



City of Sandy

Agenda

Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting

Meeting Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Meeting Date: Wednesday, December 9, 2020

Meeting Time: 7:00 PM

Page

1. ZOOM MEETING INFO

Meeting Format Notice:

The Parks and Trails Advisory Board will conduct this meeting electronically using the Zoom video conference platform.

Members of the public may listen, view, and/or participate in this meeting using Zoom.

Using Zoom is free of charge. See the instructions below:

- To login to the electronic meeting online using your computer, [click this link](#):
- **Note a passcode is required: 759839**
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 879 9245 1030
- If you do not have access to a computer or telephone and would like to take part in the meeting, please contact the Sandy Community Center (503-668-5569) by December 7th and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.1. Meeting Minutes

[Parks & Trails Advisory Board - 12 Nov 2020 - Minutes - Pdf](#)

[Parks & Trails Advisory Board - 12 Nov 2020 - Minutes - Html](#)

3 - 16

5. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

6. NEW BUSINESS

- 6.1. Tickle Creek Village 17 - 20
[Final Order Parkland and Open Space January 28, 2020](#)
[Information from Tracy Brown](#)
[Staff Report Tickle Creek Village Dec 9, 2020 meeting \(1\)](#)

7. OLD BUSINESS

- 7.1. Master Plan Update
7.2. Pesticide Policy Update 21 - 25
[Revised Final Weed and Invasive Plant Management Draft Policy2\(1\)](#)
[Staff Report for Council - Pesticide Use in City Parks](#)

8. STAFF UPDATES

- 8.1. Board Member Send Off

9. ADJOURN



MINUTES
Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, November 12, 2020 City Hall-
Council Chambers, 39250 Pioneer Blvd.,
Sandy, Oregon 97055 7:00 PM

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Kathleen Walker, Board Member, Don Robertson, Board Member, Michael Weinberg, Board Member, Susan Drew, Board Member, and Makoto Lane, Board Member

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Sam Schroyer, Board Member

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Richardson, Community Services

MEDIA PRESENT:

1. Roll Call

2. Consent Agenda

2.1. Meeting Minutes

3. Public Comment

Meeting Format Notice:

The Parks and Trails Advisory Board will conduct this meeting electronically using the Zoom video conference platform.

Members of the public may listen, view, and/or participate in this meeting using Zoom.

Using Zoom is free of charge. See the instructions below:

- To login to the electronic meeting online using your computer, [click this link](#):
- **Note a passcode is required:** 463632
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 867 0955 8895
- If you do not have access to a computer or telephone and would like to take part in the meeting, please contact the Sandy Community Center (503-668-5569) by November 10th and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

4. Consent Agenda

4.1. Clarification for October's meeting minutes. Kathleen Walker noted under 5.1 new business paragraph 3. Third sentence. Kathleen Walker would like it to

read "the acreage of land dedicated should be based on what the densities actually are"

Makoto Lane wanted to be sure he noted that the confusion on these items and the variances requested stems from the fact they are Planned Unit Developments.

Moved by Kathleen Walker, seconded by Makoto Lane

Moved to approve minutes as amended

CARRIED. 5-0

5. New Business

6. Old Business

6.1. Bull Run Terrace Development

Tracy Brown noted that the Planning Commission has recommended approval and it is being forwarded to Council.

Don Robertson noted that one of the things that the board has an opportunity to impact is whether to recommend that the city works with the developer in the Phase 1 development of the park in exchange for SDC or Fee in Lieu credit. If yes, what would be the process. If no, then we need to make that recommendation.

Tracy Brown clarified that the developer is proposing to dedicate Parkland, so there would be no Fee in Lieu. Talked to the developer again because they had been offering to help construct the park, and they are still interested in that option.

Kathleen Walker wanted to clarify:

1. Process - thought we were waiting to get more information about densities before sending a memo as to what the findings were from the board.
2. Where we have these developments where zone changes are proposed the specific details are not clear. Parkland dedication is based on knowing these details.

Kathleen Walker reviewed the parkland dedication calculations based on the understanding of what is being proposed and what is unknown.

Tracy Brown notes they are proposing more parkland than what is being required. If exceeds 13 units in the commercial zone, Fee in Lieu would be added, or additional parkland dedication.

Don Robertson clarified that what is being proposed for dedication covers 13 units in the commercial zone. If the developer exceeds 13 units, there would be a choice of additional parkland or Fee in Lieu. If city entered into a development agreement the board could recommend working with the developer on the phase 1 development of the park to include grading, 1/2 street improvements and whatever else would be agreed upon based on the 13 units. Anything beyond that would be a determination of additional parkland dedication or Fee in Lieu. Kathleen Walker agreed with the concept and noted it provides flexibility.

Don Robertson notes it is important to have the development agreement. Don Robertson asked Tracy if the developer would be amenable to that and Tracy Brown noted it is basically what they are proposing.

Moved by Don Robertson, seconded by Susan Drew

Move that Don Robertson write a memo to recommend a development agreement that includes what happens if more than 13 units are developed on the commercial property. Reference that the city would be able to decide if it wanted additional parkland dedicated or Fee in Lieu. Amended to recommend that the city credit the developer SDC's in exchange for the agreed upon park development.

CARRIED. 5-0

6.2. The Views Planned Development

Tracy Brown shared that the developer is adding amenities that will be private. Don Robertson noted that this does not eliminate SDC's or the Fee in Lieu. Kathleen Walker asked under development code 17.64 - her understanding is that Planned Development is supposed to happen within village zones. How is this allowed to be a Planned Development? Tracy Brown notes it is the intent but not necessarily a rule.

Discussion about the private amenities and how it will be maintained by an HOA. Susan Drew clarified that the amenities would not be maintained by the city.

Makoto Lane mentioned that these neighborhoods over time can change.

Tracy Brown noted the roads are public so it will not be a close gated neighborhood.

Tracy Brown shared a map of the amenities in the "Lower and Upper Views".

Discussion about the trail system and why some were eliminated in the current plan in the restricted development area.

Kathleen Walker asked about the open space requirement in the code. What is shown is not developable.

Tracy Brown noted that by the code it is not required to be developable land. What they are proposing exceeds what is required by quite a bit. Open space is defined as slopes, wetlands etc. Not defined as developable.

Makoto Lane noted that this is an issue with the Planned Development. These areas of the code are vague and there are lots of loopholes. Needs to be fixed.

Don Robertson concerned that down the road the HOA might dissolve and the city would become responsible for the parkland and open space. Need to be careful and be sure that everything meets city standards.

Kathleen Walker asked about the difference in total number of units. Tracy Brown noted the min. is 63 and max. is 159 and they are proposing 168. Kathleen Walker asked does that include subtracting out the FSH? Tracy Brown reviewed the calculations.

Don Robertson shared his experiences with HOA's in other communities. There are pros and cons, some work great and others not so well. A lot of them will over time come to the city to say they are dissolving. Kathleen Walker noted that there is a park identified near this parcel and will already have that to maintain.

Can a clause be added about about the HOA dissolving in a development agreement to address what would happen?

Don Robertson asked if the board wants to make a recommendation. Staff recommends Fee in Lieu.

Makoto Lane asked if a bond could be required.

Don Robertson suggested that the city might be able to say that it won't consider accepting any donated land from this development for 10-15 years.

Makoto Lane suggests a bond or some sort of account just in case the community board goes under.

Kathleen Walker asked about the trails and what the staff had asked. Tracy Brown noted the staff wanted more detail and the developer felt it was a lot at this stage and so they decided not to propose the trails.

Kathleen Walker noted a trail in this area is in the Parks and Trails Master Plan

as a proposed trail. If it was to be back in the development would it be open to the public? Tracy Brown said it could have an easement if in the Master Plan, and if not it would be up to the developer. Kathleen Walker feels it is important to have the easement and important to be included as part of this proposal. Does not agree with staff's request for the amount of detail at this stage. The city could work with the developer on a conceptual location and standard "typicals" and work out the details later on. Would feel better about the proposal. Having the trail connection open to the public would be positive and considered outstanding as per the code.

Don Robertson highlighted the concern that there is a city trail designated in the area and don't want to have a trail that ends at one side of the property and begins again on the other side with an off limits section in the middle of it. Would want to link the trail and be sure it is available for public use. Tracy Brown noted the developer was not opposed to the idea of the trails and a connection could be considered.

Kathleen Walker shared a conceptual trail alignment. Discussion about possible trail alignments within the development.

Suggestion that Nancy Enabnit on behalf of the Parks and Trails Master Plan discuss possible trail alignment and access.

Moved by Kathleen Walker, seconded by Michael Weinberg

Motion to prepare correspondence for the Planning Commission with two concerns. First, the concern about having to accept the parks property sometime in the next decade or two. Second, to make sure we have public access to connect a city wide trail. Recommend Nancy Enabnit work with the developer to identify a future trail connection that is compatible with the Parks and Trails Master Plan.

CARRIED. 5-0

7. STAFF UPDATES

7.1. Master Plan Update

A TAC meeting has been scheduled to update members.

Kathleen Walker noted that the website needs to be updated with regard to the Survey.

7.2. Susan Drew asked to discuss the Code of Conduct

Susan referenced two letters from the Government's Ethics Commission. Susan Drew is disturbed that they have been asked to sign the Code of Conduct, and mentioned the Letter to the Sandy Post that Laurie Smallwood submitted regarding Kathleen Walker and a possible conflict of interest should she be elected to council. Didn't think the letter to the editor was appropriate.

Susan Drew let the board know that she is not going to reapply. Interested in a leadership role in the Community Garden.

Makoto Lane stated that he feels the Code of Conduct is hypocritical and is concerned about the interpretation. Feels the council needs to readdress it and consider including employees and elected officials.

Kathleen Walker discussed as board member the importance of respecting each other and listening. When out in the community and talking about parks as a board member it is important to represent board decisions, and not personal views. Having members sign a Code of Conduct in that regard is appropriate, but gets more difficult when out in the public talking about other issues. Important to be professional and involved and be as honest as we can. Being respectful doesn't mean that you can't point out things that concern you. Kathleen Walker shared that she called the Ethic Commission as soon as she read the letter and talked to them about conflict of interest. The Ethics Commission noted they can work with Kathleen if elected and Kathleen noted the City Attorney will also be helping. Kathleen Walker notes she will recuse herself when it is appropriate.

8. Adjourn

Draft



MINUTES
Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, November 12, 2020 City Hall-
Council Chambers, 39250 Pioneer Blvd.,
Sandy, Oregon 97055 7:00 PM

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Kathleen Walker, Board Member, Don Robertson, Board Member, Michael Weinberg, Board Member, Susan Drew, Board Member, and Makoto Lane, Board Member

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Sam Schroyer, Board Member

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Richardson, Community Services

MEDIA PRESENT:

1. Roll Call

2. Consent Agenda

2.1. Meeting Minutes

3. Public Comment

Meeting Format Notice:

The Parks and Trails Advisory Board will conduct this meeting electronically using the Zoom video conference platform.

Members of the public may listen, view, and/or participate in this meeting using Zoom.

Using Zoom is free of charge. See the instructions below:

- To login to the electronic meeting online using your computer, [click this link](#):
- **Note a passcode is required:** 463632
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 867 0955 8895
- If you do not have access to a computer or telephone and would like to take part in the meeting, please contact the Sandy Community Center (503-668-5569) by November 10th and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

4. Consent Agenda

4.1. Clarification for October's meeting minutes. Kathleen Walker noted under 5.1 new business paragraph 3. Third sentence. Kathleen Walker would like it to read "the acreage of land dedicated should be based on what the densities

actually are"

Makoto Lane wanted to be sure he noted that the confusion on these items and the variances requested stems from the fact they are Planned Unit Developments.

Moved by Kathleen Walker, seconded by Makoto Lane

Moved to approve minutes as amended

CARRIED. 5-0

5. New Business

6. Old Business

6.1. Bull Run Terrace Development

Tracy Brown noted that the Planning Commission has recommended approval and it is being forwarded to Council.

Don Robertson noted that one of the things that the board has an opportunity to impact is whether to recommend that the city works with the developer in the Phase 1 development of the park in exchange for SDC or Fee in Lieu credit. If yes, what would be the process. If no, then we need to make that recommendation.

Tracy Brown clarified that the developer is proposing to dedicate Parkland, so there would be no Fee in Lieu. Talked to the developer again because they had been offering to help construct the park, and they are still interested in that option.

Kathleen Walker wanted to clarify:

1. Process - thought we were waiting to get more information about densities before sending a memo as to what the findings were from the board.
2. Where we have these developments where zone changes are proposed the specific details are not clear. Parkland dedication is based on knowing these details.

Kathleen Walker reviewed the parkland dedication calculations based on the understanding of what is being proposed and what is unknown.

Tracy Brown notes they are proposing more parkland than what is being required. If exceeds 13 units in the commercial zone, Fee in Lieu would be added, or additional parkland dedication.

Don Robertson clarified that what is being proposed for dedication covers 13

units in the commercial zone. If the developer exceeds 13 units, there would be a choice of additional parkland or Fee in Lieu. If city entered into a development agreement the board could recommend working with the developer on the phase 1 development of the park to include grading, 1/2 street improvements and whatever else would be agreed upon based on the 13 units. Anything beyond that would be a determination of additional parkland dedication or Fee in Lieu. Kathleen Walker agreed with the concept and noted it provides flexibility.

Don Robertson notes it is important to have the development agreement. Don Robertson asked Tracy if the developer would be amenable to that and Tracy Brown noted it is basically what they are proposing.

Moved by Don Robertson, seconded by Susan Drew

Move that Don Robertson write a memo to recommend a development agreement that includes what happens if more than 13 units are developed on the commercial property. Reference that the city would be able to decide if it wanted additional parkland dedicated or Fee in Lieu. Amended to recommend that the city credit the developer SDC's in exchange for the agreed upon park development.

CARRIED. 5-0

6.2. The Views Planned Development

Tracy Brown shared that the developer is adding amenities that will be private. Don Robertson noted that this does not eliminate SDC's or the Fee in Lieu. Kathleen Walker asked under development code 17.64 - her understanding is that Planned Development is supposed to happen within village zones. How is this allowed to be a Planned Development? Tracy Brown notes it is the intent but not necessarily a rule.

Discussion about the private amenities and how it will be maintained by an HOA. Susan Drew clarified that the amenities would not be maintained by the city.

Makoto Lane mentioned that these neighborhoods over time can change. Tracy Brown noted the roads are public so it will not be a close gated neighborhood.

Tracy Brown shared a map of the amenities in the "Lower and Upper Views". Discussion about the trail system and why some were eliminated in the current plan in the restricted development area.

Kathleen Walker asked about the open space requirement in the code. What is shown is not developable.

Tracy Brown noted that by the code it is not required to be developable land. What they are proposing exceeds what is required by quite a bit. Open space is defined as slopes, wetlands etc. Not defined as developable.

Makoto Lane noted that this is an issue with the Planned Development. These areas of the code are vague and there are lots of loopholes. Needs to be fixed.

Don Robertson concerned that down the road the HOA might dissolve and the city would become responsible for the parkland and open space. Need to be careful and be sure that everything meets city standards.

Kathleen Walker asked about the difference in total number of units. Tracy Brown noted the min. is 63 and max. is 159 and they are proposing 168. Kathleen Walker asked does that include subtracting out the FSH? Tracy Brown reviewed the calculations.

Don Robertson shared his experiences with HOA's in other communities. There are pros and cons, some work great and others not so well. A lot of them will over time come to the city to say they are dissolving. Kathleen Walker noted that there is a park identified near this parcel and will already have that to maintain.

Can a clause be added about about the HOA dissolving in a development agreement to address what would happen?

Don Robertson asked if the board wants to make a recommendation. Staff recommends Fee in Lieu.

Makoto Lane asked if a bond could be required.

Don Robertson suggested that the city might be able to say that it won't consider accepting any donated land from this development for 10-15 years. Makoto Lane suggests a bond or some sort of account just in case the community board goes under.

Kathleen Walker asked about the trails and what the staff had asked. Tracy Brown noted the staff wanted more detail and the developer felt it was a lot at this stage and so they decided not to propose the trails.

Kathleen Walker noted a trail in this area is in the Parks and Trails Master Plan as a proposed trail. If it was to be back in the development would it be open to the public? Tracy Brown said it could have an easement if in the Master Plan,

and if not it would be up to the developer. Kathleen Walker feels it is important to have the easement and important to be included as part of this proposal. Does not agree with staff's request for the amount of detail at this stage. The city could work with the developer on a conceptual location and standard "typicals" and work out the details later on. Would feel better about the proposal. Having the trail connection open to the public would be positive and considered outstanding as per the code.

Don Robertson highlighted the concern that there is a city trail designated in the area and don't want to have a trail that ends at one side of the property and begins again on the other side with an off limits section in the middle of it. Would want to link the trail and be sure it is available for public use. Tracy Brown noted the developer was not opposed to the idea of the trails and a connection could be considered.

Kathleen Walker shared a conceptual trail alignment. Discussion about possible trail alignments within the development.

Suggestion that Nancy Enabnit on behalf of the Parks and Trails Master Plan discuss possible trail alignment and access.

Moved by Kathleen Walker, seconded by Michael Weinberg

Motion to prepare correspondence for the Planning Commission with two concerns. First, the concern about having to accept the parks property sometime in the next decade or two. Second, to make sure we have public access to connect a city wide trail. Recommend Nancy Enabnit work with the developer to identify a future trail connection that is compatible with the Parks and Trails Master Plan.

CARRIED. 5-0

7. STAFF UPDATES

7.1. Master Plan Update

A TAC meeting has been scheduled to update members.

Kathleen Walker noted that the website needs to be updated with regard to the Survey.

7.2. Susan Drew asked to discuss the Code of Conduct

Susan referenced two letters from the Governments Ethics Commission. Susan Drew is disturbed that they have been asked to sign the Code of Conduct, and mentioned the Letter to the Sandy Post that Laurie Smallwood submitted regarding Kathleen Walker and a possible conflict of interest should she be elected to council. Didn't think the letter to the editor was appropriate.

Susan Drew let the board know that she is not going to reapply. Interested in a leadership role in the Community Garden.

Makoto Lane stated that he feels the Code of Conduct is hypocritical and is concerned about the interpretation. Feels the council needs to readdress it and consider including employees and elected officials.

Kathleen Walker discussed as board member the importance of respecting each other and listening. When out in the community and talking about parks as a board member it is important to represent board decisions, and not personal views. Having members sign a Code of Conduct in that regard is appropriate, but gets more difficult when out in the public talking about other issues. Important to be professional and involved and be as honest as we can. Being respectful doesn't mean that you can't point out things that concern you. Kathleen Walker shared that she called the Ethic Commission as soon as she read the letter and talked to them about conflict of interest. The Ethics Commission noted they can work with Kathleen if elected and Kathleen noted the City Attorney will also be helping. Kathleen Walker notes she will recuse herself when it is appropriate.

8. Adjourn

Draft

17.86 – Parkland and Open Space 54. The applicant proposes a 67-unit condo complex. As required by Chapter 17.86, parkland dedication is required during design review for multi-family development. 55.

Based upon the calculations specified in Section 17.86.10, the required dedication area is 0.58 acres of public parkland (67 proposed units x 2 persons per unit x .0043, rounded to the nearest 1/100 of an acre = 0.58 acres to be dedicated). 56.

Section 17.86.40 contains factors for the City to evaluate whether to require parkland dedication based on this formula or collect a fee in lieu of dedication. This section specifies that it is entirely at the City's discretion to accept payment of a fee in lieu of the land dedication or require the dedication.

The Parks and Trail Advisory Board (Exhibit T) reviewed the proposal and voted to recommend a fee-in-lieu of parkland.

Per Resolution 2013-14, the required fee in lieu amount is \$241,000 per acre.

Therefore, based on the current Fee Resolution, the applicant shall pay a fee in lieu of parks dedication in the amount of \$139,780 (0.58 acre park land dedication x \$241,000 payment in lieu per acre) W:\City Hall\Planning\Land Use 2000 to 2019\Orders\2019\19-038 DR FSH VAR TREE Tickle Creek Village Order.doc 15 prior to issuance of building permits.

Alternatively, the applicant shall submit an appraisal for the land in the restricted development area north of the proposed condo buildings that the applicant wants to dedicate to the City and City Council will decide if/how much credit will be applied to the parks fee-in-lieu. If the land north of the proposed condo buildings is dedicated the applicant shall maintain a setback of at least 5 feet to the new property line. **The applicant shall also submit a cost estimate from an engineer for the woodchip trail for staff review and the City of Sandy will determine whether a reduction of the Parks SDC is warranted.**

Date: November 27, 2020
To: City of Sandy Parks Board
From: Tracy Brown, Tracy Brown Planning Consultants, LLC
Re: Tickle Creek Village, Trail and Parks Proposal

Background

The Tickle Creek Village project was approved by the City of Sandy on January 28, 2020. The project includes a total of 67 units in 25 buildings and will be platted as a condominium. The subject property contains 10.4 acres but a substantial portion of the property is unbuildable because of a wetland and stream and associated buffers. The development site includes the southerly 4.23 acres of the site including 0.6 acres of restricted development area for an unrestricted site area of 3.63 acres. There is also a small area at the north end of the property that may have development potential.

As part of the land use approval a Condition of Approval requires the applicant to construct a wood chip trail through the site to connect from Dubarko Road to the existing Sunset Street alignment at the Southeast corner of the site. In addition, a condition also requires the applicant to provide an access easement and to install benches along the trail.

The Final Order states the applicant shall pay a fee in lieu of park dedication in the amount of \$139,780 prior to issuance of building permits. The approval also states that in the alternative, the City may be open to considering providing park fee credit to compensate the applicant for the value of land north of the condo development.

Proposal

Dubarko Development Corps., the developer of the Tickle Creek Village condominium project is interested in working with the city to provide the requested wood chip trail, an access easement to allow the public to walk on the trail across his property, and install benches in exchange for park fee in lieu credit or compensation. In addition, the owner is interested in dedicating the wetland area north of the development site to the city also for park fee in lieu credit or compensation.

At this time the owner has not had an appraisal completed for the property or has an Engineer's estimate been completed to determine the cost of the trail. The concept is once the site is cleared and the development site is surveyed, the trail alignment will be determined in the field and at that time the cost to construct the trail and the area of the required easement will be determined. I will be available at the Parks Board meeting to answer any questions the Board may have.





City of Sandy
39250 Pioneer Blvd.,
Sandy, OR 97055

Agenda Date: December 9, 2020

To: Parks and Trails Advisory Board

From: Sarah Richardson, Staff Liaison Parks and Trails Advisory Board

Subject: Tickle Creek Village

Attachments: Narrative and Map, Board Minutes January 8, 2020

The board discussed Tickle Creek Village at the January 8, 2020 meeting. The board voted to recommend a Parks Fee in Lieu for this development.

Attached is a proposed concept and map from the project representative Tracy Brown. Tracy will attend the December 9, 2020 meeting to address board questions.

The Planning Division received input from Councilor Exner that he would like the City of Sandy to acquire the wetland area on the subject property for the installation of a future boardwalk and/or walking trails. During land use review, Planning Division staff worked with the property owner to write flexible findings and conditions to allow fee in-lieu credit for land dedication based on an appraisal. The findings and conditions also provided flexibility to work with the property owner on SDC credits for trail improvements connecting Sunset Street to Dubarko Road, and benches for wildlife viewing. Additionally, the Planning Division has been working with ESA to add the subject property to the Parks Master Plan as open space and for additional trail connectivity.

For background, the meeting minutes from the January 8, 2020 meeting are attached:

5. New Business 5.1. Tickle Creek Village Land Use Application

Don Robertson asked about SDC rate.

Sarah Richardson shared Planning Dept. info about planned development. General Disc. about park dedication and the wetlands.

Kathleen Walker asked if this project will be a Planned Development.

Kathleen Walker noted that in the master plan there are no parks in this location, but Knollwood Park is close by. Kathleen Walker noted the city owns the swath of land south of the existing condos.

Michael Weinberg noted Tickle Creek is accessed across the street and Kathleen Walker believes a sidewalk would be added along with the development.

General discussion about pedestrian safety and safe access to Tickle Creek Trail along that area of Dubarko. Kathleen Walker noted there is a sidewalk on the north side of Dubarko that would connect to the development. Susan Drew and Kathleen Walker noted the trail on the map and wondered if this is part of the proposed dedicated outdoor area. Kathleen Walker expressed concern about the overflow parking that might result from the new development and Susan Drew noted it looked like a Bus Stop was planned.

Move that the board recommend a Fee in Lieu for Tickle Creek Village

Moved by Don Robertson, seconded by Kathleen Walker

CARRIED.



39250 Pioneer Blvd.
Sandy, OR 97055

City of Sandy Weed and Invasive Plant Management – Pesticide Use

Policy defines the management of weeds in parks and turf areas and the use of selective herbicides.

No pesticides are currently in use in city parks.

Provides specific policy-based direction for Weed and Invasive Plant Management.

Goal of the policy is to maintain park and turf areas for their intended use.

Considerations: The use of herbicides in parks requires their application to sites that have direct public uses, often involving children and pets. These applications are carefully planned to allow for adherence to the label directives, and to minimize any potential impact on all users.

Management

- a. Bark dust, string trimmers, hand tools and hedge trimmers are used whenever possible to control weeds and limit the use of Herbicides.
- b. Herbicides are used for spot spray (targeted) treatment only. *Spot treatment means that individual weeds are being treated directly or in spots, rather than applying to the entire area.*

No large turf areas are sprayed.

Scheduling

Time of day:

- a. As early in the day as possible to avoid public use, high temperatures, and wind.
- b. Applications **shall** be timed to coincide with the ideal time for weed control. Typically, during the spring and fall months, where weed growth is most active.

Signage

Signage **shall** be used to inform park users approaching the area to be sprayed.

- a. Signage will include main entrances to the park scheduled to be sprayed, and in the targeted area to be sprayed.
- b. Signs **shall** be maintained for a minimum of 48 hours, and longer if the area sprayed is not completely dry.
- c. Signs used in the targeted area will include date, time, product used.

Draft 8/2/20

Drift

Minimizing drift is critical in application.

- a. Backpack sprayers are preferred. **No large, motorized sprayers will be used.**
- b. Applications shall cease if any drift inducing condition becomes apparent.
- c. Wind must be below 8 miles per hour as measured by a wind speed device.

Targeted Applications

Spot spraying for weeds will be employed.

- a. Applications **shall** be focused on the target weed only.

Use around Community Gardens

Garden plots produce edible crops that necessitate special constraints in managing weeds.

- a. No spraying within 25 feet from the outside perimeter of a Community Garden site.
- b. No use within the garden site.

Use around Playgrounds

The deep surface layers (wood chips for example) that serve as a safety cushion for falls also act as effective weed control and reduce the need for other active weed control measures within the border of the playground area.

- a. Herbicides will not be used to control vegetation within the defined border of play areas or their margins, **including the defined border of the play area.**
- b. Mulch/surface layers that have broken down over time and provide a medium for good weed growth **shall** be replaced or amended with fresh surfacing/chips.
- c. String trimmers will be used to control weeds around the perimeter/border of playgrounds. **No herbicides or pesticides will be used.**

Dog Parks

Ideally herbicide use **shall** be as infrequent as possible and take place when dogs and people are not present.

- a. When herbicides are to be used inside fenced off leash dog parks or along the interior or immediate exterior of their fence lines, **the dog park will be closed.**
- b. Closures shall be maintained until the reentry requirements as mandated on the product label have been satisfied.

Waterways

The sensitive nature of waterway habitat requires a buffer zone and managing drifts is important in these sensitive areas.

- a. Requires a buffer zone of 25 feet in width on the sides of a stream or other body of water.
- b. Measurement begins at the edge of the water line at the time of application.
- c. Spray applications **shall** not be applied when wind speed is above 5mph and wind activity would carry product toward, or deposit them upon, open water.
- d. No herbicides are used in any body of water, ponds or along streams.

Record Keeping

All regular application record keeping requirements will be adhered to for all applications.

This includes:

- Date and time intervals of the application
- Temperature and wind conditions
- Location of application
- Materials used, concentrations used, amount applied
- Applicator information

All herbicides are applied in a safe manner in compliance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. The City only uses herbicides that are legally registered by the EPA and applied in compliance with EPA regulations.



City of Sandy
39250 Pioneer Blvd.,
Sandy, OR 97055

Agenda Date: September 9, 2020

To: Parks and Trails Advisory Board

From: Sarah Richardson, Staff Liaison Parks and Trails Advisory Board

Subject: Invasive Weed Management in city parks

Attachments: Draft Invasive Weed Management Policy

Background:

Over the last year the Parks and Trails Advisory Board has discussed the cities use and policy for spraying herbicides in city parks. The board has received feedback and questions from concerned residents.

The board requested the Staff Liaison work with Parks Maintenance on a formal policy.

Policy would also serve to provide consistency in the application of the herbicides and assist with training.

The board has asked for a simple, yet specific policy that clearly communicates the cities use of herbicides.

In collaboration with the Park Superintendent a formal policy has been drafted for Council's consideration.

With ongoing concerns about the health effects from toxic chemicals and the long term effects upon humans, animals and the environment, the board would like to encourage the city to move toward additional measures to reduce and eliminate the need for the use of pesticides. Future park planning and budgeting can help reach this goal.

Attachments:

Proposed Pesticide Management Policy, City of Sandy

Recommendation:

The board recommends Council adopt the formal policy that communicates to the public what is used in city parks, and how the public is notified of areas to be sprayed.

Staff Contact:

Sarah Richardson
503-489-2150

srichardson@cityofsandy.com

