



# TUALATIN HILLS PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT

Serving Beaverton and the west side since 1955.

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, August 4, 2008. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

### Present:

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

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

President, Larry Pelatt, 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, and
- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

The Executive Session is held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2), which allows the Board to meet in Executive Session to discuss the aforementioned legal and land issues.

President, Larry Pelatt, noted that representatives of the news media and designated staff may attend the Executive Session. All other members of the audience are asked to leave the room. Representatives of the news media are 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, Larry Pelatt, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

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

*There was no action resulting from Executive Session.*

### **Agenda Item #4 – Audience Time**

*There was no testimony during Audience Time.*

### **Agenda Item #5 – Board Time**

President, Larry Pelatt, commented that this agenda item will now be addressed at the beginning of each meeting in order to allow for increased public awareness of the topics discussed during Board Time.

Bob Scott referenced the Management Report within the Board of Directors information packet and asked whether the new promotional tools used this year for Party in the Park resulted in increased attendance of the event.

- ✓ Bob Wayt, Director of Communications & Development, described the promotional tools used, which included television and radio advertisements, and noted that the overall attendance, although difficult to pinpoint, was at least the same as, or slightly higher, than last year.

Bob Scott referenced the Management Report again and asked whether the grant received for creating a trails map will cover the cost of producing the map.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, replied that the grant was distributed by the Washington County Visitors Association as a result of the increase in the lodging tax, noting that additional information will be provided to the Board on the overall cost of the map.

Bill Kanable commented that it is nice to see the Fanno Creek re-meandering project progress with minimal disruptions to Greenway Park users.

John Griffiths asked whether the Park District will be represented at the upcoming National Recreation & Park Association annual conference.

- ✓ Doug confirmed this.

John stated that he would like to attend as well.

#### **Agenda Item #6 – Consent Agenda**

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of June 23, 2008 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Cedar Hills Recreation Center Advisory Committee Member, and (E) Resolution Authorizing the Use of an Energy Savings Performance Contract. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

#### **Agenda Item #7 – Unfinished Business**

##### **A. Future Funding Measure**

Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that based on the action by the Board of Directors at the June 23, 2008 Regular Board meeting finalizing the bond measure package and directing staff to work with Park District legal counsel and The Trust for Public Land to finalize the legal requirements necessary to file for the election, a resolution is before the Board for consideration that would take the final steps in placing the bond measure on the November 4, 2008 ballot. The resolution contains all of the legal requirements as outlined by the Washington County Elections Office, including the measure's caption, question, summary and explanatory statement. All of these items were reviewed by Park District legal counsel, bond counsel, and The Trust for Public Land. Doug noted that the action requested of the Board this evening is approval of the resolution calling for an election in the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District on November 4, 2008 to submit a General Obligation Bonded Indebtedness Measure to District voters.

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the floor for public testimony.

Barbara Wilson, 12820 SW 20<sup>th</sup> Court, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening as a resident of the Park District for the past 47 years and a dedicated conservationist. She stated that she has experience with past Park District bond measures and is of the opinion that the Park District's opportunities for conservation have not been adequately exercised. She stated that a few weeks ago she met with Park District staff to determine whether the Park District complied with the promises of the 1994 bond measure and that Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed that it had not. She believes that when a bond package is presented to the public to vote on, that the package presented serves as a contract should the measure pass, which did not happen with the 1994 bond measure, especially within the area of natural resources. She asked what guarantee is being offered that the \$12 million proposed for natural areas within the upcoming bond measure package would be the actual amount spent. She described that while the 1994 bond measure funds were being expended, she came before the Board of Directors and Budget Committee for confirmation that project cost overruns would not effect the funds set aside for land acquisition and she received that assurance. She asked what the Board's commitment is to accomplishing what is being promised through the 2004 bond measure.

- ✓ John Griffiths commented that the current bond measure does not contain facilities that would result in large cost overruns such as the 1994 bond measure did. No current Board members were serving on the Board during the time of the 1994 bond measure, so they are not familiar with how the cost overruns were handled. In addition, the current bond measure would have a Citizen Oversight Committee, unlike the 1994 measure. John asked Barbara to serve on the Committee, noting that she would be able to see exactly how the funds are being allocated and could provide reports back to the Board relative to whether the promises of the bond measure are being fulfilled.
- ✓ Larry replied that regarding the Board's level of commitment, the Board has attempted to put together a bond package that makes sense, is good for the Park District, and can be supported. Although the Board cannot be 100% sure that each item will cost exactly the amount listed, the Board is committed that all of the projects with dedicated funds within the bond measure will happen.
- ✓ Bill Kanable stated that his background is in sports and that he originally had no interest in parks, trails, or natural areas, but has learned that he needs to take a different, more balanced, perspective. He noted that the current bond package provides a balance of projects in order to be widely appealing. He commented that people like Barbara are needed to serve on the Citizen Oversight Committee because all projects come with some uncertainty as to how much they will cost in the end.

Barbara replied that she would be happy to serve on the Committee; however, she is concerned that such a committee could turn into a situation of "the fox guarding the hen house".

- ✓ Larry stated that he would expect her to report such concerns to the Board if that were occurring.
- ✓ Bill replied that the Board desires the oversight that a committee could bring, but that it can only come through valid participation on the Committee.
- ✓ John noted that he expects the Committee to consist of members who have interests in specific parts of the bond measure, such as trails, community centers, seniors, athletic facilities, natural areas, etc. He noted that each of those members will want to see their areas of interest fulfilled and that this should help eliminate the fear of the Committee becoming "the fox guarding the hen house".

- ✓ Larry expressed that the Park District wants a full citizen audit of the bond measure in order to provide accountability, as well as promote the trust for a future bond measure.

Joe Blowers asked whether the Committee members' terms would run with the life of the bond.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, replied that in general, the life of the bond would be a minimum of three to five years, especially when dealing with land acquisition. He believes it would be possible to develop a successful format for the Committee by borrowing material from Metro, who has had similar committees for past bond measures.

Bill expressed the need for the Board and public to understand upfront that compromises to the original bond package would be addressed in a way that everyone would understand why such a change needs to be made and that it would be good for the overall community.

- ✓ Larry stated that changes would be made publicly with participation via the Committee.

Doug Menke, General Manager, referenced Barbara's comments regarding her meeting with Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, and himself specific to the 1994 bond measure. He stated that there were no funding categories within the 1994 bond measure that were underfunded. There were significant challenges in land acquisition, due in part to the base cost per acre being off-market significantly, which challenged the overall number of acres acquired in the end. However, no project area was underfunded.

- ✓ Larry confirmed that the appropriate amount of funds were allocated, but the Park District was unable to purchase as many acres as originally anticipated.
- ✓ Bill commented that these are the types of challenges the Park District may face again with the upcoming bond measure.

John asked whether there were cost overruns for the Athletic Center project.

- ✓ Doug replied that there were cost overruns on a number of projects and that General Funds were used to mitigate the overruns, along with leveraging Metro funds and a variety of other activities. There were several projects that did not receive amenities that were originally planned.

Wendy Kroger, 12030 SW Settler Way, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening in support of the bond measure. She currently serves as Chair of the Trails Advisory Committee and also served on the Bond Measure Task Force and she is excited that the bond measure is moving forward. As a member of the Task Force, she is excited about the overall balance and variety of projects proposed for the bond measure, although she is particularly excited about the projects for trails, natural areas and parks, as these projects would address so many users' needs. She is looking forward to a win for the community in November.

Spence Benfield, 11819 SW Lanewood, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening in support of the bond measure. He served as Chair of the Bond Measure Task Force and noted that the Task Force took into account a lot of information, including public testimony and survey results. He believes the bond package forwarded to the Board for consideration is representative of what the Task Force believes the public is interested in. He referenced the previous testimony regarding the 1994 bond measure and urged that the Board be the ultimate oversight committee. He noted that although there will be a Citizen Oversight Committee, the Board is also accountable and that can be dealt with through the elections process. He commented that Park District staff is capable of managing the bond projects and he encourages the Board of Directors to move forward with the bond measure.

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the floor for Board discussion regarding the resolution.

- ✓ Hearing none, Larry noted that he would entertain a motion.

**Bob Scott moved the Board of Directors approve the resolution calling for an election in the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District on November 4, 2008 to submit a General Obligation Bonded Indebtedness Measure to District voters. Bill Kanable seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

#### **B. Urbanization Forum Position Paper**

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that leaders of the cities and service districts within Washington County joined with Washington County leadership to form an Urbanization Forum in April 2008. The Forum sets the stage for a public dialogue about how communities in Washington County will handle dramatic growth in population and will focus on the best way to provide and finance urban services in unincorporated, but developing areas of the county, and the best choices for extending urban services to undeveloped areas (urban reserves) outside of the cities but on the edge of Metro's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Staff has drafted an Urbanization Forum Position Paper intended to contribute to this dialogue by succinctly stating the Park District's view of the present urban service situation in Washington County and suggesting steps that could be taken to resolve issues related to long-term urban service provision in Washington County. Hal noted that the action requested of the Board of Directors this evening is authorization to submit the Urbanization Forum Position Paper on behalf of the Park District to Urbanization Forum participants in advance of the next public meeting in September.

Bob Scott noted that while the concept looks good on paper and puts the Park District in the position to help with population growth in Washington County, what is staff's opinion as to the power to really drive some of the direction that the Park District wants to have.

- ✓ Doug noted that Park District legal counsel, Pam Beery, represents several of the agencies involved in the Forum and has been retained by the Steering Committee to help understand the legal issues in moving forward. It is a complex issue, but by voicing the Park District's opinion, there is an appreciation for what special districts provide and how we work with cities and that we are an ingredient in the solution of how communities are formed and developed and able to survive into the future. Doug stated that he believes that more than anything this provides a voice from the special districts specific to our concerns. The Park District's concerns are somewhat unique amongst special districts due to the way our boundaries are formed, as well as our issues with island areas. At this point, future annexations are very challenged so some of the resolution that has to come forth based on legal recommendations that Pam and her peers will make will more than likely end up at the legislature. The hope is that a package would be reviewed in Salem and that the outcome would enable all agencies to resolve their issues. What we have tried to drive home is that this is about services to residents, not a power play for property or taxes.

Joe Blowers noted that much of the Forum discussion has been dominated to some extent by a few participants centered around the issue of cities. The Position Paper does a good job of stating that perhaps the issue needs to be looked at differently.

John Griffiths asked if any other entities have issued position papers.

- ✓ Pam Beery, Park District legal counsel, replied that she is not aware of any other official position papers and stated that she believes that the timing of the Park District's paper is good. She noted that having worked with Washington County in a lot of capacities for the last 28 years, the Forum is an unprecedented effort and credit should be given to Joe Blowers for the role he played as he was the only special district voice that spoke up while the debate around cities went on. She stated that although she is a big believer in cities, this issue is about service and when there is a service district that is working and is popular and well liked, its voice needs to be heard.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the position paper as presented. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

<b>Bob Scott</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>Larry Pelatt</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

John Griffiths added that he believes this is a good move in that the District has not been anywhere near as active in governmental affairs and the greater atmosphere in the past.

### **C. West Park SDC Credit Project at Bethany Village**

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that Central Bethany Development is proposing a System Development Charge (SDC) credit project that would provide a north-south Waterhouse Community Trail connection with a bridge and boardwalk crossing, in addition to dedicating 0.51 acres to the Park District for the trail corridor and selling most of the remaining portion of the property (Tract C) to the Park District for SDC credits. The first presentation to the Board of Directors regarding this project occurred at the June 2, 2008 Regular Board meeting. Steve noted that the action requested of the Board this evening is approval of the SDC credit project and for the General Manager or his designee, to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding that includes the SDC credits and trail improvement cost estimates as described, and authorization for staff to prepare a letter to Washington County outlining the approved SDC credit package parameters and submit the letter to Washington County for their records and implementation. Steve introduced Jeff Oberst, Project Manager of Central Bethany Development, who is in attendance this evening.

Steve provided a brief overview of the Arbor Homes trail connection near the SDC credit project under discussion this evening, noting that the Park District has stepped aside as the issue is between Washington County and Arbor Homes.

- ✓ Joe Blowers stated that the trail currently ends at a chain link fence, noting that he does not believe that this would satisfy Washington County's conditions of approval.

Steve replied that he does not believe the surface of the trail would satisfy the conditions either.

Joe referenced the site map included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that the proposed trail design includes two right angles at steep grades. He questions whether this is a safety issue, especially for those on bicycles.

- ✓ Steve replied that softening the angles will be addressed through the design of the project and that the map is only attempting to show the general connection to the existing trail.

Joe noted that there is a de facto trail going west into West Union Estates Park and asked if there are any plans to make a connection to that.

- ✓ Doug replied that it is a project included within the upcoming bond measure package.

President, Larry Pelatt, stated that although he understands it is not a Park District issue, he would like to see more of an effort to resolve the Arbor Homes trail issue.

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the floor for public testimony.

Fred Meyer, 4861 NW 162<sup>nd</sup> Terrace, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing Arbor Parc residents. He has spoken to a number of residents adjacent to the SDC credit project area and all have been in favor of it; however, there is a concern regarding the configuration of the eventual east-west trail, although he understands that it is technically an issue between Washington County and Arbor Homes. He described how the current homeowners of Arbor Park are not represented well by the Arbor Parc Homeowners Association as it is still in the hands of the developer, but that the homeowners would like to be involved in the planning process of determining the placement of the east-west trail.

- ✓ Larry replied that the issue of the east-west trail is between Washington County and Arbor Homes.
- ✓ Bill Kanable noted that Arbor Homes installed a path without a lot of consideration that just dead ends into the park.

Fred replied that he believes Arbor Homes felt that they were meeting the requirements of Washington County.

Larry stated that to the extent that the Park District gets involved in the placement of the east-west trail, they would welcome the homeowners' participation. Larry asked Steve if the Park District is going to be involved.

- ✓ Steve replied that the original plan approved by Washington County was for the east-west trail to connect with Waterhouse Trail at the central access point. He described the original route of the trail via a PowerPoint of the site map included within the Board of Directors information packet. The Park District had been involved in the discussion between Washington County and Arbor Homes in order to help facilitate a solution because the Park District is interested in the overall connectivity of the trail. However, Washington County has wanted the Park District to play a larger role in the process than its responsibility is in the situation.

Bill asked whether Washington County and Arbor Homes would seek the Park District's assistance in designing the trail.

- ✓ Steve replied that the Park District has had preliminary discussions regarding the design presented.

Bill asked if the Park District is going to have input as to how the design is going to work.

- ✓ Steve confirmed this.

- ✓ Hal replied that the trail is a condition of approval that was placed on Arbor Homes by Washington County and one requirement was that the trail connect to the Waterhouse Trail. Once the Park District takes possession of the Central Bethany Development property, Arbor Homes will have to be cognizant that it is Park District property.

Bill reiterated that if the Park District takes possession of the property, Arbor Homes would need to come to the Park District for the final design and approval.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed this, noting that there are timing issues to consider as well.

Bill stated that until the Park District acquires the property, it has no control over the issue. However, once the property is acquired, the Park District would have some control over the issue, which is what Fred is interested in.

- ✓ Fred noted that even if the Park District does not own the property, it would still have influence over the trail placement, including where the entry of the trail would be into the development, and he is asking that the homeowners be involved in that process even if the District does not own the property.

Joe Blowers noted that it is almost a given that the Park District would have neighborhood involvement, particularly if common areas are effected.

- ✓ Fred noted that in most cases there would be representation through the homeowners association, but part of the concern is that the association is not in place right now.

Joe asked for confirmation that there is a group of residents interested in this issue.

- ✓ Fred confirmed this, noting that they would appoint a lead contact resident to be involved with all parties.

Larry commented that it appears that the group is basically a less formal version of a homeowners association and that the Park District is not averse to working with them.

- ✓ Fred noted that the residents want to help in such a capacity until the turnover of the homeowners association, which may occur at the end of the year, or early next year.

Bill expressed disappointment in Arbor Home's decision to alter the original trail design.

- ✓ Joe commented that he does not believe trails are the developer's highest priority. He encouraged Fred to keep all of the homeowners informed of the situation.

Fred described that Arbor Parc is in multiple states of development and that they are talking to everyone they can.

**Joe Blowers moved the Board of Directors approve the SDC credit project and for the General Manager, or his designee, to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding that includes the SDC credits and trail improvement cost estimates as described, and authorization for staff to prepare a letter to Washington County outlining the approved SDC credit package parameters, and submit the letter to Washington County for their records and implementation. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

- November 2008 Bond Measure Information Program
  - Bob Wayt, Director of Communications & Development, provided a brief status report on the bond measure information program, noting that Mark Weiner of Winning Mark LLC has been hired as the consultant and that community presentations are in the process of being scheduled.
- Beaverton Urban Renewal Charter Amendment Task Force
  - Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a detailed overview of the task force formed to consider how the City Charter might be amended to reduce or remove restrictions on the use of urban renewal by the City of Beaverton.
- Legislative Update
- Board Member, Joe Blowers
- September Board of Directors meeting
  - *It was the consensus of the Board of Directors to schedule the September Board meeting for September 15, 2008.*

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

Joe Blowers asked how non-site-specific projects could be highlighted within the bond measure informational materials.

- ✓ Doug replied that staff will work with the consultant on this issue, noting that some projects, such as land acquisition, cannot be site-specific.

Joe commented that some projects, such as land acquisition for a community park in the northeast quadrant, are large projects, but are not very obvious in the current informational materials.

Larry Pelatt commented on the complications that can arise when using an Urban Renewal District that he learned of through his experience with the North Bethany planning process, as well as various other past experiences throughout the Metropolitan area.

John Griffiths described a recent meeting between himself, Doug, Charles Jordan, Chair of the Conservation Fund, and Bob Schulz with Portland Parks and Recreation, regarding the lack of funding for outdoor school programs. He noted that the Conservation Fund is dedicating \$7 million toward this issue and discussion arose regarding the Park District partnering on a project in this area. He stated that he is going to draft a concept paper for review, expressing that it is important to give the newest generation exposure to nature to develop them into good stewards.

#### **Agenda Item #8 – New Business**

##### **A. Elections Guidelines for Elected Officials & Public Employees**

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Park District Legal Counsel, Pam Beery, to provide an overview of elections guidelines for elected officials and public employees. Pam provided a brief review of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet titled *Elections, Public Employees and Elected Officials*, noting that Doug has asked legal counsel to review all bond materials in order to ensure that there are no such conflicts that would tarnish the bond measure.

Doug commented that legal counsel has been offering their review of bond measure materials in a timely manner and that it has been a great partnership as some of their comments have produced a better product in the end. He noted that it will be critical to continue legal counsel's involvement in the work produced by the bond measure information consultant.

Doug noted that the information provided within the Board of Directors information packet has also been provided to all Park District employees. In addition, a leadership staff meeting has been scheduled for August 14 to review the topic again to ensure that staff is aware of the rules.

Pam noted that the next step in the bond measure process will be to file the measure with the County early in order to allow for plenty of time to address any concerns.

- ✓ Bob Scott asked who would voice such concerns.

Pam replied members of the public.

- ✓ Bob asked for confirmation that the public will be offered the opportunity to review the ballot language.

Pam confirmed this, noting that elections officers could also bring up concerns as well.

- ✓ Doug noted that the bond measure caption, question, summary and explanatory statement would be filed with the Washington County Elections Office tomorrow morning. They have the obligation to advertise the material in order to provide the public the opportunity for review, for which there is a seven-day appeal period.

Pam commented that the public can challenge the ballot title and that such challenges are reviewed and at times have gone all the way up to the Supreme Court.

Joe Blowers asked, if he were to be on a speakers bureau for the "Vote Yes" Committee, could he represent himself as a Board member when speaking?

- ✓ Pam confirmed this, noting that he is an independent, elected official. However, he cannot ask Park District staff to prepare materials for that meeting.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked whether the Board could hand out the informational materials prepared by Park District staff.

- ✓ Pam confirmed this, noting that the material prepared by the Park District would be purely informational.

Bill Kanable asked Pam if she sees any potential issues with the ballot language.

- ✓ Pam replied that she is very comfortable with the ballot language approved this evening or it would not have been distributed in the Board packet. She reiterated that many individuals participated in the drafting and review of the material.

Bill asked whether the ten-word caption statement is appropriately balanced when compared to the actual funding proposed for the various areas of the bond measure, especially pertaining to conservation items.

- ✓ Pam replied that the limit of ten words requires creativity, noting that legal counsel and staff worked hard to achieve balance and attempt to represent all of the different projects fairly, without emphasizing any one over another.
- ✓ Doug replied that well over 50% of the entire package is dedicated to parks, trails and conservation. In addition, respecting that the predominance of Park District trails would end up next to riparian corridors and require mitigation, the areas next to those trails would also be improved.

John Griffiths described a story about someone he knew who did not maintain the separation between public assets and candidacy and the consequences involved in such a mistake. He stated that there are people watching such issues and encouraged the Board to follow the rules.

- ✓ Bill stressed that the Board should not use their Park District email for such efforts.

Larry referenced the informational presentations to various community groups that are in the process of being scheduled and asked that the Board members communicate back and forth as to which meetings they could attend.

- ✓ Bill asked whether there is a conflict if Park District staff facilitates those meetings.

Pam replied that staff can do minor clerical work, and scheduling meetings for informational presentations is part of that. The key is that the Board member and staff roles are different at the meetings. Staff will be there to present informational material, while the Board members can take an advocacy role.

- ✓ Doug commented that having a Board member at the informational meetings is a way to compliment the presentation. He noted that it is a respectful balance in that a lot of the groups want to hear from an elected official.

#### **Agenda Item #9 – Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

---

Larry Pelatt, President

---

Bob Scott, Secretary

Recording Secretary,  
Jessica Collins