder.
- Since the funding information was prepared for the staff memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, Clean Water Services has since stepped forward to generously offer to supply the native plants for this project, which will take care of a large portion of the plantings budget.
- Depending on how many volunteers sign up and what other resources come through, the actual cost of implementation may change.
- Staff has had an informal conversation with BES staff about the upcoming PGE easement request, but has not yet received a formal request. Staff has, however, expressed that the least desirable option is to have the work come down the trail and cause any impact to the vegetation or trail users. BES is well aware of those wishes and that of the committee, although it is expected that cost will be a factor in their request.

Bill Kanable expressed that, based on his review of the past easement restoration work completed by BES, if he would have known at the time of the request what the quality of their restoration work was going to be, he would have been much more pressing for information and the details of their planting methodology. He does not feel that BES restored the area back to its original or better condition as was required.

- ✓ Bruce replied that some of that was influenced by staff’s choices. He explained that some of the trees and shrubs were planted at staff’s recommendation to grow back in a more sustainable, maintainable fashion in the sense that the original vegetation had grown so rapidly to the edge of the trail that staff were constantly trimming down a sheer wall of foliage, which did not meet standards. While some areas are grassy and have room for additional plantings, other areas are planted to the full density of what was there before, but it is difficult to distinguish since plants do not start to grow rapidly until after about three years.

Larry Pelatt commented that it is important to keep in mind that plants and trees do not reach their full growth potential in three weeks; it takes much longer than that. The area may look bare right now, but if one looks closely, there are a lot of plants in the ground. It will not be too many years before the change will be much more apparent. Although there are many things BES could have done better through this process, it sounds like the District needs to take some responsibility for that as well and will do better next time. He agrees that the experience of the trail may have changed for the worse in some areas, but that there are probably some areas that look better as well.

Larry continued that in terms of the history of the trail, it started out as a railroad track and trees are not planted within five feet of a railroad track. In fact, the trees would be extensively removed in order to keep the railroad track clear. Perhaps the secondary history of a bridal path would have had closer trees, but even this seems suspect when considering the height of a horse and its rider. Although canopy overgrowth can be aesthetically pleasing, it can also causes problems like moss issues and falling debris hazards, and he does not believe that the aesthetics outweigh the problems. Regarding trail standards, he recalled voicing the same opinion during the Lowami Hart Woods master planning process and will reiterate it again this evening: the first time the District walks away from a standard, every time after that, the standard will be up for renegotiation. He believes it is time for the District to step up and keep to its standards, which were developed based on widely accepted policy. This is a regional trail and needs to be built to the standards of a regional trail; not like a footpath for a neighborhood. He supports a full-width trail with gravel shoulders according to the standards set.

Joe Blowers described the differences between the historical tree canopy for this area versus the tree canopy that the committee may be envisioning, noting that English Hawthorn are fairly fast growing trees that tend to be short, growing toward the middle of the path, which would not be conducive for a bridal path. His vision would be a canopy of Oregon white oak or something that would be much taller; not trees that tend to fall over and shortcut the path. He asked Bruce or the committee to talk about the canopy that currently exists versus the canopy envisioned.

- ✓ Bruce agreed that the current canopy consists mainly of relatively short trees. The committee and staff have worked together to develop an acceptable list of trees of various heights. There would be some understory-type trees, such as vine maples, along with some apple trees mixed in, and oaks and ash as well.
- ✓ Terry recalled her past service on the Board of Directors, noting that at that time, the existing, closed canopy was incredibly important to the community. The committee discussed the intention of replacing the English hawthorn over time, but not taking them out all at once, which would destroy the canopy. She described the need to remove the invasive species, such as English ivy and blackberry, in order to facilitate the growth of other trees that would provide a taller canopy over time. As those trees mature, the English hawthorn could be removed. The committee does not have an issue with maintaining the canopy at an 8 to 10-foot clearance above the trail. She referenced Larry's comments regarding standards, noting that she did some fairly extensive research on local and national standards, including the Federal Highway Administration website, on such guidelines and found that the District has adopted some of the least-vegetative standards for trails that she could find. While there is always discussion of shoulders within these materials, there is no reference to gravel shoulders, with the idea being that there is space on both sides of the trail. The committee is not desirous of a tunnel effect, but rather some very low growing plants that would keep the shoulder maintained as such.

