



Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Parks & Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting
Date: March 15, 2023; Time: 6:00 PM
Location: Virtual

In Attendance

Committee Members: Nisha George (Chair), Nanda Siddaiah (Secretary), Jane Leo, Kate Nelson, James Terwilliger, Hilary Blum

Staff: Keith Watson (Support Services Manager)

Board Liaison: Alfredo Moreno

Absent: Erica Soto, Carolina Martins, Jacqui Orenda-Weber

- I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by Keith Watson at 6:08 pm.
- II. **Approval of Minutes:** The minutes from the February 2023 meeting were emailed to the committee. Nanda Siddaiah moved to accept the minutes and seconded by Kate Nelson. Approved unanimously.
- III. **Public Comment:** No public comment was received prior to the meeting.
- IV. **Welcome/Member Check-in**

- A. James took his daughter to Commonwealth Lake Park for the first time and she was super excited to see a variety of birds!

V. New Business

A. Dog Park/Run Updates and Review

- 1. Keith shared a brief history: District was getting a lot of pressure for off-leash parks starting in 2018. District only had 3 parks (Winkleman, Hazeldale, PCC-Rock Creek) which supported off-leash dogs in fenced areas. Community wanted more options and district had a desire to add more spaces to help with illegal off-leash use in parks.
 - 2. The advisory committee was asked to help with research and recommendations. In summary – the committee recommended identifying new properties to expand fenced dog parks. Also recommended adding minimum of 4 new parks by 2024, focused on areas to cover the district better; and focus on neighborhood parks to limit traffic impact. During research, committee found in some Portland parks, there were some un-fenced areas which allowed off-leash during specific hours. Parks experience was that the public did not respect the hours, and non-dog users avoided going to such parks.
 - 3. These recommendations are documented as guidelines for future considerations for Dog Parks and Dog Runs, and are part of the Parks Functional Plan.
 - 4. First dog run was at Jackie Husen Park and started as a 1-year pilot project. Eventually became permanent and Washington County had a very pragmatic approach with regards to the district's plan to add dog run.
 - 5. Second site was at Schiffler Park, request came from neighbors as this park had a long history of unsavory behavior around the skate park and neighbors wanted to activate the space with other uses. THPRD proposed a dog run on a segment of this park; neighbor outreach went well. Had a surprise with the City, which required a type3 land use permit due to this being a 'new use' scenario. Resulted in a lot of added procedures to work thru and cost.

6. Following Schiffler the advisory committee drafted a letter to the City requesting they consider helping to streamline the process of adding dog runs to parks within the City as this was a goal found in both the city and park district visioning plans.
7. Mayor provided a response which indicated the process for adding dog runs at a future park was simplified but stated staff were busy and changing the code for existing parks was not a priority at the time.
8. Committee made a recommendation at the time for THPRD to pursue future dog runs outside of the city limits until progress was made to simplify the process. This would happen after the completion of Ridgewood Park as it was already underway. There has been no progress since April 2021.
9. Jane asked if THPRD had followed up with the City to check on any process improvements. Keith indicated that THPRD staff have been working closely with City staff on Ridgewood Park and they are still dealing with the same issues as before. No progress has been made.
10. Ridgewood Dog Run – close to completion; trending to open in the early part of summer 2023. Keith showed the various charges/fees involved in the applications process. The costs in general are almost 2x in the Beaverton city limits vs in unincorporated WA county.
11. Following Ridgewood, the next dog run is planned at Garden Home Park (outside city limits).
12. Keith asked the committee if, following Garden Home, they wanted to keep the recommendation to continue looking outside the city limits. Committee indicated they would like to check back with the city on progress... via another letter.
13. Jane asked for a map of parks outside the city limits. Keith indicated he would share.
14. James: One thing we did not see in the document is requirements for areas that are newly developed. We should consider adding that to the functional plan, for new developments which are higher density of construction. Anticipate and set requirements, before these new areas get annexed into the City limits. Keith: Yes - we are engaging more early in the process, and having the neighbors define what they'd like to see in their neighborhoods
15. James: Need to be conscious about doing these definitions proactively, as people move in / out; demographics evolve over time etc. S. Cooper Mt is an example. Keith: specifically, for S Cooper mountain, we have Winkelman and Hazeldale, which are in the general region of the district. District is also looking to do a 'parks amenities study' in the near future, which will attempt to account for future needs vs what we currently have.
16. James: if we're looking for places intentionally outside the City limits, we should include those terms in the guidelines set forth for considerations for new dog runs/parks.
17. Hilary: What're our options to develop a stance on this letter?
18. Keith: options – we're going to maintain the current stance based on current city code/ requirements; continue to live with the current procedures (pay the fees etc); push the city to consider the suggested code simplifications. There should not be any negative ramifications of pushing for an update.
19. Nisha: is THPRD working with city of Beaverton on any other land use topics, which we can wrap this into. Keith: good question – will follow up.
20. Nisha: Finding an issue which this committee cares about, and demonstrating how it aligns with the City of Beaverton's (or certain individuals in the City) goals too. Find common ground.
21. Keith – we do work with City of Beaverton on land use rules and implications to new parks/developments.
22. Jane – recommend writing a reminder to City of Beaverton, to check on where this request is. Pending their response, our position should be to maintain our current focus on sites in unincorporated WA county and new developments.
23. Alfredo – Carolina on this committee was more passionate about this topic in an earlier Board meeting/testimony. Recommend getting her view on this to see her thoughts/ideas. The City commission also has had people turnover, so the new members may be finding their feet. In

