



TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 22, 2025

Lithia Park Cabin, 340 S Pioneer Street – 4:00 PM

Committee Members Present: Adams (Park Commission Liaison), Bender, Braught, Cott (Chair), E. Hansen (City Council Liaison), Heycke, Kuwabara, Seffinger

Staff Present: Parks Superintendent Caldwell, Parks Supervisor Minica, Executive Assistant Mero

Absent: B. Hansen (Vice Chair), Director Houston

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Cott called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM
- II. **ROLL CALL** – Cott, Adams, Heycke, Braught, Hansen, Bender, Kuwabara, Seffinger all present

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Trails Advisory Committee April 14, 2025

2. Trails Advisory Committee July 15, 2025

Chair Cott asked for approval of both sets of minutes. All ayes, minutes approved.

IV. **ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA**

- Chair Cott addressed several housekeeping items
 - Due to the time required to get meeting minutes approved by the Committee and acknowledged by the Park Commission, would like draft minutes to be sent out/posted as soon as they are complete. No objections.
 - Would like TAC to meet every other month. No objections.
 - Asked members to send him their best days of the week/hours of the day for meeting as well as any days/hours they absolutely cannot meet.

V. **PUBLIC FORUM** – None

VI. **BUSINESS**

1. **Bylaws**

SITUATION – The Trails Advisory Committee (TAC) needs bylaws to assist with the management of the committee.

ASSESSMENT – The Parks and Recreation Department (Department) developed draft bylaws, consistent with other Department committees to assist in the management of the TAC. At the April 2025 TAC meeting, committee members were provided with the draft. Based on information received to date, staff has updated the draft bylaws.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Are there any edits of the bylaws that need consideration?
- Would TAC like to recommend the bylaws to the Park Commission now or at the next TAC meeting?

POLICIES, PLANS & GOALS SUPPORTED – Policy 1.01.001 – Policy Framework

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS – These bylaws will not impact Department operations or capital budgets directly. The Department will manage the capital and operations budget within the current budget limitations.

ATTACHMENTS – Draft TAC Bylaws (see packet)

Motion: I move to approve the Trails Advisory Committee Bylaws and recommend them to the Park Commission.

Motion: Seffinger

Second: Braught

Bender	Aye	Braught	Aye	Cott	Aye
Heycke	Aye	Kuwabara	Aye	Seffinger	Aye

All Ayes, motion passes.

2. Trail Proposal Procedure – Superintendent Caldwell

SITUATION – The Parks and Recreation Department (Department) needs to develop a procedure to formalize the process to assess trail proposals.

ASSESSMENT – The Department, with assistance from the trails ad-hoc committee, developed a process to review new trail proposals. With the adoption of Policy 1.01.001 – Policy Framework, the Department needs to formalize a procedure for this process. Staff utilized the prior process as a guide to develop the proposed procedure. Staff has incorporated an objective scoring criteria to assist in TAC and the Department working with proposers, the Park Commission, and the community to clearly and consistently justify recommendations.

Staff reviewed the comments from TAC members at the 7/15/2025 TAC meeting. The primary item raised was the desire to not have a minimum score for trail proposals. Staff has kept the minimum score in the procedure.

This ensures that the recommendations to the Parks Commission have an objective measurement to support TAC's recommendation. Staff does not want TAC or the Parks Commission in a position where we are defending a trail proposal that was not recommended that had a lower score than one that was approved. In addition, the scoring criteria and score help demonstrate alignment with the Department's goals and objectives.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Are there additional questions or suggested edits to the procedure?

POLICIES, PLANS & GOALS SUPPORTED – Policy 1.01.001 – Policy Framework, Parks, Recreation, Open space and Seniors Strategic Plan (PROS)

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS – This procedure will not impact Department operations or capital budgets directly. The Department will manage the capital and operations budget within the current budget limitations.

ATTACHMENTS – Procedure 3.3.001 – Draft Trail Proposal Procedure (see packet)

Questions/Discussion:

- The draft trail proposal procedure is quantitative. Need to also include a qualitative appraisal.
- The Criteria is good – keep it.
- The scoring should be more objective – remove the point system.
- Example, there may be only one primary but strongly compelling reason to build a proposed trail. Points could be too low to move it forward.
- The assessment should be a narrative. Assess the proposal by value and reason(s) to move it forward.
- Assigning a number doesn't make an assessment objective.
- A recommendation could be both a narrative and a number to provide a metric.
- Maybe a high – medium – low rating?
- Don't want to reject a proposal with a scoring of 74 if it is high needs, high environmental, and a high priority.
- The committee should be evaluating trails for whether or not they should be built.
- Suggested that the rubric, numbers and matrix are not needed. Make it simple.

- The narrative is needed for information. For instance, information could help sway voters.
- The four categories are also important.
- As a part of the process, there should be a site visit to proposed trails to acknowledge the potential downsides and issues.
- Should include funding assigned in the CIP in the conversation.
- A list of the pros/cons of a proposal is a really good idea. Would aid the next group to review the proposal.
- If there are concurrent multiple trail proposals, the committee could rank them.
- Should consider/add in externalities like potential economic boost to the area and volunteerism.
- Suggested for Josh/Rocky to rework/wordsmith the scoring criteria.

3. Trail Management Protocol – Superintendent Caldwell

SITUATION – The Parks and Recreation Department (Department) currently does not have a trail management protocol for trails. There appears to be a body of work (practices) the Department has historically used to manage the trail system.

ASSESSMENT – Staff has reviewed trail management practices for other local, state, and federal land managers. In reviewing past practices and these documents, a trail fundamentals document and corresponding trail management protocol has been drafted for review by TAC. The first review occurred at the July 15, 2025, TAC meeting. Staff have integrated that feedback into the current version.

