



Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Special Meeting to Discuss Natural Resources Functional Plan

Date: September 30, 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
Guest: Greg Mintz

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mitch Cruzan at 6:30 pm. Because of the nature of this meeting, Mitch acceded the role of chair and facilitator to Bruce.

II. Natural Resources Functional Plan

Bruce directed members' attention to the walls, where three decision tables from the draft NRFP were hanging and explained the discussion would revolve around those. He then outlined how the meeting would be structured: initial questions; two minutes for each member to explain their state of mind on the NRFP; each member to add up to five sticky notes with major questions/concerns/comments to the tables on the wall; review of those comments and then extended discussion based on issues highlighted by them. Major points from the meeting are below.

Initial questions

Mitch: How will potential differences in the district's separate functional plans be reconciled?

Cory: What does "regional greenway corridor" mean?

Bruce: It refers to a regional or community trail as defined in THPRD policies.

Jack: Table 3, #7 (public support) - can it outweigh conservation concern?

Matthew: Pointed to an inconsistency in the draft plan between the text (score 0-27) and tables (no zero option, so 8 maybe lowest score). Is a zero option needed?

Bruce: That will be addressed in next draft.

Mitch: Zero score isn't necessary.

Laura: Will the tables be used for separate decisions?

"State of mind" comments

Mitch: A- rating. It's a solid document. The committee's task is to refine it to make it more useable and give it inertia moving forward.

Don: The table should work well. Has faith in Bruce and the NR staff to apply it well. The committee needs to ensure there is nothing missing.

Jack: B rating. The plan has great potential. Would like to try out the decision tables in a planning exercise.

Rod: Good framework for decisions. It may have gaps in resource management; will it create a comparison between sites?

Cory: Anxious about wildcard options; will "overriding values" be prone to political winds? What happens if there is no NR department in the future - will the document be strong enough to stand on its own?

Laura: What does the district currently use?

Bruce: There are tables similar to #1 and 2 being discussed this evening.

Laura: Excellent that logical thought being applied to decisions. Good that draft can be applied to sites and results compared. Table 2: hard to put different site side-by-side in comparison.

Matthew: Great that logic is being pursued to guide often emotive decisions. Creating a decision-making framework based on science/logic to enable rigorous process.

Post sticky note discussion

After considering the sticky notes, discussion was focused on the following themes.

Water and Watersheds

Cory: Are sites compared within a watershed? If two sites get the same rating/score, which one gets management or acquisition attention?

Mitch: Development within a site can lead to improved habitat. For example, trails mean more interest in and therefore management activity.

Matthew: If the site has high value for NR, it should receive the necessary management irrespective of trails or other development.

Laura: Does THPRD currently plan for NR provision at the watershed level?

Matthew: Change table 1, #7 from "relationship to water" to "relationship to watershed"?

Bruce: "Geographic position" (#6) intended to address that.

Don: Is soil erosion in parks a resource concern that should be included in the tables?

Data for decisions

Mitch: There isn't mention in the tables of regular monitoring surveys.

Bruce: The existing inventory program addresses that.

Mitch: Where does the wildlife data come from to inform "wildlife sensitivity" (Table 3, #2)?

Bruce: From region-wide Intertwine reports and data. How much data should THPRD collect? When does data collection become no longer useful for management? Is it better that decisions are based on commonly accepted NR profession BMPs?

Laura: Too often data ends up in files, not seen by anyone. It's better that THPRD resources are spent on management, not data collection.

Can/should one criterion override all others

It was generally agreed that there are benefits and disadvantages of allowing a single concern or consideration to override others.

Laura: Table 1 already has many NR resources criteria, as it should for the NRFP. Regarding funding possibilities, could this be specifically NR funding?

Laura: There should be no override. That gives an opportunity for poor decisions being given cover by an otherwise rigorous process.

Checks and balances

After considering the sticky notes, discussion was focused on the following themes.

Mitch: Some concern that other THPRD functional plans may trump NRFP.

Matthew: How will THPRD decide how the separate functional plans (parks, trails, etc.) intersect, and in cases of conflicting decisions, which functional plan takes priority?

Mitch: Can THPRD have a mitigation policy, i.e., when NR land is lost to park/trail/facility development it is replaced with an equivalent NR site elsewhere in the district?

Closing thoughts

Don: Like the plan; the process will get people talking.

Rod: Plan offers three outcomes: protect, neglect, or develop. Do these need defining?

Laura: The underlying issue is will these tables and the NRFP help NR staff do their job?

Mitch: Excited by the draft plan, but wonders if the board be impressed by the scores?

Matthew: Thanked Bruce for his work on the NRFP; has made excellent progress in the right direction.

Bruce: Thanked the committee for their time and input. Noted that the public meeting will probably be on November 5th at Conestoga. The plan is still on target to be ready for the board in December.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Shepherd
Recording Secretary