



## **Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Nature & Trails Advisory Committee (NTAC) meeting**

**Date: 9/20/2016**

**Time: 6:30 p.m.**

**Location: Fanno Creek Service Center**

### **In Attendance**

Committee Members: Bernadette Le, Gerri Scheerens, John Ratliff, Laura Porter, Matthew Shepherd, Mitch Cruzan, Sam Scheerens  
Absent: Cory Samia, Jack Shorr  
Board liaison: (None)  
Staff: Bruce Barbarasch  
Guests: David Mercer

### **Ia. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

### **Ib. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the July 2016 meeting were presented to the committee.

Move to accept was proposed by Laura and seconded by Gerri.

There were no questions from the committee members and no discussion. The minutes were **accepted by unanimous vote**.

## **II. Guest Comments**

Mr. Mercer introduced himself, saying that he enjoyed long-distance hiking on THPRD trails. He requested that the District construct more bathrooms on trails, asked for a study of locations and needs, and urged the committee to advocate for additional funds for permanent bathrooms, not Porta Potty-type portable restrooms. Mr. Mercer provided the committee with copies of notes he had prepared.

After Mr. Mercer left, the committee discussed the issue of bathroom provision, touching on the following points:

- Is there a current standard for bathroom provision on trails? No, there are not even national standards that can be adopted.
- There are often facilities in nearby parks. Could signage be added to trails that directs users to the nearest bathroom facility?
- Permanent bathrooms are expensive; it may cost \$10,000 just to get a water meter installed.
- Portable bathrooms cost \$75–\$250/month (the most expensive are ADA-compliant units).

Next steps: Bruce will gather information and report back to the committee about the current status of bathrooms.

## **III. Cooper Mtn field trip debrief**

During the August meeting, members visited Cooper Mountain Nature Park to learn about how the management prioritization rubric can be applied to a natural area. It was generally agreed that the visit had

been worthwhile. However, members were unsure about one measure in the rubric, Relationship to Water, and felt that this may be better addressed if it was split into two, relationship to ponds and relationship to creeks. Bruce explained that the measure was intended to cover a spectrum of water on a rough gradient from natural features (e.g., good condition creek) to non-natural (e.g., artificial pond). Natural resources staff will review the current wording of the measure.

### **III. Trail Quality Measures**

The committee resumed a discussion of the Trail Quality Measure (TQM) matrix begun at the July meeting. After reviewing the previous discussion, it was asked what the difference was between the TQM matrix and the similar matrix in the Trails Functional Plan (TFP page 55) TQM is to guide and inform trail maintenance, care, and upkeep of existing trails on a daily to monthly basis. TFP provides a framework for planning and structural improvements, such as new trails or rebuilding existing trails.

Bruce requested the committee's input on two questions. They are presented below with notes on the members' discussions:

Question 1: If a trail scores "good" or "better" on the TQM, would you improve the trail?

- All trails in the district must meet basic requirements (TQM = good) before improvements should be made, i.e., all trails are safe, meet appropriate design standard, and have directional signs before improvements elsewhere.
- Once basic needs for the trail are met, how necessary are "better" or "best" amenities?
  - Extra provision should be based on a combination of community needs, level of use, equity across the district, and/or a focus on low-score trails.
- Guidelines should be followed to ensure equity and that basic standards are met districtwide. (Don't treat the "squeaky wheel" of a vocal neighborhood or community group.)
- Should the aim be to raise all trails to "best"?
  - No. Different levels of provision will be appropriate for different sites.

Question 2: How do you prioritize improvements if trails have similar TQM scores?

- The following were suggested:
  - Level of use,
  - Type of use (e.g., dogs or bikes have specific needs).
  - Use matrix (Table 5A) in TFP. Bruce pointed out that it is complex for small investments and that it lacks the details of particular amenities.
- How is prioritization done now?
  - It is driven by requests ("squeaky wheel"), trail surveys, and professional insight of THPRD staff.

### **V. The View from Bruce's Office**

Bruce presented the committee with information on the SW Hall Blvd crossing on the Fanno Creek Trail. (This had been requested at a prior meeting.) The crossing is a street-level, light-controlled crossing that is activated by trail users. It was used ca. 175,000 times between January 2014 and July 2015. It is unknown whether the light are synchronized with the traffic control at the nearby intersection of Hall and Greenway. The flashing red signal is preferred by City of Beaverton; drivers have adjusted to it. (Washington County prefers a traffic light with a steady red.)

**VI. Announcements**

Laura informed members of a Washington County summit being arranged by the Intertwine. It will be held on Monday, 10/3, at PCC's Rock Creek campus.

Sam had enjoyed listening to a segment on OPB Radio's Think Out Loud about the Vision Zero initiative in Portland, and recommended that other members listen to the recording online.

John suggested an area along the Rock Creek Trail west of the Pirate Playground would be appropriate for creation of mountain bike trails for young riders. Matthew requested that any trails should avoid disturbance to the many ant mounds in that area.

John also asked how volunteer hours should be recorded for this committee. Bruce said that Melissa checked meeting minutes and inputs hours based on those. Individual members can also log time for committee-related outings in their own time.

**VI. Next Meeting will be held on**

Next Meeting: JAC on Tuesday, October 18 at 6:30 p.m.; Fanno Creek Service Center. NTAC will convene afterwards to review activities in 2016 and discuss goals for the coming year.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Shepherd  
Recording Secretary