Key trail management items to address are the management of who the trail is designed for (user experience) and trail guidelines to inform development and operation of the trail system. The protocol outlines the core elements to meet these trail management needs.

The goal of the protocol is to inform the Department on trail operational guidelines to assist in prioritizing trail maintenance, guidelines for trails to provide a consistent and predictable trail experience, and to ensure our trail system is aligned with the Department's strategic direction, community needs, and Department resources.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Is there any feedback on the trail management protocol?

POLICIES, PLANS & GOALS SUPPORTED – Policy 1.01.001 – Policy Framework, Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Seniors Strategic Plan (PROS)

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS – The protocol will impact Department planning and operational costs associated with managing trails. The Department's capital and operations budgets will be managed via current limitations.

ATTACHMENTS – Protocol 1.03.001 – Draft Trail Management Protocol (see packet)

Questions/Discussion:

- Dislike categorizing existing trails in this manner.
- A set up for problems.
- A committee member did a matrix using all of the existing trails and it proved to be an exercise in futility.
- Suggested that the committee decline to vote on the protocol.
- Puts Parks/the City in more jeopardy for litigation.
- Other entities like the State and Forest Service use a similar system. The Department has to have something.
- Because of the way a trail can vary in segments and certain weather, every trail would have to be a Black diamond.
- Unnecessary bureaucracy.

Motion: I move that the Trails Advisory Committee recommend against the use of the Trail Management Protocol.

Motion: Cott

Second: Kuwabara

Bender	Aye	Brought	Aye	Cott	Aye
Heycke	Aye	Kuwabara	Aye	Seffinger	Aye

All Ayes, motion passes.

4. PROS Plan – Trails Service Level Goal – Superintendent Caldwell

SITUATION – The Department’s Parks, Recreation, Open space & Senior services strategic plan (PROS) will be establishing a service level goal for trails.

ASSESSMENT

Trail Segment Type	Miles
Trail (outside of road ROW)	98.8

Road (shared use/bike lane)	79.4
Proposed	25
Total	203.2

The level of service recommendation by Oregon Parks & Recreation, as found in their State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) Park Master Planning Guidelines, is 0.5 to 1.5 miles per 1,000 residents. Our initial data

review has identified the following:

Trail Segment Type by City Ownership	Miles
Parkland	22.4
City Owned	31.7
Other	44.7
Total	98.8

Trail Segment Type	Bike Only (miles)	Ped Only (miles)	Bike & Ped (miles)	Mutli-Use (miles)	Ped-Equine (miles)
Trail	13.2	36	10.5	35	6.4
Road	26.4	0.00	0.00	51	0.00
Proposed	11.3	0.24	0.03	13.6	0.00
Total	50.9	36.24	10.53	99.6	6.4

The data we have gathered so far through the PROS planning process is as follows:

- Trails are a highly used park asset
- The community wants more trails
- The community wants existing trails to be managed well
- The community wants easy (green) trails

Based on this, staff has proposed the current Service Level Goal:

	Current number of Miles	Service Level Goal (# of miles)	Purpose
Trails			
Trails, Pathways, and Bikeways	56	64	Create 8 miles for trail connections & improve trail diversity
Actual Miles	56	64	Proposed Miles
Current Service Level (acres per 1,000)	2.6		
Draft Service Level (acres per 1,000)	3.0		

It is important to note that the PROS Plan is developing (2) types of goals:

- Strategic Goals
 - Broader goals that will have objectives and actions to meet the community's recreational needs.
- Service Level Goals
 - Measurable outcomes for parklands, trails, park amenities and programming.

We are working with the Park Commission over the next few months to develop the strategic goals and setting the service level goals. Our intent is to bring back to the TAC draft objectives and actions for the strategic goals at the January meeting. The input we get on the service level goal will inform the final recommendation to the Park Commission.

The draft PROS plan is planned for February 2026, with adoption in April 2026.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

- Questions or feedback on the draft service level goal for trails?

POLICIES, PLANS & GOALS SUPPORTED – PROS Plan (in process)

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS – N/A

ATTACHMENTS – N/A

Questions/Discussion:

- Opposition to the use of Service Level Goals for determining miles of trail.
- Not a fair measurement – shouldn't be specifically by mile as in, "8 more miles of trail is all you get."
- Maybe use the number as a minimum.
- All levels of service are problematic. Comparing apples to oranges.

Motion: I move that we decline to participate in any further discussion of the levels of service.

Motion: Cott

Second: Heycke

Bender	Aye	Brought	Aye	Cott	Aye
Heycke	Aye	Kuwabara	Aye	Seffinger	Aye

All Ayes, motion passes.

5. Trail Proposal – Superintendent Caldwell

SITUATION – The Department has received one trail proposal.

ASSESSMENT – The trail proposal was received on 9/17/2025. Staff has begun the review process, outlined in the draft trail proposal procedure. At the 7/15/25 TAC meeting, staff recommended using a trail proposal (like this one) to assess the draft procedure. Staff is recommending that this proposal, given its location and documented concerns about cycling on Lithia Park’s trails, should have a public meeting and comment period if this proposal was to be recommended by the TAC prior to being presented to the Park Commission.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS

POLICIES, PLANS & GOALS SUPPORTED – PROS Plan (in process)

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS – N/A

ATTACHMENTS – Dormouse Trail Application

Questions/Discussion:

- There was interest in a site visit to the proposed trail. Discussion ensued regarding limiting the number of committee members (voting) participating in the visit so as to avoid having a quorum present.

VII. UPCOMING MEETING DATES – TBD

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – Chair Cott adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM

Respectfully submitted by Nancy A. Mero, Executive Assistant