



Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Natural Resources Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: September 23, 2014

Time: 6:30 pm

Location: Fanno Creek Service Center

In Attendance

Committee Members: Cory Samia, Don Nearhood, Jack Shorr, Laura Porter,
Matthew Shepherd, Mitch Cruzan, Rod Coles
Staff: Bruce Barbarasch

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mitch Cruzan at 6:40 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve proposed by Don Nearhood; seconded by Rod Coles. Approved unanimously, with no changes.

III. Financial Report

There were no financial changes to report.

IV. Old Business

a. Check in activity

Cory: Did some stuff, including visiting Cooper Mountain Nature Park.

Jack: Did quite a lot of stuff in district parks.

Don: Did some stuff, too, including visiting Schiffler Park, but hasn't been able to go to see the recently installed "Mossuments"; attended the joint advisory committee meeting.

Laura: Did some stuff, too, including visiting Ridgewood Park with her kids and Bronson Creek with a CWS projects; also attended the joint advisory committee meeting.

Rod: Did some good stuff volunteering at the native plant garden at Tualatin Hills Nature Park Interpretive Center.

Mitch: Didn't do much stuff this month.

Matthew: Apologized for his absence in past two months due to family matters; didn't do much stuff on park district property.

b. Natural Resources Functional Plan

Bruce had previously circulated a document containing a draft of part of the NRFP for the committee to review and discuss. He opened the discussion by introducing the committee to progress in the NRFP. He hopes that the plan will provide a framework for decision making, which is often tricky due to the need to balance values and community opinion against science. Bruce directed the committee members' attention to a previously circulated draft document containing a series of tables for guiding decisions regarding natural area acquisition and management decisions. Bruce talked the committee through the draft document and the tables.

Major points from the ensuing discussion are below.

Cory: Wondered about checks and balances that might be in the plan to allow for consistent interpretation/application of the plan if there are changes in THPRD personnel (both staff and board/committees).

Laura: Highlighted how decisions don't always follow the science; policy and people also influence outcomes.

Jack: Likes the draft document because the scoring tables move decisions toward data.

Bruce: Noted that the scores are not the same in each table, and asked the committee if that was an issue (would equal scores allow simpler comparison/weighting between tables)?

Matthew: Observed that the tables don't offer a zero option despite that being mentioned in the text. Could scores be placed in % bands rather than needing to equalize actual score?

Mitch: In table 1, could the habitat types be listed with a score, rather than "locally rare," etc. in line 1 (land cover type)?

Bruce: Habitat type status are based on an assessment by the Intertwine and published separately.

Cory: Is that confusing for users? Should the habitat information be included in the plan and not require users to have access to two documents from different sources?

Don: What about scoring potential value of the habitat?

Bruce: Staff judgment item allows for some flexibility; otherwise, users will follow the table.

Don: How will the table be used?

Bruce: Staff will look at the list of possible habitats.

Laura: Have the tables been tried out by staff, did they work?

Bruce: Yes, they have; yes, they did.

Laura: Were the tables easy to use and not confusing to user?

Bruce: Yes, they were; they were OK.

Laura: Why does water have its own line item (table 1, line 7)? (A question also pondered by Matthew.)

Mitch: Could habitat complexity be included in the table in the place of water?

Jack: Is the document intended for staff use or public use?

Bruce: THPRD is a public organization, so it will be in the public domain.

Matthew: Even if the plan will be in public domain, accessibility by non-expert shouldn't be the highest priority. The tables need to be rigorous enough to guide decisions.

Jack: Will there be training for users (to ensure consistency and replicability of work)?

Laura: It would be good if several people complete the tables independently.

Mitch: Can "threat of loss" (table 1, line 10) be defined?

Don: Should the investment item in table 2 (line 7) be removed? We don't want to be tipping good money after bad. Other committee members noted that the current line item is only a measure of money spent, not whether the results were worth it. Can the item be modified to reflect the return on investment (was the money worth spending)?

It was agreed that a special meeting would be required to complete the discussion. The committee will reconvene on Tuesday, September 30, 6:30 pm, at Fanno Creek Service Center.

Next steps in developing the NRFP: revised draft will be ready for staff/project partner review in mid-October; a public meeting will be held during the first week of November; the NRFP will be presented to THPRD board in early December.

V. New Business

a. None.

b. View from Bruce's Office. None (This was combined with the NRFP plan discussion to allow more time.)

VI. Other

None

**VII. Special meeting to discuss NRFP - Tuesday, September 30, 6:30 pm, at Fanno Creek Service Center.
Monthly meeting - Tuesday, October 28, 6:30 pm, at Fanno Creek Service Center.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Shepherd
Recording Secretary