general, we do have a good working relation with the City; and it will always help for this committee to make recommendations for overall improvement in the system.

24. Jane – we had earlier done temporary/popup dog runs. Does that need to go thru this permit process?
25. Keith – no, not for Popup. We used this as an event to get more focused neighborhood feedback. This was for just a temporary 2-week duration and does not go thru the city permitting process.

B. Tree Planting Partnership

1. A repeated topic that comes up during Challenge Grant project idea discussions is shade (trees) in parks. This has also come up at a handful of NAC meetings.
2. Instead of handling these requests on an individual basis THPRD is considering a partnership with PGE and Friends of Trees. THPRD would develop a coordinated operating process to manage the requests.
3. PGE can be a good partner, and this is a good opportunity for this committee to engage effectively in this partnership
4. Jane: communicating with the Contact at PGE; and Holly – PGE's attitude is 'right tree, right place'. They are open minded to make the Rock Creek powerline corridor more shady. They have the funds to support as well as will have recommendations on specific trees for specific places. Keith will keep this committee informed as these conversations progress.
5. Nisha: is this proposal limited to trees or to shade structures too? Keith: Yes, specific to trees
6. Jane: PGE may have concerns with structures under the high voltage transmission lines
7. Kate: will this be limited to the powerline corridors (PGE shared)
8. Keith: not sure, our hope is for areas not limited to these corridors
9. Keith to follow up with more info as this idea progresses.

VI. Old Business:

A. Pickleball Planning Update

1. Keith: Had a good meeting with different departments in the district. In April, Emily Kent will attend and talk about our Pickleball expansion plans.
2. Keith to share some info on studies related to the sound/noise concern many people have. Emily has asked us to think about the criteria that we would want to consider as the district looks forward to expanding pickleball usage.
3. First pass criteria: Location (distributed, away from residences), lights, parking, rules for shared-use courts, sound barriers etc
4. Kate: can we track how the courts are used between tennis and pickleball? Keith: we do not have a good way to track outdoor courts. Usage is very variable based on season, time of day, school year etc
5. James: Do we have any successful shared-use model experiences? Keith: Yes – we do; in monitored cases (athletic centers), it works as it is monitored/paid. But unmonitored sites could be a challenge.
6. Kate: Some of the rec centers are having pickleball; Can we work with programming to enable more pickleball time that doesn't overlap with other programs? Keith will get some of that info from programming. Many of our athletic centers are hosting pickleball court times.
7. James: as the demand is growing, we should have to consider dedicated pickleball facilities.

B. Challenge Grant Project Discussion

1. James: can we revisit a set of ideas from prior years, which did not make the cut last year ? Example ideas. Any parks have climbing walls? The ADA circular swing option?
2. Outdoor exercise equipment – recommend checking out Vista brook park
3. Converting gas stove to induction stove top for kids' classes and community room (ex: Cedar Hills Rec Center, Conestoga class room)
4. Nisha: we can start a google doc, for the committee to share ideas collaboratively
5. More discussion at next meeting.

VII. Wrap Up

- A. Next Meeting: Committee did not discuss date but Keith to follow up with date of next meeting (Joint AC meeting scheduled April 26 at 6pm).

VIII. Adjourn

- A. Meeting adjourned at 7:44 PM
- B. Minutes respectfully submitted by Nanda Siddaiah, Secretary