



# CITY OF TROUTDALE PARKS & FACILITIES

## AGENDA PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kellogg Community room  
234 SW Kendall Court  
Troutdale, OR 97060

May 15, 2024  
7:00 PM

The PAC meeting will be held in person in the Kellogg Room and will also be available as a Zoom meeting.

1. Roll Call
2. Review & Approve March Minutes
3. Communication from Staff
4. Presentation from Mollie King on current goings-on in Troutdale Recreation.
5. Review of 2024-25 Budget Approval process and its effects on planned Parks & Facilities improvements and projects in the coming year.
6. Discussion of the need to establish a small enclosed "dog rest area" at Glenn Otto Park, as well as a request from Marlee Boxler to allow leashed dogs at Mayor's Square and Depot Park to promote tourism, economic development, and City-sponsored events.
7. Committee Concerns and Initiatives, future agenda items, closing comments
8. Hold or cancel next month's meeting, Wednesday, June 19, 2024

This meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities.

A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities should be made in writing at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to Jona Jacobsen 503-674-7271 or by email to: [Jona.Jacobsen@Troutdaleoregon.gov](mailto:Jona.Jacobsen@Troutdaleoregon.gov)

**SUMMARY**  
**PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Kellogg Community Room**  
**March 27, 2024**

**Members Present:** Jeff Hutchinson - Chair, Zach Andrews, Shelly Reynolds, Victoria Rizzo, Robbie Cantrell, Jim Hill, Michelle Craver (Alternate)

**Members Absent:** Carol Allen - Vice Chair, Brenda Austin, Sherilee Winters

**Staff:** Jona Jacobsen, Parks and Facilities Superintendent

1. **Roll Call** – Jeff called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.
2. **Review and approve February Minutes** – The February 21, 2024, minutes were approved as presented. Sally Wright expressed concerns about the skate park on behalf of the Cherry Ridge Owners Association.
3. **Communication from Staff** – Jona updated on several activities, including the Earth Day event, and designs for the Sandy Riverfront Trail, and the Ch'akch'ak Trail grand opening.
4. **Continued discussion of 24/25 FY Parks budget allocations** – The PAC guidance framework would not be ready in time for the 24/25 Budget but would be for FY25/26. More Parks project ideas were wanted from the public.
5. **Detailed breakdown of current funding sources for the Beaver Creek Bridge replacement project (total amounts available from various City funds and grant awards)** – Jona updated on cost estimates and grant money and would pursue the possibility of a less expensive alternative location.
6. **Discussion of opportunity / improvement fund access & availability for use on PAC-approved Parks projects (NOT a "slush fund")** – Jeff and Victoria were encouraged to petition the Budget Committee for the fund on behalf of the PAC. Discussion regarded alternatives for improving community engagement and input on projects.
7. **Discussion of creation and implementation of a PAC guidance framework for future Parks budget items, as described in the 2023 Parks Master Plan** – Funds would come from the Capital Outlay section of the Parks budget. PAC members were invited to review the Parks Master Plan and create a list of their priorities.
8. **Committee Concerns and Initiatives, future agenda items, closing comments** – The PAC discussed the skate park, the possibility of more community gardens, Robbie's suggestion box idea, and citizens wanting a feature like a Troutdale mural as seen in other towns.
9. **Hold or cancel next month's meeting, Thursday April 18, 2024** – The meeting would be held on a Thursday because the room had been reserved for the Budget Committee on the PAC's usual meeting day.

**MINUTES  
PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Kellogg Community Room  
March 27, 2024**

**Members Present:** Jeff Hutchinson - Chair  
Zach Andrews  
Shelly Reynolds  
Victoria Rizzo  
Robbie Cantrell  
Jim Hill  
Michelle Craver (Alternate)

**Members Absent:** Carol Allen - Vice Chair  
Brenda Austin  
Sherilee Winters

**Staff:** Jona Jacobsen, Parks and Facilities Superintendent

**1. Roll Call:** Jeff called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

**2. Review and Approve February Minutes**

**Zach Andrews moved to approve the February 21, 2024, meeting minutes as presented. Robbie Cantrell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

Jeff called for public comment.

Sally Wright, President, Cherry Ridge Owners Association, provided copies of a letter addressed to the PAC outlining the Association's concerns relating to the skate park in progress in Columbia Park. The skate park was not on the agenda, but she wanted to get their concerns on record. Tonight was not the appropriate time to go into detail, but there were reasons why the Association had not been involved with the project to this point. Now that the project was on a fast track, they wanted to be involved with the decisions that would be made. The Association's letter outlined eight points that needed to be on the drawing board. Cherry Ridge borders Columbia Park on the west side. The development was also on the north side on Cherry Park Road. The skate park was something major that could have both positive and negative impacts.

Sally confirmed she represented a little over 200 homes in the Association and had no problem with the PAC presenting a portion of the letter or the entire letter to City Council. She had not provided the letter to City Council because did not know the protocol. She had copied Ray Young on the letter and would send it to him via email. She thanked the PAC for the dog park, adding it was wonderful most of the time.

**3. Communication from Staff**

Jona reported on Parks activities and events as follows:

- The Earth Day event was planned for April 20th at Columbia Park. Native plant nursery order lists were received in preparation for the event. Some volunteer planting would go on in some newly planted native plant beds at the event. He encouraged all the Cherry Ridge Homeowners Association (HOA) neighbors and the PAC members to participate. There would likely be live music and a table from Fred's Trees [08:18] and also a table representing the Backyard Habitat Certification Board which Ryan Largura, Environmental Specialist, had been working on. He confirmed he would talk to Ryan about the Earth Day event and attending a PAC meeting and would forward Robbie his contact info as requested.
- He noted the vegetation management programs had already begun for the year and updated on the maintenance for the tennis courts and basketball courts at Kiku and Llewellyn Parks. The courts were surface crack sealed, restriped, and deep pressure washed. Unfortunately, the surface at Helen Althaus was in rougher shape and would be more expensive to repair. He confirmed the surface was the top of the reservoir. Repairs would depend on how much was structural and how much aesthetic. The costs of the maintenance would likely be shared with the Public Works water budget because it was a reservoir and would likely be a 2025/26 budget item.
- He had met with a representative from the engineering and design firm working on the Sandy Riverfront Trail project. They sent along some preliminary plans, and he believed the final plans for the park were expected to be submitted this Friday and he was happy to share them with the PAC via email. The design firm was working on a series of mini parks that would be rustic in nature along the multiuse trail that would run along the Sandy Riverfront from Depot Park past the I-84 Bridge and tie into the 40-Mile Loop Trail. The mini parks would have a rough-hewn wood and stone feel with some interesting play features, water play features, and an amphitheater. One park designed for really little kids would have some reading and storytelling nest play structure features and a large meadow that would be seeded with Columbia Gorge wildflowers. The most optimistic timeline would have the site being prepped later this fall.
- He confirmed to his knowledge the grand opening for the Ch'akch'ak Trail of the 40-Mile Loop was still scheduled for June 17th, noting it was not organized by the City but by the other agencies involved in the trail. He would like the PAC to partner with them and if nothing else, attend the event.

#### **4. Continued discussion of 24/25 FY Parks budget allocations**

Jona asked if the PAC had any follow-up questions or wanted additional details about any of the projects talked about at the last meeting related to the Parks budget. The Budget Committee meetings in April were quickly approaching when the final 24/25 Fiscal Year would be reviewed, adjusted, and approved.

Zach said did not believe the PAC would be able to successfully implement the guidance framework to oversee the year's projects without being involved in the preliminary stage with Public Works. It would probably be best for the PAC to continue to be involved in the conversations before presenting it to the Budget Committee. Each PAC member could have a list of projects to put forward during the year and see how they fit in. Staff had more insight into how projects intertwined with bigger ones. For example, the Depot Park bike hub was not a high priority for the general public responding to the survey, but because the trail would be completed and continue the part along the path, it would have to end somewhere properly. Marlee was

talking about it at the Town Center Advisory Board (TCAB) meeting. It made sense for the bike hub to also fit in at that time.

Jona agreed the PAC was running up against the deadline for the current fiscal year, but that presented an opportunity for the maximum amount of time to address the matter which tied into the later agenda item about the PAC's ranking system to evaluate Parks and Facilities budget items. It could be a rolling agenda item in the coming year as the PAC and Jona developed the priority system together and had it ready to roll out for FY25/26.

Jona clarified that ideas for budget allocations could be discussed and compiled throughout the year at any point. The process with the City's budget was to begin working on budget worksheets in the new calendar year. Internally there were usually deadlines in February at some point where the worksheets go to City management for review and fine-tuning. He did not present anything to the Budget Committee himself. The entire budget would be presented by Finance Director Erich Mueller at the April Budget Committee meeting. The budget was for the fiscal calendar year from July 1st through June 30th.

Zach said the discussion tied into Beaver Creek Bridge because he and a few other PAC members did not believe the \$250,000 budgeted for permitting the bridge was the best use of funds if the permits had a time limit, since the rest of the cost was currently out of reach. It might be better to reallocate those funds for more immediate use, especially if the permitting costs were more static. Jona explained there might be some misunderstanding around the matter. He had spoken in depth with Public Works Engineer Scott Waddell who presented to the PAC in December. The total funding package consisted of what was already available and also what was not yet 100 percent secured for the bridge. What was reflected in the budget for permitting was not the actual expenditure or the forecasted expenditure. He would address that in the next agenda item.

Jim asked if there were any other mechanisms than the PAC and the survey for residents to propose ideas, such as a website. Jona said that was a good idea. Jim added that maybe people do not know they can attend this meeting. Jona noted he recommended a budget allocation for an improvement to Imagination Station from an idea that a member of the public presented to the PAC, the sun sails, which was a perfect example of ideas from the public being implemented.

#### **5. Detailed breakdown of current funding sources for the Beaver Creek Bridge replacement project (total amounts available from various City funds and grant awards)**

Jona summarized information about funding for the Beaver Creek Bridge he had gathered from Scott Waddell and City Manager Ray Young:

- The cost to replace the bridge had ballooned due to many factors including increased costs through the pandemic.
- The pause on the work done in 2020 and 2021 also affected the permits the City had for previous design of the bridge.
- Currently, the City was looking at around \$750,000 for the total cost of the bridge. The bridge itself could cost \$700,000, perhaps less, and while \$200,000 was budgeted for permitting, that was just a rough estimate.

- The original permit that ran from 2017 to 2021 and then was extended was about to expire, and the City spent \$60,000 to \$70,000 on the permit out of the \$200,000. The problem with the permit was the designs the permit was issued for were not complete designs. They did not factor in some of the other issues with seismic and FEMA, etc.
- The final design cost in 2019 was \$650,000. Scott forecasted around \$80,000 for new permitting for a new design, not \$200,000. He did not know why there was a discrepancy in the figures.
- From the General Fund, the City was looking at \$200,000 to \$400,000 for the bridge. The rest would mostly come from one grant, a travel and recreation grant from the Metro Bond. One of the City's grant writers and Ray Young were meeting with Metro in the coming weeks to finalize the requirements to allocate \$400,000 of the Bond for the Beaver Creek Bridge. There was \$150,000 already approved from Oregon State Parks for the bridge. In total that was \$550,000 of grant money.
- Scott had also reminded that the previous 2019 estimate and the current estimate could be higher than bids received during the request for proposals (RFP) process because the initial estimates came from one design group and construction contractor. A project with such a price tag must go through competitive bidding and competition might bring the numbers down.

Zach asked if it was the same bid that also quoted \$1.2 million for the new price. Jona believed it was, adding there was a kind of leading thing happening with the contractor. Zach asked if the PAC would be involved in the process, similar to TCAB and the request for qualifications (RFQs) for the confluence site as far as looking over the proposals, etc. Jona believed so, adding he would report any developments to the PAC monthly. Being the number one issue for the PAC.

Jeff noted the \$60,000 to \$70,000 spent a few years ago was for a geologic survey, which he guessed was done at the old bridge site. Scott mentioned that one reason the bridge was so expensive was it had to be above the flood level, which would require the bridge to be three or four times longer than the other bridge. He noted Jona's inquiry about seeing if there was narrower place in the canyon where the bridge could be a third or half the size of what was proposed. The old bridge might not be the ideal location, and now that the weather was more agreeable, and they could see if there were a location to join the trails and not have the long length and high expense.

Jona confirmed another geotech analysis would be needed if the bridge location changed, and that he would follow up with Jeff via email about whether another analysis would be needed anyway when the survey expired. He noted the location he observed may not be ideal either, but it raised the question about other unexplored options to consider. He would bring it to Scott's attention, as well as his email exchange with Jeff. Perhaps the geographical information system (GIS) analyst could hone in on any locations that looked good before Scott looked, too.

#### **6. Discussion of opportunity / improvement fund access & availability for use on PAC-approved Parks projects (NOT a "slush fund")**

Jona noted it was a bit of a departure from normal protocols to have a citizens committee empowered to spend public money in such a way as proposed for PAC-approved Parks projects. With the right standard operating procedure built in, any ideas to use the fund on a project would

need to go to a vote at the PAC, be voted for by a majority of Committee members, and then probably require approval by Staff and/or City Council. Neither Staff nor City management were opposed to the idea.

- Looking where the opportunity/improvement fund might live in the budget, his first inclination was the Parks Opportunity Fund, Fund 16-00, but that fund had restrictions that would not make it easy to access in the way the PAC was intending. If Jeff and Victoria supported this PAC fund, he encouraged them as Budget Committee members representing the PAC to petition the Budget Committee in April and ask for a special department expense within the Parks Budget 01-85, specific allocation 01-85-8211.
- At this point in the budget crafting stage, Jeff would probably get more traction requesting it himself than Jona asking for a last-minute addition that may or may not be approved by the Budget Committee. He asked if the PAC had a few examples of how the money would be spent, noting Robbie had mentioned parks improvement projects and public art or sculptures like kinetic art.

Zach said he loved the idea and wanted to be sure to have more community involvement, perhaps partnering with CAC. The complaint he heard most was people not knowing about projects, not knowing how to get involved, not knowing there was a survey, etc. He suggested sending out a blast: "If you're going to come to any Parks meeting, come to this one because you can throw your ideas out there and we will see where we are as far as being able to take on projects."

Jona confirmed the Parks Department would have a table this year at First Fridays. People digest information in different ways. When Parks wanted something to get out, they put it in the Troutdale Champion and on social media. Flyers could also be posted at the parks or announcements on the bulletin boards at the Glenn Otto and Columbia Parks.

Zach said the PAC could come up with ideas and maybe do a poll of what is the most popular option and then have a space next year.

Jona said when announced the flushing program, Public Works used A-frame signs with a QR code that went straight to the City website with more information. Parks could do the same for any announcements in the future, such as construction projects. Victoria added it was hard to get people out.

Robbie noted typically during community outreach the public was asked to view something on a phone or another mobile device, which may be a hindrance. Maybe the PAC was overthinking the matter. On sunny days, there were so many people in Sunrise Park. He suggested the PAC place a suggestion box at the entrance of the park, which would not cost much and could be approved to be paid by the Parks Opportunity Fund. The PAC would be accessing people through the means by which they were accessing the PAC. When people spend time in the parks, they do not want to pull out their phones and scan a QR code. Also, many people in the city and in the parks are from the older generation and might not even have their phones with them. He believed there were too many steps to get the public involved, so a grass roots method like a suggestion box might help. Jona liked the idea, adding that using mixed media would reach different demographics of people. He noted the inverse was also true; not a lot of young people read the Champion.

Shelly believed being visible to the public at a First Friday table was wonderful, but it would take commitment from all Committee members, not just one or two. Just standing there and handing out flyers provided virtually no visibility to the parks, so the PAC must do something to pull the public in, such as asking specific questions on a whiteboard to get their interest and she provided some examples. Otherwise, the table at First Friday would not be as visible as the PAC would like. Shelly and Robbie offered to help at First Friday.

Jeff said he liked the idea of suggestion boxes at the park, especially because the PAC wanted comments from people who use the parks. People who see announcements in the Champion or at a First Friday table may not even go to the parks.

Shelly noted that was a good point, but her biggest concern was vandalism and how long the boxes would last; the one in Llewellyn Park had been repaired three times. She recommended a suggestion box at First Friday, too. Jeff noted pen and paper would be provided at the box, with the slot on the box only thin enough for paper. Robbie said to give the community some credit because the library box at Sunrise Park was always stacked with books and a more tempting target for kids to hit with baseball bats but they had not.

Robbie envisioned a suggestion box being at the park entrance or by the parking lot. Jona liked the face-to-face engagement of the table at First Fridays. The PAC would have to sift through the comments received to find genuine suggestions as jokes and mean comments were part of having a suggestion box, but it was a good way to get people engaged in the moment, when they were walking through the park thinking about needs or ideas.

Jona noted the shade at Sunrise Park was controversial, as some homeowners did not want their view blocked.

Jeff shared his conversation with the owner of the RV-style garage adjacent to Sunrise Park, noting the garage helped clean up the property. Jona added the gentleman provided the power and water for the community gardens and was very involved in the community garden project.

Michelle said the idea of having a table and some type of engagement at First Fridays was an excellent idea. Maybe the PAC could do something to showcase the 40-Mile Loop grand opening which was right around the corner.

## **7. Discussion of creation and implementation of a PAC guidance framework for future Parks budget items, as described in the 2023 Parks Master Plan**

Jona thanked Zach for bringing the matter to the PAC's attention, noting it was not a part of the Parks Master Plan that he had considered beyond his initial reading of it. This was an excellent time to begin the discussion which would likely continue throughout the year, potentially involving other stakeholders, members of the public, and Staff. He asked for preliminary ideas about how the framework could work.

Zach said the PAC had gone into some of the budget details previously, but it might be helpful to overview how the Parks budget stood currently for the year to help the PAC better understand the general process for coming up with the items that Jona would go through.

Jona read Goal 7.6 in the Parks Master Plan, "Create a priority system for the Parks Advisory Committee to evaluate new and improved park facilities," which he assumed also meant features

or amenities, "that considers available funding sources as recommended in the Parks Master Plan." The Capital Outlay section of the Parks Budget discussed available sources of funding, including grants and bonds. It would be important to not only focus on the Capital Outlay projects sections, but to keep in mind there were other static parts of the Parks operating budget that the PAC would not be heavily involved in. He certainly believed the PAC should discuss projects, planning development, or major changes in the parks throughout the year. He would bring ideas about things he would like to put in the Capital Outlay section for the following year's budget before the PAC before working on the budget. It was also important to invite other members of Staff who could speak of the non-General Fund sources of funding, such as grant writer Bill Peterson, Public Works Director Travis Hultin, and probably Ray Young. Zach said he would love to talk with grant writers and commend them for their hard work.

Jona confirmed he basically put together his list of projects to initially present to the PAC in the winter. For the first two months of the new year, he worked on the budget. Any amount of work he can do on it before then would save him headaches.

Zach suggested that in November, PAC members could bring their top three things to focus on for the next year to formalize the process of what the PAC would want to work on. Once that list was established, maybe then the PAC could meet with the grant writing team or Ray Young to see what out of the PAC's list could be a reality. Then the PAC could revisit the list again in January before Jona would send the list off. Jona suggested doing that work in January and February given the potential for meetings to get cancelled in the winter. He would feel great knowing any Capital Outlay Parks projects he was planning had been pre-vetted by the PAC.

Shelly suggested reviewing the Parks Master Plan, which was a fairly convoluted, and pulling out and summarizing some specific things listed in the Plan. With such a list, the PAC could prioritize and determine project costs and what might be a good year to do the projects. The Committee could be progressive about tackling some of the tasks and accomplishing the Plan in a more direct and assertive way as opposed to just letting the document sit while the PAC takes on one project here and there. Jeff, Zach, and Jona liked the idea. Jona said he would review the Plan and invited other members to review it as well. Shelly said she would love to see people who did not help write the Master Plan, take a look at it and give their perspective.

Jona recommended that as the PAC moved into future agenda items, perhaps reviewing the Master Plan should be a rolling agenda item to be covered at the next few meetings; Jeff agreed.

## **8. Committee Concerns and Initiatives, future agenda items, closing comments**

Shelly said she wanted to make Sally Wright's letter an agenda item to try to find ways to mitigate the concerns without eliminating the skate park or figuring out if the skate park needed to be reevaluated as an option. Jona believed the City was looking at finalizing a contract by the end of April, so now was an excellent time to speak up about the skate park. Sally said she would be happy to participate.

Jona explained in the very early mock-up he had seen, the skate park would take up the entire top of the field in the corner near the school entrance and Cherry Park Road, but not extend directly to the property line on the west side of the field. The project would change in later versions of the design, but probably three-quarters of the top of the field from east to west would be for the skate park. He did not know the distance from the western edge of the skate park to the closest

house, but he would look into it. The only things that had been done were an existing conditions survey of the site and geotechnical analysis of the ground.

Shelly said for expediency, she encouraged Sally Wright and anyone else to attend a City Council to bring their concerns up when public comment was open. She confirmed they could address their concerns even if the skate park was not on the City Council's meeting agenda. She thanked Sally for coming.

Victoria understood the skate park would come right up near Cherry Park Road so it would be seen. Jona acknowledged it would be seen, adding some sort of barrier fence or hedgerow would be needed to keep people and skateboards from going into the road. He would follow up in an email to Sally when he had more information about the design.

Jona confirmed the gentleman who lived next door to Sunrise Park was fundamental in the creation of the gardens. He did not know if the man still provided water and power, but there was a period of time when the gardens were being established that the man was essentially donating utilities to help the gardens. He did not know if there was a source of Troutdale-provided power and water at the community gardens. Debra Ann McAllister who worked at City Hall managed the program. [1:10:10]

Robbie said if the utilities were still being provided by the man next door and the gardens did not have a source of power and water provided by the City, he would like to discuss the possibility of the man revoking the access. He would not want the operation of the community gardens halted. It was interesting Troutdale had only one space for community gardens. Even though the gardens were not overseen by the PAC, the Committee could play a part. There were many opportunities to have community gardens, such as at the park with the basketball courts or near apartments. He suggested establishing another community garden to provide more opportunity throughout the rest of Troutdale and also securely have one that is wholly provided by the City. He asked Jona to do some fact-finding around the community gardens, who had direct oversight over them, how power and water was provided, etc. and add the discussion as a future agenda item.

Jona did not believe the gardens required power most of the time; the man provided power during the construction phase. Sunrise Park now had a City-owned water line to the butterfly garden, and an irrigation drip line would be installed there.

Robbie said he would like to take ownership of the suggestion box idea, putting together ideas and coming up with possible locations and costs so if the PAC sent Jona to a Budget meeting to request the Opportunity Fund, he could talk about concrete ways to implement the idea and provide the community a way to become more engaged. He would follow up with Jona over email.

Jona confirmed a representative from VetREST had presented in the past to the PAC about veteran victory gardens, but the project died during the transition from the former Parks Superintendent. He could reach out to the man again to see if the project could be revived. Jona believed the garden was geared more toward horticultural therapy and working with veterans' groups. He was not sure if the gardens would be available to folks in the apartments near Woodale Park or if the project would have been geared more towards veterans' groups specifically.

Zach passed on feedback from community members that people had noticed other towns like Sisters have features like a mural with the town's sign on it that people can take pictures in front of, so maybe the PAC could look into a mural at a park or somewhere widely used. He thanked everyone for their time and dedication.

Jeff asked all the Committee members to look at the Parks Master Plan and jot down some of their priorities. Maybe at next month's meeting, the Committee could review the priorities and rank them in order of priority. He said Shelly made a good point to suggest summarizing the Master Plan and getting the bullet points on a single piece of paper. The PAC could always refer back to the Plan for more detailed information. It would be good to see what the priorities are, especially for the new members, and also the PAC members' input on what they had seen in the Plan. Shelly added it would also be nice to note the PAC's accomplishments such as the dog park. Jeff believed things that are mid-range or lower priority tended to be forgotten. Shelly added especially the maintenance bulletins. Jona said he needed to review and reference the bulletins probably on a monthly if not weekly basis.

Victoria believed the City did have water at the community gardens, but not power. She noted there was a beautiful mural downtown in Mayors Square.

Shelly asked for information on how many plots were rented every year in the community gardens. Jona said the plots were in high demand when they became available. Shelly said any kind of waiting list the City might have would be interesting information as well. Robbie said the PAC could even conduct outreach with people interested in the plots and ask how far they would be willing to go to access community gardens. Shelly agreed there were a couple of parks that had room for community gardens. Jeff noted a couple years ago, the PAC had the kids come in and discuss the Woodale project, but he was not sure if public water was available there. Jona replied the irrigation at Woodale Park had been decommissioned.

Zach recommended the suggestion box at Sunrise Park go next to the library box near the man's house with security cameras. Jona noted a neighbor at the top of the hill had advanced security cameras as well; the City did not have any cameras there.

**9. Hold or cancel next month's meeting, Thursday, April 18, 2024**

Jona said another committee had booked the room, so the April PAC meeting would have to be held on a Thursday, April 18th. He confirmed it was a one-time thing, adding he believed it was the Budget Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff Hutchinson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Attest:  
\_\_\_\_\_