Joe asked for clarification regarding the staff recommendation of no restrictions on easements as opposed to the committee's recommendation of restrictions on easements that materially effect the vegetation.

- ✓ Bruce replied that the thought process behind the staff recommendation was not to insinuate that anything and everything is acceptable; rather it was developed with a caution in mind regarding restricting or limiting decisions of future boards. Per Board policy, any easement with consequences already comes before the Board for approval; therefore, it did not make sense to staff to include such a restriction.
- ✓ Jim McElhinny, Director of Park & Recreation Services, echoed the desire to leave some flexibility for the Board in such future decisions.
- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the Board already has a detailed and specific policy pertaining to easement requests and, in general, the Board has always been very prudent when it comes to easement requests with a healthy amount of scrutiny, especially when dealing with requests for this particular area.

Joe asked whether it would be possible to include language that would reflect both the intent of the committee, as well as not bind future boards, such as to basically express that it is important to maintain the vegetative character of this trail corridor.

- ✓ Larry expressed concern that it is too easy to take such statements out of context. Ten or 20 years from now, a future board will be essentially second guessing the meaning of those statements. The District already has a good track record of being prudent in terms of easement requests. He worries about restricting it and reflected on the second guessing that occurred by the Board and neighborhood during the Lowami Hart Woods master planning process. He expressed concern for even potentially restricting, or placing a minor limitation on what a future board might consider.

Joe replied that he is thinking something along the line of “while it is not the intent of this Board to restrict what future boards might consider in terms of easements, it is not the intent of the Board or the mission of the District to do anything that would harm the vegetative nature of our trail corridors.” He pondered whether it would be likely that a future board would disregard vegetative corridors altogether, noting that such a statement is in keeping with the District’s mission and may be helpful to a future board.

- ✓ Larry replied that he believes the District’s history already reflects this and asked, if the language is watered down so much that it is not really doing anything, then why include it? The District has a very good track record operating under the current language that exists right now.

Joe replied that he does not feel it is pointless to include language conveying that a special attribute of a particular trail corridor is its vegetated nature and that the Board hopes that this value and intent would extend into the future. It is a record to a future board to clarify the current Board’s position, without restricting the decisions of that future board.

- ✓ Larry reiterated that if the language does not contain any specific direction, he sees no reason to include it when the District already has such a good track record.

Joe replied that perhaps the primary value of such a statement would be to reassure the community of the District’s intentions.

- ✓ Larry replied that he believes the District will reassure the community through its actions. How the District proceeds with this project will say volumes more than whether wording is added to a vision statement.

John Griffiths noted that this is a non-standard trail corridor for many reasons and not unlike Lowami Hart Woods in that it has a neighborhood following and history. The first thing that drew his attention when reviewing the trail corridor was the need to widen out the spots where it narrows in order to create a more standard configuration within the corridor, but until that happens, given the history and following it has, he thinks the District should do its best to maintain that vegetative feel. He believes the District got its message out that dead trees potentially falling on top of trail users is not acceptable. Now it is a manner of how the District manages the trail going forward. He supports the proposal to remove and replace the invasive trees as they die and widening the trail over time, while still retaining the canopy feel.

Discussion occurred regarding a gravel shoulder versus vegetated shoulder for the trail:

- ✓ Bruce noted that the gravel shoulder would only be installed as part of a remodeling project or major reconstruction. The question is, if that opportunity arises, should the District rebuild the trail to the way it is now.
- ✓ Discussion occurred regarding the varying widths of the trail in different sections.
- ✓ John commented that he generally feels that it is beneficial to have a shoulder, but if the trail is too narrow, it is a moot point. If there is a major renovation and the trail is widened in those narrow spots, then a shoulder should be included.
- ✓ Joe reiterated that the question is, should the shoulder be gravel or not?
- ✓ Larry explained that a gravel shoulder adds support to the blacktop to help prevent the edges of the trail from crumbling.
- ✓ John noted that another benefit of gravel shoulders is that a trail user has something solid to step onto if they need to step off of the asphalt.
- ✓ Larry reminded the Board that, as seen in the pictures this evening, vegetation tends to grow through the gravel as well, but the gravel still provides stability. He believes the long-term value of having a gravel shoulder is in reducing the maintenance costs of the asphalt trail.
- ✓ John asked for confirmation that the District generally has gravel shoulders on its trails.
- ✓ Bruce confirmed this, noting that the intent is to continue to meet those general parameters for trails. This would not be done all at once, but over time.
- ✓ Larry agreed, noting that as the trail is improved, it should be rebuilt structurally sound.
- ✓ Doug asked for confirmation that there is a general Board consensus that the preferred option is gravel shoulders, but only when the trail is being widened.
- ✓ John agreed, adding that when there is room for the gravel shoulders without sacrificing the vegetative quality or canopy.
- ✓ Larry confirmed that as the District moves through trail reconstruction over time, gravel shoulders should be added.
- ✓ Bill stated that the District should take each opportunity as it arises and that it will take some time.
- ✓ Joe questioned whether there are circumstances where gravel shoulders are harmful to the environment, such as near a wetland. He asked if there are areas where gravel shoulders should not be installed.
- ✓ Bill referenced the Tualatin Hills Nature Park as an example of a site without gravel shoulders, noting that it is a different experience and not meant as a transportation method in the same sense as a regional trail. Regarding the Fanno Creek Trail, even though it is passing through a canopied corridor, it is still a regional trail and improvements should be made to those standards, including gravel shoulders.

President, Bob Scott, stated that he is in agreement with John's comments regarding the canopy and transitioning over time. He does not have a problem with staff's recommendation for no restrictions on easements and hopes that future boards will ensure that the vegetation is maintained. He believes a regional trail needs gravel shoulders, although he has an issue with the rigidness of a standard of two feet on both sides, noting that some portions of the trail that are wide will need that amount, while other portions that are narrower will not, and that this should be up to the discretion of the District. He commented that once other jurisdictions' portions of the trail and the Hall Blvd. crossing are constructed, this will become a major trail.

- ✓ Joe noted that he lives along a major trail and thinks that the places that need the gravel the most are the narrow sections in order to be able to step off when a bicyclist is passing. He suggested that the next time BES requests an easement for this area, that the District require them to widen the sections that need it.
- ✓ Larry agreed with Joe's suggestion, but proposed that BES dedicate the funding to the District for this purpose and that the District have control over the construction in order to

ensure its quality. He agrees with previous comments that gravel shoulders be installed where it makes sense and where it adds to the serviceability of the trail.

President, Bob Scott, opened the floor for public testimony.

Virginia Vantur, 7655 SW 88th Avenue, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the Fanno Creek Trail Vision. She thanked the Board of Directors for the amount of time they have spent hearing the committee's recommendations and for their thoughtful discussion this evening. She has heard a few things being said within the community that she thought the District should be aware. First is the sense that the District is a watchdog for the community regarding what is happening to the trail. There have been some drastic changes to the trail over the last 10 years, which in the community's mind have virtually destroyed it. There are a lot of negative feelings regarding what has occurred and the community looks to the District to help maintain the integrity of the trail. Often when the trail is discussed, it is done so in terms of multiple uses, but in the Garden Home neighborhood, one of the major uses of the trail is for exercise. Garden Home does not have a lot of sidewalks and not everyone can use the recreation center, but everyone can use the trail to walk and it is heavily used by all ages and abilities. When the District talks about the trail in terms of the vegetation being put in, three to five years is a long period of time for those who live along the trail and rely upon it for exercise and enjoyment. She described the negative aesthetics of some of the narrower portions of the trail and asked that when the District chooses plants for the area, that quickly-growing varieties are chosen. In addition, she expressed that by adopting the committee's recommendations, the District would be reassuring the community that it has their best interests at heart.

President, Bob Scott, asked Joe whether he could support the Board action requested this evening.

- ✓ Joe replied that he can, but is nervous with the language. He does not like the language regarding no restrictions on easements in that while he knows what that means, he questions how it might appear to someone else. He would like to reassure the community that this is not the intent of the District, or its mission. Other than that, he does have conflicting feelings regarding the gravel shoulders in that he does not like the way they look, but he understands why they are needed along regional trails.

President, Bob Scott, stated that he would entertain a motion.

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the vision and implementation as funding allows with the following exceptions: a gravel shoulder, not a vegetated shoulder, and no restrictions on easements. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #9 - Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Bob Scott, President

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins