



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, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, June 18, 2012. 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 (<i>via telephone</i>)	Director
John Griffiths	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

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

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

- To consider the employment of a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, 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 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, Bob Scott, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Board member, Bill Kanable, was excused from the meeting.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

Joe Blowers moved that the Board of Directors accept the General Manager's evaluation as presented and authorize a compensation increase of 3.8% and a bonus amount of \$5,000. **Larry Pelatt** seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #4 – Election of Officers for Fiscal Year 2012-13

President, Bob Scott, opened the floor to nominations for Board officers for Fiscal Year 2012-13, taking effect on July 1, 2012.

Larry Pelatt nominated Joe Blowers to serve as President of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors for Fiscal Year 2012-13. John Griffiths seconded the nomination. Hearing no further nominations, roll call proceeded as follows:

Joe Blowers Yes
John Griffiths Yes
Larry Pelatt Yes
Bob Scott Yes

The nomination to elect Joe Blowers to serve as President for Fiscal Year 2012-13 was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

John Griffiths nominated Larry Pelatt to serve as Secretary of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors for Fiscal Year 2012-13. Joe Blowers seconded the nomination. Hearing no further nominations, roll call proceeded as follows:

Larry Pelatt Yes
Joe Blowers Yes
John Griffiths Yes
Bob Scott Yes

The nomination to elect Larry Pelatt to serve as Secretary for Fiscal Year 2012-13 was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Larry Pelatt nominated Bob Scott to serve as Secretary Pro-Tempore of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors for Fiscal Year 2012-13. Joe Blowers seconded the nomination. Hearing no further nominations, roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths Yes
Joe Blowers Yes
Larry Pelatt Yes
Bob Scott Yes

The nomination to elect Bob Scott to serve as Secretary Pro-Tempore for Fiscal Year 2012-13 was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #5 – Budget Hearing: Resolution Adopting the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget, Levying Taxes, and Making Appropriations

A. Open Hearing

President, Bob Scott, opened the Budget Hearing.

B. Staff Report

Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that Board approval is being requested this evening of the resolution to adopt the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget, make appropriations, and levy ad valorem taxes.

C. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

D. Board Discussion

There was no Board discussion.

E. Close Hearing

President, Bob Scott, closed the Budget Hearing.

F. Board Action

Joe Blowers moved the Board of Directors approve Resolution 2012-11 to adopt the 2012-13 Budget, make appropriations, and levy ad valorem taxes. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**.

Agenda Item #6 – Audience Time

There was no testimony during Audience Time.

Agenda Item #7 – Board Time

Joe Blowers invited the Board members and audience to attend the District's Sunday Trailways event taking place on June 24, 2012.

Agenda Item #8 – Consent Agenda

Larry Pelatt moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Winkelman Park Construction Contract, (B) Rock Creek Trail Construction Contract, (C) City of Beaverton Request for Easements on District Owned Property at SW 155th and Sexton Mountain Drive, and (D) Champions Too Field Location. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**.

Agenda Item #9 – Unfinished Business

A. Preferred Fanno Creek Trail / Hall Blvd. Crossing Option

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that in 2007, the District received grant funds through Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to conduct a feasibility study to determine a safe crossing option for the Fanno Creek Trail at Hall Boulevard. The design team, with input from a Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC), identified five crossing options for consideration, which was then followed by an extensive public involvement process. At this point, the options have been narrowed to two and in order to complete the grant requirements on schedule, a decision on the preferred option is needed from the Board this evening. Hal introduced Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, and Brad Hauschild, Project Manager, to provide an overview of the two crossing options under consideration.

Steve and Brad provided a detailed overview of the two crossing options proposed for consideration this evening, a mid-block crossing and a wooden bridge overcrossing, via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record.

