



**Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors**

A regular meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held on Monday, February 2, 2015, at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton. Executive Session 5:45 pm; Regular Meeting 7 pm.

Present:

John Griffiths	President/Director
Bob Scott	Secretary/Director
Jerry Jones Jr.	Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
Joseph Blowers	Director
Larry Pelatt	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

Agenda Item #1 – Executive Session (A) Legal (B) Land

President Griffiths called executive session to order for the following purposes:

- To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed,
- To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection, and
- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

Executive session is held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e)(f) & (h), which allows the board to meet in executive session to discuss the aforementioned issues.

President Griffiths noted that representatives of the news media and designated staff may attend the executive session. All other members of the audience were asked to leave the room. Representatives of the news media were specifically directed not to disclose information discussed during executive session. No final action or final decision may be made in executive session. At the end of executive session, the board will return to open session and welcome the audience back into the room.

Agenda Item #2 – Call Regular Meeting to Order

President Griffiths called the regular meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

Joe Blowers moved that the board of directors include an additional negotiation point as described and approved at the January 13, 2015 executive session to authorize staff to work with district legal counsel to determine the appropriate legal instrument to limit uses to only those consistent with park development activities on the balance of the future park site in the southeast quadrant of the district. Jerry Jones Jr. seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Bob Scott **Yes**
Larry Pelatt **No**
Jerry Jones Jr. **Yes**
Joe Blowers **Yes**
John Griffiths **Yes**

The motion PASSED by MAJORITY vote.

Agenda Item #4 – Bonny Slope West (Area 93) Update

Aisha Willits, director of Planning, introduced Washington County Principal Planner Theresa Cherniak and Senior Planner Suzanne Savin to make a presentation to the board of directors on the conceptual planning process for Bonny Slope West, a 160-acre group of properties formerly known as Area 93. The area was previously served by Multnomah County, but through a legislative act, became part of Washington County as of January 1, 2014. Multnomah County had started the conceptual planning process for urbanization of the area, but was unable to adopt a plan due to service provision and governance issues.

Theresa and Suzanne provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation regarding the current conceptual planning process for the Bonny Slope West area, a copy of which was entered into the record, and included the following information:

- Geographical and historical information regarding the urbanization planning efforts for the area, including current residential development status and future rezoning considerations.
- Proposed areas for neighborhood park locations (for a total of one to two sites, each 1.5 to 2 acres in size), trail routes, and a pedestrian/bicycle bridge spanning the creek to link the northern and southern neighborhoods.
- Potential funding sources, including district System Development Charge (SDC) funds and opportunities for cost-sharing specific improvements, such as the bridge (estimated cost around \$2 million).

Theresa and Suzanne offered to answer any questions the board may have.

Joe Blowers commented on the potential for the majority of the parkland within the area to be natural area acreage versus active-use. He asked for additional information regarding the existing parkland shown on the map adjacent to, but outside of, Bonny Slope West's northwestern boundary.

- ✓ Aisha replied that this is a district-owned, undeveloped park site, of which a significant portion is encumbered by wetland, although there may be a segment that could function as active-use. She noted that there is another future neighborhood park site across from Findley Elementary School that, although not within the Bonny Slope West area's boundaries, would be able to serve some of its residents.

Joe asked if that particular site falls within the desired half-mile service area radius.

- ✓ Aisha replied that it does not; however, she referenced the Parks Functional Plan currently in development that will help the district explore how to better measure service levels based on overall amenities provided in an area versus distance-related measurements. Even with a change in the service level analysis method used, there will be an acknowledged need for additional service near the eastern boundary of the area.

Joe noted that, when taking this information into consideration, the identified neighborhood park areas to the north and east would seem to make the most sense in meeting service level needs.

- ✓ Aisha agreed that focusing on those areas would be in line with the most recent level of service analysis.

Larry Pelatt inquired whether the district would still be expected to construct a pedestrian/bicycle bridge if there was no park located to the north of the creek.

- ✓ Joe commented that the residents north of the creek would likely want access to the parks and trail located to the south, as well as a walking route for school children.

Larry theorized that if the bridge is being utilized for purposes other than recreational, that the district should receive some funding from other agencies for its construction.

President Griffiths commented that the need for greenspace will be more apparent in the areas zoned R-9. In addition, he does not believe funding the pedestrian/bicycle bridge should be the sole responsibility of the district, as it will serve a transportation function, as well. Lastly, he suggested that consideration be given to matching the boundaries of the proposed neighborhood parks to the creek, noting that the parkland would then encompass not only neighborhood park amenities, but also the trail corridor and natural area.

Jerry Jones Jr. stated that while he likes the overall conceptual plan, he is concerned about the funding shortage between the amount of SDCs expected to be generated from the area versus the estimated costs of the proposed improvements. He expressed agreement with John's comment that the district should not be expected to fund the entire cost of the bridge, noting that it is a significant cost and that it will need to be determined which other local agencies benefit from the bridge and should be contributing to its cost.

- ✓ Suzanne noted Tualatin Valley Water District's potential interest in running a waterline under the bridge, although they have not expressed an interest in cost sharing.
- ✓ Larry commented on the cost effectiveness of running a waterline under the bridge rather than via boring.

Jerry asked what would bind the district to purchasing parkland in the designated areas, and referenced the process the district has been involved in purchasing parkland in the North Bethany area. He asked if the district would be required to purchase parks in the identified areas, such as with North Bethany, or if there would be some flexibility.

- ✓ Suzanne replied that this has not yet been determined. She noted that while the county is familiar with the process used for North Bethany, the other method that has been used in the past was not designating any areas at all for parkland, which presented its own challenges. She offered that at least with the North Bethany method, the developers know that they need to speak with the district before they get too far along in their development plans.

Jerry agreed that there are some benefits, but that it can also be a double-edged sword in that the district is forced to purchase properties in particular areas that may be highly-developable, and therefore more expensive, or are not the right area for other reasons. He suggested the district and county continue the discussion on how to evolve away from such rigid requirements of forcing the district to purchase in specific areas.

- ✓ Theresa commented that her sense is that the current process for Bonny Slope West would not preclude the district from purchasing property in another area, but would give the developers notice that specific areas are under consideration as possible parkland. Upon exploring the Bonny Slope West area for potential park sites, the county used criteria provided to them by district staff, which included flatter land adjacent to the creek with access to the proposed trail route. The potential parkland areas that have been identified fit those criteria better than some of the other areas that were looked at. However, if the district found land in a different area that it desired to purchase, she does not believe that this would preclude the district from doing so.

President Griffiths asked what community park would serve this area.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke replied that the Teufel property would serve the area once it is developed.

President Griffiths thanked Washington County staff on behalf of the board for the informative presentation, noting that they appreciate being provided an opportunity to comment this early in the process.

Agenda Item #5 – Board Time

Earl Egan, 9015 SW Jameson Road, Portland, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the district's recent elimination of the 20-punch pass for fitness and aquatic programs. He stated that he has lived in the district since 1977 and is grateful for the services provided; however, he objects to the discontinuation of the 20-punch pass, which has been replaced by the deluxe pass. Although the price per visit based on his normal usage is about the same for each method, the main difference is that he would still be charged if he is unable to attend his regular class due to illness or other obligations under the rules of the deluxe pass. He requested that the district reinstate the 20-punch pass.

- ✓ Jim McElhinny, director of Park & Recreation Services, replied that, as with any new program or fee change, the district evaluates how the change has been received by its patrons. District staff is currently evaluating how the 20-punch pass can be reincorporated based on feedback received similar to the testimony this evening.

Neil Soiffer, 9215 NW Lovejoy Street, Portland, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the district's practice of not applying the senior discount to non-primetime rates at the Tennis Center. He stated that he has lived in the district for 30 years, noting that he regularly uses the Tennis Center during non-primetime hours, for which the rates are reduced in order to encourage more participation during the low-use times of day. However, the senior discount is no longer being offered for those rates, although there is no such limitation noted within the district's policy. He explained that while there is a policy statement prohibiting patrons from receiving a double discount, it pertains to those who would qualify for a senior and military discount, or other such example. There is no statement contained within that precludes the previous practice of providing a discount on non-primetime rates. He elaborated that without the senior discount, there is no incentive for seniors to play during non-primetime hours since when the senior discount is applied to prime-time rates, it equals that of the non-primetime rates. He theorized that offering the senior discount to non-primetime rates would likely be revenue neutral as the small amount of revenue lost would be balanced by the greater number of courts being booked during low-use hours. In addition, it would facilitate greater use of the district's facilities to the benefit of both seniors and non-seniors alike without any cost to the district. He urged the board to instruct staff to reinstate the senior discount for non-primetime hours.

- ✓ Jim McElhinny, director of Park & Recreation Services, replied that while the district does not have a final policy yet in place, the testimony this evening is accurate in that only one discount or pricing adjustment should be applied to each fee. The language in the draft policy that the board reviewed in November was not as clear on those pricing adjustments as needed. The intent will be to bring the draft policy back to the board for review and clarification later this spring when the board is asked to approve the Comprehensive Fee Policy update.
- ✓ Discussion occurred between board members and Mr. Soiffer regarding the continuation of the current practice of denying a senior discount to non-primetime rates until it comes to the board for review in the spring, with the conclusion that staff would make an effort to inform Mr. Soiffer when the policy is back in front of the board for review.

Annalee Lander, 14075 SW Maverick Court, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the proposed rezoning of the district's Cobb property, located at Murray Boulevard and Sexton Mountain Drive. She referenced the district's Natural Resources Functional Plan, noting that the plan calls for public input, public support, natural resources assessment, and an environmental impact assessment. She expressed concern regarding the

lack of public process for the rezoning request, as well as the district not having completed any due diligence, including any environmental assessment or impact report for the property. She described the diverse wildlife that has been seen on the property, which serves as an extension to the Hyland Woods Natural Area corridor, including indigenous species listed as fragile, threatened or endangered. She expressed concern regarding the impact development of the property would have on that wildlife. She stated that the public trusted the district with its money in 2010 when the district purchased the property and in order to maintain that trust she requested that the district first complete an environmental impact study on what will happen to the wildlife on the property should the development move forward as planned.

William Comer, 8350 SW Sexton Mountain Court, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the proposed rezoning of the district's Cobb property, located at Murray Boulevard and Sexton Mountain Drive. He stated that he has lived in the district since 1975 and has used the services provided extensively, along with members of his family. He commented that the district's website, as well as the 2010 press release by the district announcing the purchase of the Cobb property, stated that the entire 8.6-acre site would become a park and that the property to the south owned by City of Beaverton could potentially be added in the future as parkland, too. He expressed concern regarding the lack of public notice regarding the proposed rezoning, as well as no notice on the district's website to this day. Although he supports the mission of Bridge Meadows, he does not believe that the development should come at the expense of a park and believes that a better property could be found in the Beaverton area for the development. He noted that residents from the surrounding neighborhood plan on attending the upcoming City of Beaverton Planning Committee meeting, as well as the City Council meeting, in order to provide more testimony on this topic.

Joseph Marietta, 8445 SW Maverick Place, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the proposed rezoning of the district's Cobb property, located at Murray Boulevard and Sexton Mountain Drive. He described that his backyard is directly adjacent to the Cobb property and that when he was considering the purchase of his home a few years ago, he first called the district to inquire of its plans for the Cobb property. He was told that the property would be a park, with no mention of a potential for development. He echoed previous testimony regarding the district's press release announcing the purchase of the property and current website information, noting that this issue is affecting the trust the public has for the district. He described the traffic impact that additional development would have on the area and stated that he and a group of neighbors have gathered over 300 signatures of fellow neighbors that agree with the stated concerns. Lastly, he expressed agreement with earlier testimony regarding the detrimental effect a development would have on the wildlife seen on the property and referenced the district's own materials noting that the property is unique and that it is difficult to find comparable property in the Beaverton area. He urged the district to keep it that way.

Greg Cody, 13953 SW Barlow Place, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the proposed rezoning of the district's Cobb property, located at Murray Boulevard and Sexton Mountain Drive. He expressed agreement with the previous testimony regarding the area having plentiful wildlife, noting that Hyland Woods Natural Area is across the street from the Cobb property, as is Sexton Mountain Park. While he agrees that the area is full of diverse wildlife, he also believes the area is in need of additional active recreation facilities for sports. He described that the property to the south of the Cobb property owned by the City of Beaverton would be able to facilitate a new sports field well due to its topography. He expressed the need for more sports facilities for middle school-aged children in particular, noting that as the area becomes denser, the need for more active recreation and sports fields becomes even greater.

President Griffiths opened the floor for comments from the board regarding the Cobb property. Jerry Jones Jr. stated that he will continue to keep an open mind and consider all of the input received on the topic, including from the neighborhood, district staff, City of Beaverton, and Bridge Meadows. However, he will also consider the district's mission for the entire community when formulating his decision on the subject. He supports moving forward in the discussions with the city because the result could be a park with the highest and best use of the land, with both a natural area component and active use, which he believes could be the best use of the property for the community as a whole. Although he acknowledges that this is a difficult decision due to the proximity of the neighbors, the needs of the entire community need to be considered. He clarified that any funds received for the sale of a portion of the Cobb property would be returned to the 2008 Bond Measure fund in order to purchase additional property and expressed the need for the district to be as transparent as possible through that process. Lastly, he expressed the need for the communications to the public from the district and the city to be aligned and correct, noting that he has seen firsthand the conflicting information that has been presented to the public on this topic.

Joe Blowers apologized to the public for any miscommunication and offered assurance that the district would attempt to do a better job in the future, noting that part of the difficulty is in having multiple government entities involved, each with their own public notice requirements and practices. He offered a historical perspective on the purchase of the Cobb property, noting that at the time of purchase, it was acknowledged that the property is much larger than the size of a typical neighborhood park and that even with the proposed Bridge Meadows development, the site would still be one of the largest neighborhood parks in the district.

Bob Scott expressed agreement with Jerry and Joe's comments, noting that he serves as the board liaison on the district's Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee. The committee has been well-aware that a portion of the Cobb property could be sold, and that although the district would not actively seek to sell the property, a time may come where an opportunity presents itself for consideration.

Larry Pelatt explained that the district did not actively seek an opportunity to sell a portion of the Cobb property. Rather, the City of Beaverton approached the district with this idea, which he feels would help integrate another aspect into the Beaverton community. He also apologized for the lack of communication, noting that he feels that the more people that are engaged in this process, the better. He also pointed out that having use of the City of Beaverton property to the south of the Cobb property would bring the total acreage for the site back up to 8.6 acres, which is the same acreage as the property is now and is land that could facilitate a more active use element. He encouraged the public to stay engaged through this process, noting that public input will only benefit the end result.

President Griffiths agreed with Larry's comments that the district was approached by the City of Beaverton regarding this proposal from the standpoint that the district had over-purchased the amount of land needed for a neighborhood park. Generally, he feels that there is no such thing as owning too much land; however, he supports the concept because it enhances the district's mission and furthers the mission in a way that the existing property under its current boundaries does not. The benefits to the district of the proposal include the city purchasing the portion of property at today's dollars, which is more than what was paid, and with which the district can then acquire other property. The district would also acquire an easement for the city's property to the south, in addition to the city agreeing to fill the hole on the property to a level surface on which the district could facilitate active use recreation. In order for the district to turn the existing Cobb property into land suitable for active use or sports fields, it would easily cost over a million dollars. This easement would also enable a connection to Wildwood Park. Lastly, the significant

trees located primarily on the western portion of the Cobb property would be preserved. President Griffiths concluded that the city's proposal would result in better, more usable land for the district, the same amount of acreage as originally purchased, as well as additional land acquisition funds and no need to allocate future funding to grading the existing Cobb property site for active use improvements. For these reasons, he believes that the proposal is in the best interest of the district. The district has not had a public outreach process on this topic because it is not the district's development; it is the city's development. He reiterated that the district is not acting opportunistically in this situation, but is solely interested in provided a better park, better topography, and more public funds for roughly the same amount of land as originally purchased.

Agenda Item #6 – Board Time

There were no comments during board time.

Agenda Item #7 – Consent Agenda

Joe Blowers moved that the board of directors approve consent agenda items (A) Minutes of January 13, 2015 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Resolution Appointing Audit Committee Members, and (E) Resolution Reappointing Stuhr Center Advisory Committee Members. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Larry Pelatt	Yes
Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #7 – Unfinished Business

A. Bond Update

Aisha Willits, director of Planning, provided an overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet regarding implementation of the bond program via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, showing photos of projects currently under construction. Aisha referenced the detailed overview of the budget status of the three remaining large bond projects (Southwest Quadrant Community Park, Somerset West Park, and Cedar Hills Park) that was provided at the November 2014 board meeting, noting that not much has changed regarding the projects' budgets since that presentation. Aisha offered to answer any questions the board may have.

- ✓ Hearing no comments or questions, President Griffiths requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

B. Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 – Sponsorships/Naming of District Property/Memorials

Geoff Roach, director of Community Partnerships, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet regarding proposed amendments to District Compiled Policies (DCP) Chapter 8, District Property, and specifically to the district's policies and procedures for naming of district properties, sponsorships, and memorials and tributes. With the adoption of the district's Comprehensive Plan Update in late 2013, the recommendation was made that the district evaluate certain policies and practices in order to either control costs or increase participation and cost recovery. The initial presentation to the board on the topic of naming of district properties, sponsorships, and memorials and tributes occurred at the September 22, 2014 regular board meeting.

Geoff noted that the three policies relate to each other because the application of all determines how a vast majority of other names (of people, of organizations, and of businesses) relate to THPRD and appear side by side with our name on district properties. Formal naming is one end of the continuum that should be carefully considered acts with the decision making held at the highest levels of the organization, the board of directors and general manager. On the other end of the continuum is memorials and tributes, which is an accommodation that the district would like to continue to offer its citizens, but done so thoughtfully in order to ensure that the placement of such features neither detracts from the overall visitor experience nor adds substantial impacts to the district's maintenance and management burden. In between are sponsorships, which simply afford a negotiation between the district and a potential sponsor that assures the sponsor a right to temporarily receive recognition of its brand, logo and/or name through placement at THPRD, and secures resources for THPRD, primarily cash and in-kind services, to build and operate the district. Geoff provided an overview of the recommended amendments to DCP Chapter 8, as well as the draft procedures that would implement each of the policies, and offered to answer any questions the board may have.

Jerry Jones Jr. asked for an overview of the different approval levels recommended for the three policies.

- ✓ Geoff replied that all naming requests would be approved by the board of directors and/or general manager. Any sponsorships with a value of \$150,000 or greater would be approved by the board. Sponsorships under that threshold would be approved by various levels of staff based on the value of the sponsorship, from the general manager down. Memorials and tributes would be approved by staff and would include an interdepartmental team that would review memorial and tribute requests twice per year.

Joe Blowers referenced the draft procedures provided for sponsorships, specifically the section noting that sponsorship opportunities with the district are ineligible for products or services incompatible with the district's mission, values and policies. He asked whether the bulleted list of ineligible products and services is limited to only those listed, or if there are other potential products or services that should be considered ineligible beyond that list.

- ✓ Geoff replied that these would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- ✓ Jerry suggested adding the phrase "but not limited to" in order to encompass a broader range of products and services.

Bob Scott referenced the DCP section for Naming of District Property and requested clarification regarding the language under B(3) which proposes to reverse the previous language that "in no case shall a District property be permanently named for a business or corporation".

- ✓ Geoff explained that prior to making this recommendation, he reviewed why that limitation was included in the initial policy, noting that he discovered that much of the district's current policy was modeled after the City of Portland's policy. Portland was defining the policy in the context of a complete city government and did not have the flexibility and latitude that the district has in making decisions for a park and recreation district. His sense is that the district is going to have businesses within the community that would like to get involved and want to be noticed if they are donors. If there is a large business donor that wants to invest in a particular amenity, why would the district want to eliminate that? The board would still have the prerogative not to move forward, but as the current policy reads, the board does not have an option to even consider it.

Larry Pelatt commented that he appreciates the flexibility provided in the proposed policy amendments.

Bob Scott moved that the board of directors' approve Resolution No. 2015-04, amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 - District Property. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Jerry Jones Jr. Yes
Larry Pelatt Yes
Joe Blowers Yes
Bob Scott Yes
John Griffiths Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

C. General Manager's Report

General Manager Doug Menke provided an overview of his General Manager's Report included within the board of directors' information packet, including the following:

- State Legislative Minimum Wage Increase Proposal
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Doug introduced Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, to provide an overview of an item not included within the report regarding an opportunity for the district to refinance some General Obligation bonds resulting from the voter-approved 2008 Bond Measure.

- ✓ Keith provided a detailed overview of the benefits of refinancing at this time, noting that with all costs associated, the net present value savings on interest is estimated at \$1,654,064. In addition, it would be possible to issue the balance of the \$100 million authority (\$1.435 million) at the same time, and achieve economies of scale in closing costs. This would only be completed if it is possible to maintain existing debt levels and retirement dates. These funds could be used to potentially offset any underfunded projects originally approved in the bond measure. Keith noted that with board consensus to move forward, this issue would be brought back to the board for approval at the March regular board meeting.
- ✓ The board offered its consensus to move forward with the refinancing opportunity.

Bob Scott inquired about the subsidized bonds, asking for confirmation that if we refinanced those bonds, the district would no longer be receiving a subsidy for them, but the lower rate would compensate for the loss of the subsidy.

- ✓ Keith confirmed this, noting that the theory is that the new tax exempt rate for the refinanced bonds would be lower than the net rate that the district was receiving with the subsidy. In addition, there is a question whether the subsidy will stay intact for 30 years.

Agenda Item #9 – Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

John Griffiths, President

Bob Scott, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins