



## 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 at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, September 12, 2011. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Bob Scott	President/Director
Larry Pelatt	Secretary/Director
Joseph Blowers	Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
William Kanable	Director
John Griffiths	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

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

President, Bob Scott, called Executive Session to order for the following purposes:

- 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), which allows the Board to meet in Executive Session to discuss the aforementioned issues.

President, Bob Scott, 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 the Executive Session. No final action or final decision may be made in Executive Session. At the end of the 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, Bob Scott, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

### **Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session**

There was no action resulting from Executive Session.

### **Agenda Item #4 – Results of Riley Research Survey on THPRD Public Awareness**

Bob Wayt, Director of Communications & Outreach, introduced Mike Riley of Riley Research Associates, to provide an overview of the results from a recently conducted, statistically-valid telephone poll of about 400 residents within THPRD's boundaries to test public attitudes of a wide variety of topics related to the Park District.

Mike provided a detailed overview of the survey results via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, noting that improvement was shown in most areas as compared to an initial survey conducted in 2007. In addition, Mike provided some

recommendations for the District's consideration in order to increase public awareness in key areas, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Bob Scott referenced the results pertaining specifically to public awareness of the District's tagline of "Connecting People, Parks & Nature" and asked whether there is an approximate amount of time necessary before people will begin to recognize relatively new taglines.

- ✓ Mike replied that people generally think of organizations in a functional way and not as taglines. This is why he mentioned the potential for some type of branding campaign, as it does not necessarily take years to accomplish tagline awareness if it is done in a visible and concerted way, but it has been done somewhat casually up until this point.
- ✓ Bob Wayt noted that staff is currently working with a consultant on a branding campaign and the results of this survey will be key in driving those activities.

President, Bob Scott, thanked Mike on behalf of the Board of Directors for the informative presentation.

#### **Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time**

Joe Rayhawk, 15248 NW Germantown Road, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the downward trend in land acquisition prices. He recently attended a Washington County Board of Commissioners public hearing regarding the development of the North Bethany area and Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, had testified that the area's developers were asking to be paid the same prices for land as they had paid prior to the real estate market crash of 2008 and that the District anticipates spending approximately 40% less than the developers' request. Joe believes that District staff is underestimating that number, noting that he assumes it was developed from the fact that nationally housing prices have dropped 40% over the last few years. However, the cost of building new houses consists of fixed and variable price components. As the price the developers can get for the homes drop, the amount of money available for the variable priced components shrinks much more rapidly. He believes the residual value of raw land for use in new home construction is close to zero. He entered two documents into the record: *Residual Value of Land After the 2008 Crash* and *Land Development Economics and Finance in North Bethany – A Whitepaper from ECONorthwest, February 2008*.

#### **Agenda Item #6 – Board Time**

Bill Kanable described a sporting event that occurred over the past weekend during hot weather and thanked District staff for the extra efforts in accommodating the participants.

Joe Blowers inquired as to the current status of the Fanno Creek Trail construction project and whether a potential grand opening date has been discussed.

- ✓ Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, replied that a grand opening date has not yet been set; however, the contractor has finished clearing the site and the project is moving forward well.

President, Bob Scott, complimented staff on the two park dedication events that took place during the month of August.

#### **Agenda Item #7 – Consent Agenda**

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of August 8, 2011 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, and (D) HMT Administration Building Seismic Upgrades Project. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

**Joe Blowers**            **Yes**  
**John Griffiths**        **Yes**  
**Larry Pelatt**           **Yes**  
**Bill Kanable**          **Yes**  
**Bob Scott**             **Yes**

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Agenda Item #8 – Unfinished Business**

**A. Bond Program**

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding recent Bond Program activities, including the Roy Dancer Park bond project, upcoming meetings related to the Bond Program, the most recent Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee meeting, and a proposal to expand Bond Program temporary administrative support services. Hal offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked whether staff had explored using a project management company instead of hiring new staff for additional Bond Program administrative support.

- ✓ Hal replied that the District does use a firm currently for outside project management for several construction projects and have explored that idea for these services as well, but it is not a substantial cost difference and staff would feel more comfortable to have these positions as employees.

Bob Scott requested that when the budget adjustment is brought back to the October Regular Board meeting for approval that it is clearly stated that these new positions are temporary.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve to initiate the process to hire/contract for additional Bond Program administrative support as described pending a budget adjustment to be brought to the Board for approval at the October meeting. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

**John Griffiths**        **Yes**  
**Joe Blowers**         **Yes**  
**Larry Pelatt**         **Yes**  
**Bill Kanable**         **Yes**  
**Bob Scott**            **Yes**

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**B. Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan**

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that at the August 8, 2011 Regular Board meeting, staff presented a master plan for Lowami Hart Woods Park for consideration by the Board of Directors. After receiving public testimony, the Board deliberated on various elements of the proposed master plan and decisions were made regarding each plan element. The Board approved most of the proposed staff recommendations with a few exceptions: 1) a Board majority directed that the paved trail shall be 8' rather than 6' wide; 2) the Board directed staff to revisit the parking area design to minimize site impacts as much as possible, with 8-10 parking spaces provided; and 3) the Board wanted a rule drafted that directs patrons to walk bicycles within the site. Hal noted that staff will be returning to the Board at a later date regarding item 3. The action requested this evening is Board indication of the preferred parking area design option followed by adoption of a resolution approving the master plan for Lowami Hart Woods, including the summary findings and August 3 staff memo as the basis for the decision.

Hal introduced Matt Kilmartin, Park Planner, and Paul Agrimis, with Vigil-Agrimis, Inc., the project consultant, to present an overview of the parking area design options.

Matt and Paul provided a detailed overview of the three proposed parking area designs for the Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan via a PowerPoint presentation of the materials included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that the staff recommended design option is Option 1A, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked how much of a footprint reduction is Option 1A as compared to the parking area design presented at the August 8, 2011 Regular Board meeting.

- ✓ Paul replied it is a 26% reduction.

President, Bob Scott, asked Hal to describe a conversation he had with City of Hillsboro staff regarding the parking lot for one of their natural areas, Noble Woods Park.

- ✓ Hal described his recent visit to this site, noting that at noon on a weekday the approximately 20-space parking lot was almost full. Staff contacted City of Hillsboro staff to find out more about the site and determined that while it was somewhat similar to Lowami Hart Woods, there were some differences as well, including Noble Wood's location near a large employment area that includes Intel. The City of Hillsboro's general advice was not to skimp on parking spaces. On the other hand, the District could always expand the parking lot at Lowami Hart Woods at a later date if the size is found to be inadequate.

Bob expressed agreement that Noble Wood's location may drive a lot of its use.

John Griffiths referenced an area in downtown Portland that has diagonal parking spaces directly off of the street into the curb and asked whether this might be a possibility for Lowami Hart Woods.

- ✓ Hal and Paul both agreed that this type of design would not be allowed by the City of Beaverton.
- ✓ Larry agreed, adding that the costs to improve the street in order to facilitate that type of parking would be prohibitive as well.

Bill Kanable noted that if the Board wishes to further reduce the parking area footprint, then Option 3 should be considered. He pondered how important a turn out is versus the goal to reduce the footprint of the parking area. An ambulance could still gain access to the site via Option 3, but a fire truck would have to pull over alongside Hart Road.

- ✓ Joe Blowers noted that if the site were on fire, the fire truck would not park in the parking lot anyway. He questioned under what circumstance a fire truck would need access to the parking lot.

Larry described Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue's standard practice of when an ambulance is sent on a call, a fire truck is dispatched as well.

- ✓ Joe commented that since Option 3 meets City of Beaverton code, apparently the code does not require the parking lot to be accessible to a fire truck.

Matt stated that Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue has told staff that because the site will not have a built structure, such as a picnic shelter or permanent restroom, they would not require fire truck access to the parking lot. However, the City requires emergency vehicle access for smaller vehicles, such as an ambulance. If a fire truck was called to the site, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue would know that it is not an accessible site.

- ✓ Joe stated that another question is whether the parking lot needs bus access, as Option 3 would not accommodate that either.

Bob asked whether there are any TriMet bus stops nearby and whether it would be allowable for a school bus to stop there to unload students.

- ✓ Matt described the nearby TriMet bus stops, noting that the City has informed staff that if the District has school buses use those stops, they would like the District to modify the right-of-way for a pull-out behind the bike lane.
- ✓ Larry noted that the District may also want to first check with the Beaverton School District relative to their policies regarding passenger loading and unloading.

Bill asked Kristin Atman, Interpretive Programs Supervisor, for her opinion regarding whether the site needs school bus access.

- ✓ Kristin replied that the programs that staff is anticipating operating at Lowami Hart Woods would be camps with a maximum of 16 students. The District transports students via 15-passenger vans. She does not know whether the School District has smaller buses in order to transport students, but based on past experience, it is usually the standard 40-foot school bus. She agrees that staff would need to check with the School District about whether it would be acceptable to pull up alongside the street in order to drop students off.

John Griffiths referenced the public testimony during the August 8, 2011 Regular Board meeting from teachers that stated that the site would be used by the School District.

- ✓ Bob noted that they also had testified that the School District does not have funding to use buses for field trips anymore.

Bill asked whether the Park District would pick up students from Beaverton School District sites for field trips.

- ✓ Kristin replied that the Park District does not currently offer that service to the schools. Typical class sizes are between 20 and 32 students, which would require at least two to three vans. A single bus would be easier to transport a group of that size.

Larry encouraged the Board not to be shortsighted on this issue, noting that although at this point the School District may not have funding for buses; such funding could become available in the future. He referenced past public testimony regarding the lack of parking at other parks in the District and encouraged the Board to heed City of Hillsboro's advice not to skimp on the parking for this site.

- ✓ Bob agreed, noting that he had been contemplating Option 3 in order to further reduce the footprint; however, to accommodate the potential use, he would like to consider Option 1 as well. He does not want to see the District get involved in street improvements or complicate matters for the School District.

Larry expressed support for Option 1, noting that it is a 26% reduction over the original design presented. While he does not believe the design is overly long-sighted, at least it is not exceptionally shortsighted, such as Option 3.

Joe noted that Option 3 appeals to him in terms of saving as many trees as possible and that it may be easier to expand in the future compared to Option 1. He described where additional parking spaces could be added for Option 3, noting that Option 1 appears to be more difficult to expand. He asked whether there is room for a bus pullout with Option 3 or would that shift the entire design north.

- ✓ Matt confirmed that it would shift the design north, noting that there is a requirement to have a particular width of landscape screening between the road and parking lot.

Joe commented that in that case, by the time the entire footprint of Option 3 is moved north to accommodate the landscape buffer, more trees would be lost.

John asked whether Option 1 could be moved adjacent to the street.

- ✓ Larry and Bill replied that the turning radius then becomes affected for anything larger than a van.

Doug Menke, General Manager, asked Paul whether Option 1 is as tight to the road as it could be.

- ✓ Paul replied that Option 1 could be squeezed closer to the road, although not as close as Option 3, if the desire is still to accommodate larger vehicles. It could be moved closer by about half the distance of what is shown on Option 1 versus Option 3.

Joe asked whether a few more trees could be saved by doing that.

- ✓ Paul confirmed that it appears that three trees to the southeast of the storm water pond could potentially be saved.

Joe replied that this change would make him much more supportive of Option 1.

President, Bob Scott, asked whether there was any public testimony this evening regarding the parking options.

- ✓ Hearing none, he asked whether there was any additional Board discussion regarding the parking lot options, noting that what he is hearing the Board say is that they are supportive of Option 1, but with it moved a little closer to the road specifically to save the three trees referenced.

Hal asked for confirmation that Bob is referring to Option 1A.

- ✓ Bob confirmed this.

Hal asked for confirmation that the Board is acceptable to the number and type of parking spaces proposed in Option 1A.

- ✓ The Board confirmed this.

Doug reiterated that the primary objective for this proposal will be to save the three trees.

- ✓ Bob confirmed this.
- ✓ Larry expressed agreement as well.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Option 1A with the caveat to shift the parking as close to the street as reasonable and save as many trees as possible. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

<b>John Griffiths</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Larry Pelatt</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Joe Blowers</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bill Kanable</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bob Scott</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

President, Bob Scott, noted that he would entertain a motion regarding adoption of the Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan.

Bill requested that the Board reconsider the trail width for the master plan, but leave the designation as a community trail. He would like the Board to consider reducing the trail width from 8' to 6'.

- ✓ Larry mentioned that as a point of order, this discussion should take place once a motion has been made to adopt the Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Resolution 2011-22 approving the new master plan for Lowami Hart Woods as well as summary findings and the August 3 staff memo as the basis of the Board's decision. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion.**

President, Bob Scott, opened the floor for Board discussion.

Bill reiterated that he would like the Board to reconsider the trail width for the Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan and return it back to the original staff recommendation of 6'-wide. Bill acknowledged that he had voted in support of the 8'-wide trail at the August 8, 2011 Regular Board meeting, and noted that he still believes it is the right decision in the long-term; however,

there has been so much emotional distress since that ruling that he wants to heal and put an end to this process. In doing so, he wants no further issues taken up regarding the master plan from this point forward and if the neighborhood is willing to accept those terms, he is willing to support a 6'-wide trail. As a result, he asks that there be no more arguing regarding the other elements of the master plan, including the educational programming of the site and the parking lot, and that everyone move forward from this point. He reiterated his support for a 6'-wide trail paved with asphalt with a 1' shoulder on each side, noting that it does not mean that in the future the Board could not reexamine the 8' width when it becomes necessary as this Board cannot tie future Board's hands as such. He is making this request in the existing environment that a 6'-wide trail brings better partnership between the District and the surrounding neighborhood. He does not believe that the cost savings of installing an 8'-wide trail now versus expanding it at a later date is significant enough, although ideally he would prefer that it be saved by doing it now. He acknowledged that this is a difficult request to make in that there has been so much effort put into this particular issue; however, in the end, he wants to find a way to end the ongoing discourse and bring peace to the issue.

Joe stated that the trail can always be expanded to 8'-wide in the future if the need is displayed, so he would like to start small with a 6'-wide trail. He acknowledges that it will be more expensive to widen the trail at a later date, but he believes that it is worth the potential in order to see if the 6'-wide trail is adequate. He commented that the District might be surprised to learn that a 6'-wide trail works at this location and would like to try it for a while with the hope that perhaps it could be kept at 6'-wide.

Larry stated that he believes the Board made the right decision with the 8' width. He noted that the trail will eventually provide a great access point and an 8'-wide trail will be safer than at 6'. In addition, he will never support throwing money away when it could be spent right the first time. The original staff recommendation before bowing to neighborhood pressure was 8' wide. The District does this type of work on a regular basis and is good at it and it became even more apparent when the Board reviewed the pictures showing use of a trail at 8' versus 6'. Although he understands and appreciates the thought process of the neighborhood, the Board needs to move above that and focus on the needs of the 220,000 residents the District serves and provide access for all. He will not support a reduction in trail width to 6' and feels that the Board should stand by how it initially voted on this issue.

Bob stated that he has not changed his original thought process that a 6'-wide trail is perfect for Lowami Hart Woods. He likes having a minimal impact at this site, although he acknowledges that the area is not as pristine as the District would like it to be. He believes what the District is doing will eventually help make this park a better site and believes that 6' is the right width for this trail. He likes that the shoulders will be covered as it gives the District the future opportunity to expand, but right now he is supportive of a 6'-wide trail.

John referenced the Soap Box article he submitted to the *Beaverton Valley Times* on this topic, noting that he had tried to clearly state why the Board chose an 8'-wide trail and that the choice was made during an open and public process. He stated that if the trail is built too narrow, people will eventually widen it in order to get around one another. As has been found at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park, in order to protect the flora and fauna, a wider trail makes sense, although it seems counterintuitive. The same number of trees will be removed for the 6'-wide trail with 1' shoulders as for an 8'-wide trail. Although he can understand the desire by other Board members to ease the discontent of the neighborhood and put a stop to a potential fight at the City level, he also asks whether this is sure to happen if the Board accepts a 6'-wide trail. Secondly, although he may be able to support a 6'-wide trail in the interim, at some point this trail will become a community trail and the traffic will increase. He does not want anything in the

master plan that would prohibit the trail from being expanded to 8'-wide in the future, such as once the community trail is further developed, because that is when the trail traffic will really start increasing. If the area remains as an island for years, he can accept the 6' width, but once the community trail starts taking shape, the District should not have to fight again to be able to expand the trail to 8'-wide and this should be inherent in the master plan.

- ✓ Joe noted that he would phrase the master plan language as that the trail should be expanded to 8'-wide if and when the need presents itself, whether that is when the community trail is built or through demonstrated use over time.

John noted that the community trail standard today is between 8' and 10'-wide. The Board would be making an exception here from that standard. He does not believe that the expansion should be tied to whether or not the need is there; otherwise the Board will be facing these types of debates on every standard and for every trail.

- ✓ Bill replied that the Board is not considering removing the designation as a community trail. The staff recommendation was not to remove the designation as a community trail, only to have it as 6'-wide for a period of time. Everything else would be built out as normal for a community trail.

John questioned what is defined as the period of time.

- ✓ Bill replied that decision would be left for another Board at another time based on what the outcome is and whether the District ever enables the other trail connections.

John asked for confirmation that there would be nothing included within the master plan that would limit the District from expanding the trail to 8'-wide in the future.

- ✓ Bill confirmed this.

Joe noted that his personal view is that there are times when a community trail plan should bow to a natural area. In other words, in terms of hierarchy, does the community trail designation always rise above the need for a natural area to remain natural? His response is no. Perhaps on a case-by-case basis or more systematically there are times when a community trail plan is not what drives the decision. Perhaps there are times when a natural area is so significant that changes have to be made to the trail standards. He thinks this is a broader discussion that the Board needs to have.

Bill noted that in its current state, the trail under discussion is an isolated segment, and any expansion will be up to the Board at a future time. However, at this particular time, it is a closed system. Since the Board does not have any information beyond that point, the discussion of 6' versus 8' is insignificant, but so emotional at this point that he wants it to end and for everyone to move on and come back together toward working on improving the site and seeing the District as a partner rather than as an enemy.

John described how he sees the District's mission as going beyond that of just providing parks and trails, but he also sees the District playing a role in addressing the area's transportation needs and choices through its trails plan. When he says that he can live with this trail as 6'-wide, it is in the terms of the segment remaining as an island. He does not want to hamper a future Board from expanding the trail in the future.

Larry asked for someone to explain the logic behind clearing an 8'-wide swath through the property, completing all of the construction, tree removal and wildlife displacement required for constructing an 8' trail, but then violating the District's own standards by only paving 6' of it. He noted that this standard was not developed by whimsy, but that there is scientific evidence that goes into making such standards.

- ✓ Bill replied that it is not being driven by logic. He wants to heal the rift that is going to continue otherwise and does not believe it is worth fighting over 2' of asphalt. He wants the bitterness to end tonight so that the District and community can move forward



together. Although he believes that once this is all said and done, the Board is going to look back and be disappointed that an 8' trail was not constructed, he is willing to put that aside in order to get some healing out of this situation right now. Otherwise, this topic is going to continue to be a focus drawing away personnel resources and possibly other resources at a time when there are more important topics to focus on. That is why he brought the topic forth this evening in all humility to ask that it be readdressed.

Larry responded that he understands Bill's sentiments and agrees that the Board is going to regret not installing the 8'-wide trail, at the very least from a financial perspective, and if nothing else that the Board did not follow its own standards. He is concerned that from this point forward when the District attempts to construct a project according to its standards, those standards will be questioned and he does not think that is a worthy sacrifice. He does not have the same sense that changing the trail width this evening will heal the situation and he is not convinced that the rift is as significant as described. He believes that if the trail width is changed, the Board is painting itself into a corner and, in the future, when this Board or a future Board determines that it is time to expand the trail, the same issues and same public fighting will occur. It happened with the 2001 master plan, it happened with this master plan, and it will happen again in the future.

Hal asked for clarification that the Board would be voting this evening on the staff recommendation of a trail width of 6', but with wider spots in a few locations of up to 10' wide.

✓ Bill confirmed this.

Hal noted that if the Board wishes to proceed with this amendment, the findings included for the resolution would need to be amended.

✓ Bill suggested that this be presented as a Consent Agenda item for the October Regular Board meeting so that it can be written exactly as intended.

Larry asked whether there is a particular need to have it approved this evening.

✓ Hal replied that it could be approved in October as well.

Larry agreed that he would rather see it on the Consent Agenda in October.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors amend the Lowami Hart Woods Natural Area Master Plan to reflect the return to staff's original recommendation for the trail work as presented to the Board at the August meeting, which will include a 6' trail with segments that have turnout capabilities as reflected in the staff recommendation. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

<b>John Griffiths</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Larry Pelatt</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Joe Blowers</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bill Kanable</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bob Scott</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion was APPROVED by MAJORITY vote.**

President, Bob Scott, noted that the resolution approving the Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan will be brought back for consideration for approval by the Board at the October Regular Board meeting.

### **C. Park District Sites Reclassification Project**

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that staff is seeking Board approval of the proposed reclassifications and name changes to various District sites and facilities as reflected in the site names list accompanying the memo as an attachment. Previous presentations have been made to the Board on this subject at the February 8, 2010 and February 7, 2011 Regular Board meetings. Hal described the public outreach that has occurred for this project, noting that the

comments received were taken into consideration and are reflected within the staff recommendation. In addition, it came to staff's attention today that Kaiser Woods Park, which is proposed to be changed to Kaiser Woods Natural Area, has sections that are also active use and staff would like the administrative ability to reexamine portions of that site to determine what should be labeled as a park versus a natural area. Hal noted that the action requested this evening is Board approval of the Park District Sites Reclassification Project and name changes to various District sites and facilities, pursuant to Board Policy 8.05, Naming of District Property, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked for clarification regarding the proposed name change for Kaiser Ridge Park to Hansen Ridge Park and how that pertains to Kaiser Woods Park.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that Kaiser Woods Park is actually some distance from Kaiser Ridge Park, which that master plan is being presented for Board consideration this evening. He noted that the fact that both sites start with the same word provides some confusion at times.

Joe Blowers noted that he does not see Mount Williams on the list and was under the impression that it needed a designation attached to it.

- ✓ Steve replied that Mount Williams is not listed as the name is not proposed to be changed from its existing name of Mount Williams Park.

**Joe Blowers moved the Board of Directors approve the Park District Sites Reclassification Project and name changes to various District sites and facilities, pursuant to Board Policy 8.05, Naming of District Property. Bill Kanable seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

<b>Larry Pelatt</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Griffiths</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bill Kanable</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Joe Blowers</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bob Scott</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

#### **D. General Manager's Report**

Doug Menke, General Manager, provided a detailed overview of the General Manager's Report included within the Board of Directors information packet, which included the following topics:

- Park Dedications
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Doug offered to answer any questions the Board may have regarding the General Manager's Report.

- ✓ Hearing none, President, Bob Scott, requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

#### **Agenda Item #9 – New Business**

##### **A. Kaiser Ridge Park Master Plan**

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, introduced Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, Brad Hauschild, Park Planner, and Jim Walsh, Project Manager with JD Walsh & Associates, the project consultant, to present an overview of the proposed Kaiser Ridge Park Master Plan.

Steve provided an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that the proposed Kaiser Ridge Park Master Plan includes new play equipment, a bridge, hard surface pathways, turf areas, benches and picnic tables, and on-street parking improvements.

Brad provided an overview of the public process in the development of the master plan, noting that two neighborhood meetings were held. In addition, the master plan was presented to the Parks and Natural Resources Advisory Committees. Overall, meeting attendees supported the preferred master plan and staff has not received any additional correspondence or comments regarding the preferred master plan since the second neighborhood meeting was held.

Jim provided a detailed overview of the various elements included within the proposed master plan via a PowerPoint presentation of the informational materials included within the Board of Directors information packet and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked what will happen to NW 147<sup>th</sup> Avenue when Washington County abandons it.

- ✓ Brad replied that staff has been told by the County that the right-of-way would revert back to Portland General Electric (PGE). The District has requested to PGE to use the west half of the road as a potential parking area for the site. Eventually this site will be utilized as a trailhead for the Westside Trail. The remaining east side of the right-of-way would be restricted to PGE use as well as for access by District maintenance vehicles and emergency vehicles. The District would maintain the west half while PGE would maintain the east half.

Bill noted that in terms of the future trailhead, the District would not need to plan for a lot of parking as most use would be coming from the adjacent neighborhoods.

- ✓ Steve replied that there would be 11 to 12 spaces along the road.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the (park formerly known as) Kaiser Ridge Park Master Plan. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

<b>Larry Pelatt</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Griffiths</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Joe Blowers</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bill Kanable</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bob Scott</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

## **B. Fee Market Survey Update Findings & Recommendations**

Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that staff has completed an update of the market survey of user fees first compiled for the 2006 Fee Study and is requesting Board review and concurrence of these findings and recommendations. With Board concurrence of the recommendations, those that require Board action to implement will be brought back via a resolution at the October 3, 2011 Board of Directors meeting. The remaining recommendations would proceed as scheduled with many adjustments occurring January 2012.

Ann provided an overview of the proposed recommendations as follows:

1. Proceed with the original recommendations of the 2007 fee adjustments as approved by the Board:
  - Effective January 1, 2012 commence the fourth and final year fee increases for drop-in programs and passes.
  - Effective January 1, 2012 commence the fourth year fee increases for registration programs at the Elsie Stuhr Center.
  - Continue to increase fees for classes not yet recovering full costs.
  - Continue to increase class fees for inflation.

- Proceed with plans to decrease the senior discount rate from 40% to 25% at the Elsie Stuhr Center at a reduction rate of 5% per year beginning January 2013.
2. Bring a resolution to the October 3, 2011 Regular Board meeting making adjustments that were not in the original 2007 fee adjustments as approved by the Board:
- Increase pass fees to align with the higher average number of visits and phase the increase in over a three-year period beginning January 2013 and ending January 2015.
  - Implement a 25% discount on youth pass fees beginning January 2013.
  - Decrease the out-of-District premium surcharge rate on drop-in fees from 200% to 100% effective January 2012.

Ann offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Joe Blowers asked for clarification regarding the \$280 annual assessment fee for out-of-District users versus the out-of-District surcharge for drop-in fees.

- ✓ Ann replied that out-of-District users have a choice to either pay the out-of-District assessment fee upfront and pay in-District rates thereafter, or pay the out-of-District drop-in fees.

Joe asked why the District would change this since out-of-District users have two different options to choose from.

- ✓ Ann replied that although the District is not here to serve out-of-District patrons primarily, it is a revenue source that the District does not want to lose. The balancing point is the consideration between keeping in-District patrons happy, but at the same time the District needs to look at the financial sustainability as well.

Joe asked how big a revenue source out-of-District patrons are.

- ✓ Ann replied about 12%.
- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the District provides several mitigating methods for in-District residents in terms of program capacity. For example, for popular drop-in programs, there will be an in-District line and an out-of-District line. But the majority of drop-in programs have capacity, so there is potential revenue that may not be realized because it is price prohibitive.

Joe commented that he does not want to make any changes that might discourage out-of-District patrons from taking advantage of the District's Voluntary Annexation Program. He realizes that while the District may be losing revenue, he also does not want it to be too attractive for out-of-District residents to choose to remain out-of-District and still use drop-in programs.

- ✓ Bill Kanable noted that the out-of-District fees are still less than most athletic clubs.
- ✓ Larry Pelatt disagreed, noting that some athletic clubs have specials that are close to the same price if not less. He noted that the District doesn't need to be the most inexpensive option, but should remain competitive. He is of the mind that "if it isn't broken, don't fix it."

Bill asked if there is a way to determine whether those paying the out-of-District assessment or fees are primarily from within the District's ultimate service area or are from areas outside of the boundary and therefore would not have the option to annex.

- ✓ Ann replied that additional research would need to be done to determine this.

Larry asked whether certain centers have more out-of-District users than others.

- ✓ Ann replied that this would need additional research as well.
- ✓ Doug replied that this particular aspect of the recommendations could be left alone for now; however, the other recommendations need to be discussed in order to meet the production deadlines for the upcoming activities guide.

The Board expressed concurrence with the market survey findings and recommendations.

**C. Recommended Goal Outcomes for Fiscal Year 2012-13 Planning & Budgeting**  
President, Bob Scott, requested that this agenda item be postponed to the October Regular Board Meeting.

**Agenda Item #10 - Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

---

Bob Scott, President

---

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

Recording Secretary,  
Jessica Collins