Hal provided the following comments regarding the potential funding scenarios for both options:

- The mid-block crossing option probably would not receive grant funding based on the advice received from ODOT staff pertaining to the grants they have available. However, the project may qualify for some funding from Washington County's general fund dedicated to non-automobile transportation projects, but this decision most likely would not be made until the latter part of this year.
- The bridge option would most likely be competitive for grant funding through ODOT, but would require around a 10% match.
- Ultimately, the out-of-pocket cost to the District could be about the same for each option (if the District did not receive funding from Washington County for the mid-block crossing).

Hal introduced Peter Arellano, Public Works Director with the City of Beaverton, who is in attendance this evening to answer any questions on the project from the City staff's perspective.

Larry Pelatt asked Peter for the City's opinion regarding the two options being presented and asked for clarification regarding past discussions that ODOT would not allow a mid-block crossing in this location.

- ✓ Peter replied that he was not familiar with ODOT's opposition to a mid-block crossing, noting that portion of Hall Boulevard is under City control. He commented that several years ago there was a mid-block crossing project at the same location that the City Council declined to approve due to the inclusion of a raised median island in the center turn lane, which would have blocked traffic. A raised median is not proposed with this project, which allows cars to stage behind the crossing during normal operation.

Larry asked if this was an indication that the City Council would support the mid-block crossing option.

- ✓ Peter replied that City staff believes that in the immediate term, and for some time thereafter, the proposed mid-block crossing would work well and he is prepared to make a strong recommendation in support of the project. He has spoken individually to some of the Council members regarding this recommendation and has not heard any strong opposition up to this point.
- ✓ Steve commented that, regarding ODOT, their desire was for an alternative crossing option that would satisfy the grant. However, they understand if the District would rather move forward with the mid-block crossing option.

Larry noted that perhaps he misunderstood or received inaccurate information, and asked for confirmation that ODOT does not have an issue with the mid-block crossing option.

- ✓ Brad confirmed this; however, ODOT would not fund a mid-block crossing option.
- ✓ Peter clarified that ODOT would likely fund a mid-block crossing option, but only if it were to include the widening of Hall Boulevard to include two left turn lanes.

Joe Blowers noted that if the project were to include two left turn lanes, the project would likely incite a lot of political opposition, similar to when such a plan was proposed in the past.

Although the data shows that it would not cause much additional traffic, this is not the perception.

President, Bob Scott, asked how good of a chance the District would have of receiving grant funding from ODOT for the bridge option.

- ✓ Steve replied that the project would be very competitive as ODOT has been involved in the process from the beginning.

Joe asked about the timeline for grant notification and actual funding.

- ✓ Walt Bartel, Project Manager with David Evans and Associates, the project consultant, replied that notification would be received by December and the funds would become available in June of 2013.

Joe asked what the match is for the grant.

- ✓ Walt replied it is a 10% match, and that the project cost estimate is \$3.4 million.

Bob noted this is why he is intrigued with the bridge option, because the price to the District would be about the same as that of the mid-block crossing option.

- ✓ Larry disagreed, noting that if the District receives funding from Washington County for the mid-block crossing option, it would be less than the bridge option. In addition, if the District is not awarded a grant for the bridge option, the District will lose time in addressing this issue only to restart the process of moving forward with the mid-block crossing option. Even if the mid-block crossing fails by 2035, there would still have been over 20 years of use. He believes that the mid-block crossing option offers a significantly better value than the bridge option, which would also be very out of character for the area.

Joe noted that a downside to the mid-block crossing option is that there is the potential for the City to determine that it is not working and request that it be taken out. Although he does not consider this to be likely, it is a risk that needs to be considered.

- ✓ Larry replied that there are risks in the bridge option as well. He hopes the City would be upfront with the District if there is a suspicion that the mid-block crossing option might not work for the long-term. However, at this point, he is not hearing that.

Peter noted that, in his opinion, the mid-block crossing option is more likely a 10-year solution rather than 20-year. In addition, the City would like the District to site the mid-block crossing in a way that enables Hall Boulevard to be expanded in the future, if necessary. In order to minimize the risks, he will also be recommending that the City make the District partially whole by purchasing the hardware should the mid-block crossing need to be removed, provided that the City has a location where it could be reinstalled.

- ✓ Larry commented that he is supportive of the mid-block crossing option even as a 10-year solution in order to keep the District away from a large bridge in the middle of flatlands that is so out of character for the area.

John Griffiths commented that he was beginning to lean toward the bridge option until it was mentioned that some bicyclists may still prefer to cross across traffic rather than use the bridge. When he asks himself what the best solution is in terms of taxpayer value, he finds himself leaning toward the mid-block crossing option. He likes that the project could be implemented sooner and that Washington County may be able to help with funding. He noted that it is also a minimal investment for an area that is likely to change in the somewhat near future.

President, Bob Scott, expressed support for the mid-block crossing option, noting that his goal is to get a crossing installed as soon as possible. It worries him that bicyclists would not use the bridge.

Joe stated that he would support either option in order to get a crossing installed as soon as possible, but if the mid-block crossing option is chosen, he asks that the District make a strong effort to collect data on the crossing as it would be unprecedented in Washington County.

- ✓ Larry expressed agreement, noting that although this may be the first such mid-block crossing, it likely would not be the last. If sufficient data is collected, hopefully the discussion will not take as long next time and the choice will be more evident and easier to defend.

Joe suggested textured pavement for the mid-block crossing as a way to encourage automobile traffic not to stop within the crossing and Larry asked about signage telling drivers not to block the crosswalk.

- ✓ Peter replied that the City would likely propose signage that would help drivers understand what to do. He noted that in the normal installation of such a signal, the light

immediately activates when the pedestrian pushes the button; however, this can be done only for a location that is far from any other signals. Due to the mid-block crossing's proximity to the Greenway signal, the crossing's signal would need to be timed to the Greenway signal, requiring pedestrians to wait for up to 1.5 minutes after pushing the button for the signal to change.

President, Bob Scott, opened the floor to public testimony.

Wendy Kroger, 12030 SW Settler Way, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the Fanno Creek Trail crossing of Hall Boulevard. She noted that while she served on the SAC, she is here this evening representing only herself. She commended the Board and District staff on the efforts made on the public outreach aspect for this project. She stated that it is apparent that this is not a simple problem with a simple solution and asks that the District not give up on the project, as a crossing is greatly needed in this location and that pedestrians continue to cross against traffic. Although she is not committed to either option, she leans toward the mid-block crossing option due to how fast it could be installed and its cost. She has heard some concern from Greenway residents about a mid-block crossing with two turn lanes that it would increase the traffic into the neighborhood, as well as make it difficult for drivers coming off of Davies and turning left onto Greenway to get to Hall Boulevard. Although no one can be sure what will happen in 10 or 15 years, for now she asks that the District and City implement a crossing to protect people trying to cross the street.

Brian Walker, 9050 SW Parkview Loop, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening in support of the mid-block crossing option for the Fanno Creek Trail crossing of Hall Boulevard. He noted that he is a member of the Beaverton Bicycle Advisory Committee and attended all of the SAC and open houses on this topic; however, he is here this evening representing only himself. He uses a bicycle to commute on a fairly regular basis and uses the Fanno Creek Trail frequently. His preferred option is the mid-block crossing. He does not believe a fence blocking off the sides of a bridge from bicyclists still trying to cross at-grade would work, noting that they also need access to Albertson's. The approaches for the bridge are also quite steep and problematic, whether or not the approach is a straightaway or has landings. He expressed concern regarding a pedestrian eventually being hit attempting to cross the street in its current state and encouraged implementation of a solution sooner rather than later, noting that it is his understanding that the City is exploring installation of this type of crossing at other areas, too.

Joe Blowers moved that the Board of Directors approve the at-grade mid-block crossing without street widening as the preferred approach for the Fanno Creek Trail crossing of Hall Boulevard with the understanding that a wooden bridge with spiral approaches is the preferred alternative for purposes of the grant agreement, to be pursued using funding from an Oregon Department of Transportation grant and/or other grant sources if it is determined by the City of Beaverton that the at-grade mid-block crossing must be removed due to safety/operational issues. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion.

Discussion followed:

Larry asked for clarification regarding the motion on the floor, specifically whether it allows for possible construction of the bridge. And if so, why?

- ✓ Joe replied because the mid-block crossing option does not satisfy the requirements of the grant process being concluded. The motion is basically saying that for construction purposes, the Board prefers the at-grade mid-block crossing without street widening. But, for the purposes of the grant, the Board has the preferred alternative of the bridge.

John asked why the District needs the grant if it has no intention of constructing the bridge.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, explained that the funds for the study were via a grant.
- ✓ Hal agreed, noting that although the District has received most of the grant funds for the study, it has not received all, and that the motion on the floor would allow the consultant to complete their work on the grant respective of the bridge option. Basically, the bridge option is a failsafe if it is determined that the mid-block crossing does not work, allowing the District to go back to the bridge option with the study in accordance with the grant agreement and apply for funding for the bridge instead. There is also an issue of timing to be considered. Staff believes that the mid-block crossing could be completed by 2013, but that the bridge would not be completed until 2015. The District could pursue a grant application for the bridge at the same time as pursuing the mid-block crossing.

Larry asked for clarification why the District would be pushing forward for grant funding for a bridge if there is no intention of constructing it.

- ✓ Hal replied that it is a fallback position if the mid-block crossing fails.
- ✓ Bob agreed, noting that if the District completes the mid-block crossing and there are issues that cause the City to request removal of the crossing, the District would have a fallback option. The Board is not saying "yes" to the bridge; it is only keeping the process going so that the design work could be done.
- ✓ Doug noted that another factor to consider is that the City Council has not voted on their preferred option yet.

John asked whether the District would be required to construct the bridge option in order to satisfy the grant requirements.

- ✓ Doug replied that the District is only required to complete the charge of the grant.
- ✓ Hal confirmed this, noting that the main thing the Board needs to do in order to complete the grant is to make a decision. If the decision is to totally exclude the bridge option from any future considerations, the District would most likely not receive the portion of the grant funding still outstanding. However, the District has received most of the funding at this point and ODOT would not ask for it to be returned.

John asked how certain staff is that the mid-block crossing option is going to be constructed.

- ✓ Hal noted that the City Council would have to agree to that option as well. Ultimately, it is a three-party agreement between the District, City and ODOT.
- ✓ Peter replied that he could only guarantee his recommendation. The topic is going to be a public process with the City, including public testimony received. If he had to guess, he would give the mid-block crossing a 90% chance for implementation.

Larry asked for clarification, noting that earlier this evening it was stated that ODOT does not have a say on what type of crossing is selected.

- ✓ Hal replied that ODOT is involved only as a party of the grant agreement.
- ✓ Joe agreed, noting that if the District does not receive the last portion of the grant funding for the study, it would be ODOT that is not providing that funding.

Larry asked whether this motion binds future boards to a bridge option if the mid-block crossing option is deemed not acceptable in the future.

- ✓ Joe suggested that this issue would be similar to an old master plan for a park in that it may offer some guidance to the Board, but would not lock it into a decision.

Larry described how an old master plan can have a negative effect on a future board. However, he can be supportive of the motion on the floor if it needs to be worded in this way as a backup plan and that the Board is fully understanding of the preference for the mid-block crossing option and if that option fails, that it would require more Board discussion.

- ✓ Bob noted that he assumes that the grant has a limited time span in order for the Board to react. If the City came to the District in three or four years and requested that the mid-block crossing be removed, the grant funding for the bridge may no longer be an option because the funding would have gone to another project by then. He assumes that the

grant funding for the bridge option would only be a possibility if the mid-block crossing option fails in a short amount of time.

- ✓ Doug agreed, noting that the Board would also need to authorize staff to pursue the grant since the matching funds required are a significant size.

John commented that, although he understands Larry's concerns, the District is only one party to this issue and what the District decides may not be agreed to by the other parties, so a backup is needed.

- ✓ Larry stated that given this clarification, he is supportive of the motion as worded.

Roll call proceeded as follows:

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

B. The Bluffs Park Trail Construction Contract

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that staff is seeking Board approval of the lowest responsible bid of \$252,569, minus two deductive alternates, for a total of \$244,635, from Paul Brothers Inc. for the construction of The Bluffs Park Trail project, funded via the District's 2008 Bond Measure. The project includes a new trail and sidewalk paving, signage, landscape plantings, and a storm swale and will result in improved access to the park and playground equipment, as well as the local school. Hal described the lengthy public outreach process that has occurred for this project, noting that the project initially received Board approval in 2004 after a public outreach process, and that there was an additional public outreach process prior to construction of the existing soft-surface trail in 2009. In addition, there have been two public meetings in May and July of 2011 in preparation of final construction plans for the project, as well as an additional neighborhood meeting on May 17, 2012. Hal noted that this project is similar to many trail projects that go through residential areas in that some of the adjacent neighbors to the park have expressed concern, while the residents of the larger neighborhood are generally supportive of the project. Hal described the changes to the plan's design that have occurred in an effort to compromise with the adjacent neighbors that have expressed concern. Hal noted that the action requested from the Board this evening is acceptance of the lowest responsible bid from Paul Brothers Inc. for the construction of the Bluffs Park Trail project for the amount of \$244,635, and authorization for the General Manager or his designee to execute the contract. Hal offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Bob Scott, asked what shoulder width is proposed for the paved trail.

- ✓ Hal replied that the proposed width is 8' total with 18" gravel shoulders on each side, which would result in a 5' paved section in the center.

President, Bob Scott, opened the floor to public testimony.

Guy Silvestri, 12415 NW Haskell Court #12, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing the Hideaway Condominiums. He stated that he has three concerns regarding this project:

1. Does the proposed asphalt trail conform to Tualatin Basin Natural Resource Committee Goal 5, which mandates preservation of green areas? And if so, how has this been demonstrated?

2. A wide, asphalt trail does not fulfill the District's mission; a more nature-based material would be a better fit. However, if asphalt is determined to be necessary, he requests that the trail be constrained to 3' wide as it traverses the Hideaway property.
3. Water runoff behind the Hideaway Condominiums is already a problem. Removal of the vegetation on the slope will aggravate the issue. In order to prevent even worse conditions, he requests minimum removal of the present vegetation.

A written copy of Guy's testimony was entered into the record.

Bill Booth, 12136 NW Blackhawk, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing the nine homeowners of the Blackhawk Gardens Neighborhood Association. He stated that the neighborhood association is unanimously against the proposed project. He expressed concern regarding the public process for this project, noting that it has been deeply unsatisfactory in terms of the message from the neighborhood not being accurately conveyed. He strongly encourages the Board to further explore the District's public outreach process and to teach District staff how to communicate honestly the public feedback they receive on projects, noting that the minutes of the public meetings were dramatically different from what actually occurred. He suggested videotaping such meetings instead. Regarding the proposed project, he expressed concern with the amount of vegetation that would be removed, as well as existing drainage and slope issues. He stated that it is an unnecessary project, noting that if the Board members were to visit the site, they would agree as well. In addition, there is virtually no neighborhood support for the project as evidenced by the many neighbors he interviewed. He expressed concern for the loss of privacy that the project would cause for the adjacent property owners. He asks that the Board reconsider this project as it is not desired by the community and is a waste of taxpayer dollars.

Jeff Mucha, 2485 NW 119th Place, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding The Bluffs Park project. He stated that his family, as well as two of his neighbors, supports the project. He commented that he has followed the public process for this project since the beginning, almost 10 years ago, and is looking forward to its completion. He described how the current trail within the park is difficult to use when pushing a stroller and that a paved trail would enable easier access for his family to the play equipment. In addition, a paved trail would provide better accessibility during the wet weather months and lower overall maintenance costs.

Bill Hagerup, 12165 NW Big Fir Circle, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding The Bluffs Park project. He stated that he is in support of this project and would like to echo Jeff's testimony. He noted that he, too, has followed the public process for this project for close to 10 years as a former member of the Trails Advisory Committee. He stated that there is overwhelming neighborhood support for the project and referenced the petition in support of the project that had been submitted to the Board previously that was signed by approximately 40 residents within The Bluffs neighborhood. He encouraged the Board to approve the project this evening as presented.

Joe Blowers commented that he recently visited The Bluffs Park to walk the site and noticed that the neighborhood surrounding it is very dense and that the trail has the potential for a lot of use. Due to the site's topography, he could imagine that the current trail could get quite muddy and soggy during the wet weather months. Although he believes a natural trail might be appropriate in a different setting, this site needs a hard surface trail to serve the residents pushing strollers and the children walking to school. In terms of the trail access behind the condominiums, he agrees that the corridor is tight; however, the trail exists there now. The signs delineating park property from private property are clear and he believes that with the plantings proposed for the project, that the setting may become nicer than it is now. Although

the site is nowhere near a pristine natural area, he does encourage that the construction of the project have sensitivity to the existing trees on site to ensure that they are not damaged, as well as replant the site in a way that it would mature into a nice natural area.

John Griffiths asked for additional information regarding the trail's connectivity.

- ✓ Doug described the trail connections to the school and neighborhood, as well as a future project the District will be working on with the Beaverton School District for the installation of a hard surface trail at a different piece of property in order to fulfill the District's agreement with the School District.

John recalled the past public campaign that had been focused on the District to purchase property in order to enable that trail connection to the school. He expressed support for utilizing The Bluffs Park to its full potential.

Larry Pelatt commented that he had also visited The Bluffs Park and walked the site during the rainy season and that the trail was very wet and boggy. He stated that the most effective use of the site would be as a hard surface trail and that the District has a responsibility to the tax payers that are funding the project to complete it in the most beneficial manner. He noted that the children will be using the trail mainly during the wet weather months.

President, Bob Scott, stated that he is in agreement with the other Board members and noted that he would entertain a motion.

Larry Pelatt moved that the Board of Directors accept the lowest responsible bid from Paul Brothers Inc., for the construction of the Bluffs Park Trail project for the amount of \$244,635 and authorize the General Manager or his designee to execute the contract. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #10 – New Business

A. Affiliated Sports Policy

Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports, provided an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a new District Compiled Policy (DCP) being proposed for the Board's consideration pertaining to the relationships and responsibilities between the District, its affiliated sports groups, and other user groups. Scott noted that in 2010, a Community Sports Delivery Task Force (CSDTF) was formed with the goal of identifying "the most efficient and cost effective method of working together to deliver sport programs to the community." The CSDTF was formed under, and appointed by, the Sports Advisory Committee and members were selected from a list of affiliated organizations' volunteers, a representative from the Unified Fields Steering Committee and the Sports Advisory Committee. The CSDTF met nine times over the course of a year and a half and ultimately developed a summary of recommendations, a copy of which is included within the information packet. Scott described the outreach to the various sports groups that has occurred thus far on the recommendations, noting that the recommendations have also been reviewed by the District's legal counsel, as well as District staff to ensure that the operational aspects could be met. Working with the affiliated groups, a reasonable implementation plan and phase-in period will be developed, but staff anticipates that the impact to the majority of the groups will be minor and of an administrative nature. Scott stated that only the Board's review and comment regarding the draft DCP is being requested this evening, noting that the DCP would then be reviewed with the

affiliated groups and committees, including the CSDF, and brought back to the Board at the August Regular Board meeting for consideration of approval.

Scott provided an overview of the main components of the proposed policy:

- Affiliated groups would be required to establish policies and procedures within their by-laws that assure information is given to the District that provides evidence of background checks and proper training of their volunteers and staff.
- Affiliated groups would be required to provide annual financial reports for review (when requested) to the District in order to assure proper accounting practices are being followed and funds are adequately protected.
- Establishment of THPRD and Beaverton School District service boundaries as being considered in-District for roster purposes only.
- A limitation of 100% in-District participation in recreation programs and an 80% in-District participation in competitive programs.

Scott offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked for confirmation that if the Board does not have any input on the DCP this evening, that it would be presented for adoption at the August Regular Board meeting as-is.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed this with one caveat, noting that District staff would be presenting this information again to all of the sports groups, including the affiliated groups, CSDF, and Sports Advisory Committee. If there is any substantial input stemming from those reviews, this would be presented to the Board at the August Regular Board meeting as well.

Larry stated that the District needs to ensure that it is giving the affiliated groups, especially the competitive clubs, a timeframe for implementation that can be met. He described how some sports register months in advance, noting that the District should not ask such clubs to approach their players again in order to enact the new requirements. He stated that he is not convinced that there needs to be a reference within the DCP to the players paying the out-of-District assessment, noting that it is ultimately a club responsibility; it is a fee the club can collect and he does not want the District involved in policing the individual players. In addition, he would also like to see some flexibility in the policy regarding the 20% out-of-District limitation, noting that there will be some years when certain age groups or clubs simply cannot meet that requirement and flexibility is needed in order to enable District staff to address such team recruitment issues on an individual basis.

- ✓ Doug replied that he believes staff could draft policy language that would address Larry's suggestions, noting that staff is recommending a three-year phase-in with regard to the out-of-District ratio. In addition, the ratios also have flexibility already built into the initial recommendation in that any roster can be 50% in-District and 50% out-of-District, but the overall participation for that club needs to meet the 20% out-of-District cap. This point will be part of the communication to the affiliated groups prior to the August Regular Board meeting, recognizing that every sport is going to be a little different, as is their ability to meet that particular requirement. There is no question that the District has no interest in eliminating any clubs or any club's ability to compete well. This message will be in the forefront of the outreach to the affiliated groups.

Larry reiterated his concern regarding stating a steadfast number in the policy, noting that there could be years where the clubs simply cannot meet the requirement.

- ✓ Doug replied that he is confident that problems can be avoided if the District and affiliated groups work together.

Larry reiterated the need for District staff to have the flexibility when enforcing out-of-District ratios to ensure that the clubs can remain competitive.

- ✓ John Griffiths commented that he believes District staff will have flexibility in that the 20% out-of-District cap is on a macro level versus micro. He believes what Larry is arguing for is that staff should be able to have some discretion if the ratio is borderline. One red flag might be if there are more competitive teams in year four of the phase-in that are overstuffed with out-of-District players; however, if there are fewer teams than the year before, and over 20% out-of-District, the staff discretion could come into play. Although he is fine with the language as stated, he does believe that the point needs to be reinforced, both for competitive and recreation teams, that the facilities are paid for by and primarily for the use of the taxpayers that reside within District boundaries.
- ✓ Joe Blowers expressed agreement with John's comments.
- ✓ President, Bob Scott, also agreed; however, setting a hard 20% cap also worries him. He would like to see some flexibility for staff to modify the cap on a case-by-case basis.

Larry asked for the purpose behind the proposed three-year phase-in. He commented that it seems like this is a functional issue that could be implemented more quickly than that.

- ✓ Doug offered clarification regarding the charging of the out-of-District assessment, which is an obligation today, with the out-of-District ratio cap, which is to be phased-in.

Larry reiterated his suggestion that collecting the out-of-District assessments would be considered a club responsibility.

- ✓ Doug replied that this is an excellent suggestion that needs to be run by the affiliated groups to get their reaction.

President, Bob Scott, opened the floor to public testimony.

Greg Cody, 13955 SW Barlow Place, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the proposed affiliated sports policy. He stated that the CSDTF did an excellent job and considered a lot of testimony in order to arrive at their recommendations. He noted that, as a member of the Sports Advisory Committee, the committee was kept informed of the task force's work via progress reports; however, his understanding was that the proposed written DCP would be presented to the Sports Advisory Committee for review prior to coming to the Board for consideration. He noted that this is currently the busiest time of the year for the baseball/softball programs and that the policy might not receive the attention it deserves. In addition, due to the volunteer status of their board members, there may be some education required on the topic in order to enable a proper review of the proposed policy. He requested additional time be considered for the policy to be reviewed by the baseball/softball programs before it is approved by the Board of Directors.

President, Bob Scott, suggested that staff reconsider the timeline if various groups begin commenting on a hardship in terms of the time allotted for their review and to possibly delay the August Regular Board meeting deadline.

- ✓ Doug agreed, but reiterated that three little leagues and junior baseball representatives served on the CSDTF. He noted that there has been a great deal of communication throughout this process.

Jim Marron, 12810 SW Hart Road, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing softball and serves on both the Unified Fields Steering Committee and the Baseball/Softball Steering Committee. He stated that they are in support of establishing the policy and that it will be beneficial to the groups to be able to operate within it. He noted that the competitive softball program was not represented on the CSDTF and that this particular program has concerns regarding certain areas of the policy, one being the out-of-District ratio. He described that as softball players age, there are fewer women involved and the players become more geographically spread out. Also, the teams tend to affiliate themselves with

specific individual high schools or universities and no longer use THPRD facilities. Meeting the desired roster percentages may be difficult in this situation and they ask for some consideration in terms of age groups and facilities being used. The players and the teams that are using THPRD facilities are 90-95% in-District; however, he does not believe that the adult competitive softball program as a whole would be able to satisfy the 80% in-District requirement. He described another concern regarding the policy section pertaining to election processes, noting that all of their coaches serve as their board members so there is no formal election process.

Larry asked for clarification regarding any impact this policy would have on teams that are not using District facilities.

- ✓ Doug replied that if a team is not using fields owned or maintained by the District, it does not need to conform to the policy.

Jim Marron noted that the policy states that they are required to submit rosters for all of their teams and expressed concern that there is no separation for such a situation.

- ✓ Doug replied that such conditions could be isolated and addressed via the follow-up meetings, as well as that of the election requirements also mentioned.

Gary Rowell, 3910 SE 166th Avenue #7, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing the Oregon Little League Board of Directors. He stated that he represents five baseball leagues and one softball league. He has already met with District staff regarding some concerns about the proposed policy, which were mainly based on being able to have input in the process. He acknowledged Doug's comment that three little league representatives served on the CSDF, and stated that although they are well-meaning volunteers, he was not being kept informed as he should have been and only recently learned of this. Although he supports nearly 100% of the proposed policy, the communication breakdown is concerning. However, he believes in and is committed to the policy, although it may be challenging to get the information out during tournament season. Although getting the attention of his league presidents, user groups, and volunteer boards is going to be difficult, he will make his best effort and work with District staff to make it happen.

Larry commented that it sounds like it was not the District's fault that Gary did not hear about this issue until recently.

- ✓ Gary acknowledged this, noting that the three individuals serving on the CSDF obviously failed to get the information to him; however, he shares some of the blame for not asking questions as a member of the Baseball/Softball Steering Committee. He mainly wants to point out that it seems that the District has an assumption that the pertinent information regarding this policy is out there, but that is not correct.

Larry noted that the Board's desire is that District staff be as communicative as possible.

- ✓ Gary clarified that although he saw the information for the first time last week, he had a hunch it was coming based on previous conversations with others. He acknowledged that he should have made contact with District staff at that time, but that the District may also wish to reconsider the communication mechanism being used. Perhaps it would have been helpful if they had received the meeting minutes from the CSDF meetings. Either way, he applauds the task force's work and will do all he can to help roll it out.

Larry commented that this lends even more validity to the previous comments that the timing for the review of the information by the groups needs to be reasonable.

Doug confirmed the consensus of the Board that it is acceptable for staff to return to the Board of Directors for consideration of approval of this DCP after the August Regular Board meeting in order to allow for additional review time by the committees.

Agenda Item #11 – Adjourn

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

Bob Scott, President

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins