# Board of Directors Regular Meeting November 7, 2011 <br> 6:00 p.m. Executive Session; 7:00 p.m. Regular Meeting HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Meeting Room 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton 

|  | AGENDA |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6:00 PM | 1. Executive Session* <br> A. Land |
| 7:00 PM | 2. Call Regular Meeting to Order |
| 7:05 PM | 3. Action Resulting from Executive Session |
| 7:10 PM | 4. Public Hearing: Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter Five to include Contractor Prequalification <br> A. Open Hearing <br> B. Staff Report <br> C. Public Comment** <br> D. Board Discussion <br> E. Close Hearing <br> F. Board Action |
| 7:25 PM | 5. Audience Time** |
| 7:30 PM | 6. Board Time |
| 7:35 PM | 7. Consent Agenda*** <br> A. Approve: Minutes of October 3, 2011 Regular Meeting <br> B. Approve: Monthly Bills <br> C. Approve: Monthly Financial Statement <br> D. Approve: Resolution Appointing Sports Advisory Committee Member <br> E. Approve: Resolution for Annexation of Properties per Washington County Ordinance 624 and in Accordance with ORS 198.857(2) |
| 7:40 PM | 8. Unfinished Business <br> A. Update: Bond Program <br> B. Approve: Resolution Adopting the Decrease in the Out-of-District Drop-in Surcharge Rate <br> C. Update: Sustainability Program <br> D. Information: General Manager's Report |
| 8:15 PM | 9. New Business <br> A. Approve: Resolution Amending Comprehensive and Trails Plans Pertaining to North Bethany <br> B. Approve: Garden Home Recreation Center Project List Funded by City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services <br> C. Approve: Resolution Acknowledging Recent Property Acquisitions and Describing Funding Source(s) and Purpose |
| 8:45 PM | 10. Adjourn |

[^0]MEMO

DATE: October 31, 2011
TO: The Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager
RE: Information Regarding the November 7, 2011 Board of Directors Meeting
Agenda Item \#4 - Public Hearing: Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter Five to include Contractor Prequalification
Attached please find a memo from Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, requesting that the Board of Directors, acting as the Local Contract Review Board, conduct a public hearing to amend the District Public Contract Rules contained in Chapter 5 of the District Compiled Policies. Pending the outcome of the public hearing, staff requests that the Board adopt the proposed changes, to include prequalification of general contractors specifically for trail projects associated with the 2008 Bond valued at $\$ 1$ million or more. Keith will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and answer any questions the Board may have.

Action Requested: Upon completion of the Public Hearing, the Board of Directors, acting as the Local Contract Review Board, approve Resolution 2011-29, Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter Five To Include Contractor Prequalification.

## Agenda Item \#7 - Consent Agenda

Attached please find Consent Agenda items \#7A-E for your review and approval.

> | Action Requested: Approve Consent Agenda Items \#7A-E as submitted: |
| :--- |
| A. Approve: Minutes of October 3,2011 Regular Meeting |
| B. Approve: Monthly Bills |
| C. Approve: Monthly Financial Statement |
| D. Approve: Resolution Appointing Sports Advisory Committee Member |
| E. Approve: Resolution for Annexation of Properties per Washington County |
| Ordinance 624 and in Accordance with ORS 198.857(2) |

## Agenda Item \#8 - Unfinished Business

A. Bond Update

Attached please find a memo from Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, providing an update regarding recent activities centered around the Bond Program. Hal will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board may have.

## B. Resolution Adopting the Decrease in the Out-of-District Drop-in Surcharge Rate

 Attached please find a memo from Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, noting that based on the results of an update of the market survey of user fees first compiled for the 2006 Fee Study, staff is requesting that the Board of Directors approve a resolution to decrease the out-of-District premium surcharge rate on drop-in fees from $200 \%$ to $100 \%$ effective January 2012 . Keith will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board may have.Action Requested: Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2011-32, Adopting the Decrease in the Out-of-District Drop-in Surcharge Rate.

## C. Sustainability Program

Attached please find a memo from Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, and Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources \& Trails Management, providing an overview of sustainability efforts being made by the District under its Sustainability Program. Keith and Bruce will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board may have.

## D. General Manager's Report

Attached please find the General Manager's Report for the October Regular Board meeting.

## Agenda Item \#9 - New Business

A. Resolution Amending Comprehensive and Trails Plans Pertaining to North Bethany Attached please find a memo from Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, regarding amendments proposed for the Board of Director's consideration to the Comprehensive Plan and Trails Plan in order to recognize the North Bethany Subarea Plan recently adopted by Washington County. Hal will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board may have.

## Action Requested: Board of Directors approval and signature of Resolution 201133, Adding to and Directing Amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan Pertaining to the North Bethany Area.

## B. Garden Home Recreation Center Project List Funded by City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services

Attached please find a memo from Jim McElhinny, Director of Park \& Recreation, presenting a proposed list of improvement projects for the Garden Home Recreation Center and a portion of the Fanno Creek Trail. The projects will be funded via fees paid by the City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services as a result of the sanitary sewer replacement project that crossed the Garden Home Recreation Center property and Fanno Creek Trail. Eric Owens, Superintendent of Recreation, will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the project list and to answer any questions the Board may have.

## Action Requested: Board of Directors approval of the project list as submitted and direction to staff to proceed with the implementation of the projects.

## C. Resolution Acknowledging Recent Property Acquisitions and Describing Funding Source(s) and Purpose

Attached please find a memo from Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, noting that the District has recently completed several property acquisitions for a variety of purposes using multiple funding sources and that in order to increase public knowledge and establish a record of the details and purpose of each completed acquisition, it is proposed that the Board regularly provide such information through approval of a resolution, starting with a resolution acknowledging completed acquisitions for the last fiscal year. Hal will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo as well as the report and to answer any questions the Board may have.

| Action Requested | Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2011-34, Acknowledging Recent Property Acquisitions and Describing Funding Source(s) and Purpose. |
| :---: | :---: |

Other Packet Enclosures

- Management Report to the Board
- System Development Charge Report
- Monthly Capital Report
- Newspaper Articles
- Monthly Bond Capital Report

DATE: October 10, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter Five to Include Contractor Prequalification

## Introduction

Staff is requesting that the Board of Directors, acting as the Local Contract Review Board, conduct a public hearing to amend the District Public Contract Rules contained in Chapter 5 of the District Compiled Policies (DCP). Pending outcome of the public hearing, staff requests that the Board adopt the proposed changes, to include prequalification of general contractors specifically for trail projects associated with the 2008 Bond valued at $\$ 1$ million or more.

## Background

The Oregon Public Contracting Code (OPCC) requires the Attorney General to adopt model rules of procedure appropriate for use by state agencies and local governments. Local agencies may either accept and follow the model rules, or adopt their own purchasing rules in accordance with state purchasing statutes. While the District largely follows the Attorney General's model rules, the District did adopt its own rules to specify certain exceptions from the model rules. The District purchasing rules have been codified in Chapter 5 of the DCP.

In 2003, the Board of Directors approved a resolution adopting mandatory prequalification of all bidders for certain public improvement projects. In 2009, when the District codified the District policies as the DCP, the prequalification provisions were inadvertently omitted. As a result, the District needed to correct this inconsistency and determine whether or not the District purchasing rules include prequalification. At the Board of Directors March 7, 2011 meeting, the Board rescinded the use of mandatory prequalification for all public improvement contracts.

## Proposal Request

Staff has received conflicting opinions on the impact of prequalification on the level of competitiveness on project bidding. As such, staff is recommending that we use prequalification on a pilot basis by creating a requirement of mandatory prequalification of all bidders for trail specific projects associated with the 2008 Bond valued at $\$ 1$ million or more. The prequalification process will create a master list of general contractors, ensuring that potential bidders on these large projects are capable of completing projects of this size, and qualified based on the unique characteristics of these projects.

Any potential bidder who is disqualified as a result of the prequalification process has the right to appeal their disqualification. Such appeal would be brought to the Board of Directors as the District's Local Contract Review Board

Staff is requesting that the Board of Directors, acting as the District's Local Contract Review Board, approve the resolution amending DCP Chapter 5 to reflect the proposed changes.
Attached to the resolution is a marked-up version of DCP Chapter 5, labeled as Exhibit A, which identifies the proposed amendment. The OPCC requires that the Park District hold a public hearing prior to amending the Contracting Rules and Procedures. Notice of the public hearing has been properly published and posted.

The attached resolution has been drafted by (and the proposed changes to DCP Chapter 5 have been reviewed by) District legal counsel.

## Benefits of Proposal

The proposed changes to DCP Chapter 5 will ensure that bidders on the 2008 Bond trail specific projects have met the qualification standards of similar work experience, financial resources and integrity prior to being allowed to bid. In the absence of a prequalification process, an apparent low bidder who does not meet these standards is deemed not to be a responsible bidder which has the potential to create delays in the actual bid award to the lowest responsible bidder.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

The potential downside to mandatory prequalification is the possibility that it will unnecessarily restrict the pool of available bidders thereby diminishing competition. To mitigate this potential risk, staff will review the pool of prequalified bidders with the Board of Directors prior to conducting a bid restricted to the prequalified pool. If the Board is dissatisfied with the number of prequalified bidders, staff can be directed to conduct the bid without restriction to prequalified bidders.

## Action Requested

Upon completion of the Public Hearing, the Board of Directors, acting as the Local Contract Review Board, approve Resolution 2011-29 Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter Five, To Include Contractor Prequalification.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2011-29

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon

## A RESOLUTION AMENDING DISTRICT COMPILED POLICIES CHAPTER FIVE, TO INCLUDE CONTRACTOR PREQUALIFICATION

WHEREAS, in 2009 the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors adopted new district policies chapters as District Complied Policies (DCP) to make them more useful and readable;

WHEREAS, DCP Chapter 5 includes the provisions related to Public Contracts and Agreements;

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2011 the Board repealed the prequalification of all public improvement contracts;

WHEREAS, the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District desires to update DCP Chapter 5, to include a prequalification process specific to Trail Projects related to the 2008 Bond; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors on November 7, 2011 to receive public testimony on this proposed update to DCP Chapter 5.

THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. DCP Chapter 5 is amended to read as shown in the attached Exhibit $A$ to this resolution;

Section 2. This resolution is approved and takes effect upon adoption by the Board. Adopted by the Board of Directors this $7^{\text {th }}$ day of November 2011.

## ATTEST:

Larry Pelatt
Board Secretary
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## District Compiled Policies

## CHAPTER 5 - PUBLIC CONTRACTS \& AGREEMENTS

### 5.01 Public Contracts Generally

The Board serves as the Local Contract Review Board for the District and has adopted as its public contracting rules ORS chapter 279A, B and C and the Attorney General's Model Public Contract Rules, OAR Chapter 137, Division 46 (General Provisions Related to Cooperative Procurement), Division 47 (Public Procurements for Goods or Services), Division 48 (Consultant Selection: Architectural, Engineering and Land Surveying Services and Related Services Contracts) and Division 49 (General Provisions Related to Public Contracts for Construction Services), subject to the exceptions provided in this document.

### 5.02 Definitions

AWARD, the selection of a person to provide goods, services or public improvements under a public contract. The award of the contract is not binding on the District until the contract is executed and delivered by the Manager.

BID, a binding, sealed, written offer to provide goods, services or public improvements for a specified price or prices.

BIDDER, a person that submits a bid in response to an invitation to bid.

CONCESSION AGREEMENT, a contract that authorizes and requires a person to promote or sell, for its own business purposes, specified types of goods or services from a site within a building or upon land owned by the District, under which the concessionaire makes payments to the District based, in whole or in part, on the concessionaire's sales revenues. "Concession agreement" does not include an agreement, which is merely a flat-fee or per-foot rental, lease, license, permit, or other arrangement for the use of public property.

CONTRACTING AGENCY, a public body authorized by law to conduct procurement.
EMERGENCY, circumstances that (a) could not have reasonably been foreseen; (b) create a substantial risk of loss, damage, or interruption of services or a substantial threat to property, public health, welfare or safety; and (c) require prompt execution of a contract to remedy the condition.

EXEMPTIONS, exemptions from the formal competitive selection procedures for public improvement contracts, personal service contracts of architects, engineers, land surveyors, and related services, as well as contracts and classes of contracts designated as "special procurements" under ORS 279B.085.

LOCAL CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD (LCRB), the Board.
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## PERSONAL SERVICES,

(A) Includes those services that require specialized technical, creative, professional or communication skills or talents, unique and specialized knowledge, or the exercise of discretionary judgment, and for which the quality of the service depends on attributes that are unique to the service provider. Such services include architects, engineers, surveyors, attorneys, accountants, auditors, agents of record, computer programmers, land acquisition specialists, property managers, artists, designers, performers and consultants. The Manager has authority to determine whether a particular service is a "personal service" under this definition.
(B) Personal Services do not include contracts primarily for equipment, supplies or materials. For example, a contract to supply all hardware and standard software is not Personal Services, but a contract with a technology consultant to design or develop a new computer system is Personal Services.

PROPOSAL, a binding offer to provide goods, services or public improvements with the understanding that acceptance will depend on evaluation of factors other than, or in addition to, price. A proposal may be made in response to a request for proposals or under an informal solicitation.

PUBLIC CONTRACT, any agreement for the purchase, lease, or sale by the District of personal property, public improvements, or services other than agreements that are for personal and professional services.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT, projects for construction, reconstruction, or major renovation on real property by or for the District. "Public improvement" does not include emergency work, minor alteration, ordinary repair, or maintenance necessary in order to preserve a public improvement.

QUOTE, a price offer made in response to an informal solicitation to provide goods, services or public improvements.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP), means the solicitation of written competitive proposals, or offers, to be used as a basis for making an acquisition, or entering into a contract when specifications and price will not necessarily be the predominant award criteria.

SURPLUS PROPERTY, any personal property of the District that has been determined by the Manager to be of no use or value to the District.

### 5.03 Personal Services

(A) Exempt Personal Service Contracts. Exempt Personal Service contracts are defined by the LCRB, and are exempt from the public procurement procedures
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and may be executed by direct appointment. The following contracts are considered exempt by the District:
(1) Contracts existing on July 11, 2005; and
(2) Contracts for accounting, legal, underwriting, and investment, financial and insurance advising services, and instructional services.
(B) Direct Appointment (Under $\$ 50,000$ ). Personal service contracts may be entered into directly with a Consultant if the estimated fee to be paid under the contract does not exceed \$50,000.
(C) Informal Selection Process (\$50,000 - \$150,000).
(1) The use of the informal selection procedures described in OAR 137-0480210 and OAR 137-047-0270 will be used to obtain a contract if the estimated fee is expected to be $\$ 50,000$ or more and not to exceed $\$ 150,000$.
(2) The selection may be based on criteria including, but not limited to, each proposer's:
(a) Particular capability to perform the services required;
(b) Experienced staff available to perform the services required, including each proposer's recent, current and projected workloads;
(c) Performance history;
(d) Approach and philosophy used in providing services;
(e) Fees or costs; and
(f) Geographic proximity to the project or the area where the services are to be performed.
(3) Price may be considered, but need not be the determining factor. Proposals may also be solicited by using a written RFP, at the District's discretion.
(D) Formal Selection Process (Over $\$ 150,000$ ). The use of the formal selection procedures described in OAR 137-048-0220 and ORS 279B. 060 will be used to obtain a contract if the estimated fee is expected to exceed $\$ 150,000$.

### 5.04 Delegation

(A) Except as otherwise provided in the Local Rules, the powers and duties of the LCRB under public contract law must be exercised and performed by the Board.
(B) Unless expressly limited by the LCRB, the Model Rules or Local Rules, all powers and duties given or assigned to contract agencies by public contract law
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may be exercised or performed by the Manager, including the authority to enter into emergency contracts under ORS 279B.080.
(C) All public contracts estimated to cost $\$ 150,000$ or more in a fiscal year must be approved by the Board.
(D) All public contracts estimated to cost less than $\$ 150,000$ in a fiscal year may be entered into by the Manager without Board approval. However, either the Board or the Manager may enter into emergency contracts under DCP 5.11, regardless of dollar limits, subject to ORS 294.455.

### 5.05 Special Procurements and Exemptions

(A) The LCRB may exempt from competitive bidding certain contracts or classes of contracts for procurement of goods and services according to the procedures described in ORS 279B.085.
(B) The LCRB may exempt certain contracts or classes of contracts for public improvements from competitive bidding according to the procedures described in ORS 279C.335. When exempting a contract for public improvement from competitive bidding, the LCRB may authorize the contract to be awarded using an RFP process for public improvements, according to the processes described in OAR 137-049-0640 through 137-049-0690.

### 5.06 Small Procurements (Under \$5,000)

(A) Public contracts under $\$ 5,000$ are not subject to competitive bidding requirements. The Manager will make a reasonable effort to obtain competitive quotes in order to ensure the best value for the District.
(B) The District may amend a public contract awarded as a small procurement beyond the $\$ 5,000$ limit in accordance with OAR 137-047-0800, provided the cumulative amendments do not increase the total contract price to more than $125 \%$ of the original contract price.

### 5.07 Intermediate Procurements

(A) A contract for procurement of goods and services estimated to cost between $\$ 5,000$ and $\$ 150,000$ in a fiscal year, or a contract for a public improvement that is estimated to cost between $\$ 5,000$ and $\$ 150,000$ in a fiscal year may be awarded according to the processes for intermediate procurements described in ORS 279B. 070 .
(B) The District may amend a public contract awarded as an intermediate procurement beyond the stated limitations in accordance with OAR 137-047-
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0800, provided the cumulative amendments do not increase the total contract price to more than $125 \%$ of the original contract price.

### 5.08 Electronic Advertising

Under ORS 279C. 360 and ORS 279B.055, electronic advertisement of public contracts in lieu of newspaper publication is authorized when it is cost-effective to do so. The Manager has the authority to determine when electronic publication is appropriate, and consistent with the District's public contracting policies.

### 5.09 Notice of intent to award certain contracts

(A) At least seven days before the award of a public contract solicited under a traditional invitation to bid or RFP, the District will post or provide to each bidder or proposer notice of the District's intent to award a contract.
(B) If stated in the solicitation document, the District may post this notice electronically or through non-electronic means and require the bidder or proposer to determine the status of the District's intent.
(C) As an alternate, the District may provide written notice to each bidder or proposer of the District's intent to award a contract. This written notice may be provided electronically or through non-electronic means.
(D) The District may give less than seven days notice of its intent to award a contract if the District determines in writing that seven days is impractical as allowed by ORS 279B. 135.
(E) This section does not apply to goods or services contracts awarded under the small procurements under the Local Rules, or other goods and services contracts awarded in accordance with ORS 279B.070, 279B.075, 279B. 080 or 279B. 085.
(F) This section does not apply to any public improvement contract or class of public improvement contracts exempted from competitive bidding requirements.
(G) A protest of the District's intent to award a contract may only be filed in accordance with OAR 137-047-0740 or OAR 137-049-0450, as applicable.

### 5.10 Methods for Awarding Contracts Using RFP Process

(A) In making an award using the RFP process in ORS 279B.060, the District may use any evaluation method determined to be most appropriate for the selection process, including the processes described in ORS 279B.060(6)(b), as well as direct appointment of personal services contracts if direct appointment is determined to be most advantageous to the District. The evaluation process used
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must be stated in the RFP. OAR 137-047-0261 through 137-047-0263 apply to evaluation of proposals.
(B) The District may require prequalification of bidders or proposers as stated in ORS 279B. 125 for public improvement contracts in excess of $\$ 300,000$.

### 5.11 Emergency Contracts

(A) The President or Manager has the authority to determine when emergency conditions exist sufficient to warrant an emergency contract. The nature of the emergency and the method used for the selection of the contractor must be documented.
(B) Emergency contracts may be awarded as follows:
(1) Goods and Services. Emergency contracts for procurement of goods and services may be awarded under ORS 279B. 080 and DCP 5.04.
(2) Public Improvements. The District adopts OAR 137-049-0150 as its contracting rules for awarding a public improvement contract under emergency conditions.

### 5.12 Disposal of Surplus Property

(A) The Manager may dispose of surplus property as follows:
(1) For surplus property deemed to have an estimated salvage value of $\$ 50,000$ or less, the Manager may authorize the property to be sold, donated or destroyed.
(2) For surplus property deemed to have an estimated salvage value of more than $\$ 50,000$, the Board may authorize the Manager to dispose of the property in any appropriate manner.
(B) Surplus property may be disposed of in the manner that is most advantageous to the District or the community at large including the following:
(1) Public Auction. Auctions must be sufficiently advertised in the manner that is most likely to obtain a competitive bidding pool for the property. Employees of the District may purchase surplus property from the District only at an advertised auction, and only if the employee submits the highest bid for such property.
(2) Donation. Surplus property may be donated or sold to any non-profit organization, any other local government, or any state or federal program created to dispose of surplus property.
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(3) Disposal. Surplus property determined to be of insufficient value to merit auction or donation may be disposed of in any appropriate manner.

### 5.13 Prequalification

(A) The District will allow prequalification for specifically the 2008 Bond trail projects valued at $\$ 1$ million or more.as authorized by ORS 279C. 430 using forms approved by the Manager.
(B) The Manager will determine qualifications based on the factors listed in ORS 279C.375(3)(b):
(1) The financial resources of the applicant, including insurance and bonding capacity, solvency and past payment history with employees, subcontractors and suppliers.
(2) The equipment and technology of the applicant available to perform the contract, including licensing and contract rights to use equipment and technology.
(4) The key personnel of applicant available to perform the contract, including their experience and capabilities as demonstrated by performance on comparable contracts.
(5) Holds current licensees that business or service professional operating in this state must hold in order to undertake or perform work specified in the contract.
(6) Completed previous contracts of a similar nature with a satisfactory records of performance, including planning, phasing, and scheduling; safety programs and records; compliance with local, state and federal laws relating to employment; dispute resolution; and references from owners, engineers and other contract agencies.
(7) Has a satisfactory record of integrity, and may consider, previous criminal convictions for offenses related to obtaining or subcontracting or in the connection with the bidders performance of a contract or subcontract.
(C) The Manager will notify applicants of qualification or disqualification within 30 days of applications. Applicants may appeal disqualifications by filing a written notice of appeal with the Manager within three days of receipt of notice of disqualification. The District presumes receipt at the earliest of date of personal delivery, facsimile, actual oral or written notice, or three days after mailing of a notice of disqualification.
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(D) The Manager may debar a prospective bidder or proposer for the reasons listed in ORS 279C.375(3)(b). The Manager must provide written notice of such determination to the person or applicant and comply with the decision requirements of ORS 279C.375(4).

### 5.14 Appeals of Prequalification Decisions and Debarment Decisions

Review of the District's prequalification and debarment decisions are as stated in ORS 279B.425. The following additional procedures apply to hearings on such decisions by the LCRB:
(A) Notices must be submitted in writing to the Manager. Appeals filed after the filing period stated in ORS 279B. 425 will not be considered.
(B) Upon opening of the hearing, District staff will explain the decision being appealed and the justification thereof. The appellant will then be heard. Time for the appellant's testimony will be established by the President. The appellant may submit any testimony or evidence relevant to the decision or the appeal. Any party requesting time to testify in support of the appeal will then be heard, subject to time limits established by the President.
(C) Once all testimony and evidence in support of the appeal is heard, any party requesting time to testify in support of the District decision will be heard, with time limits set by the President. Any party testifying in opposition to the appeal may submit any testimony or evidence relevant to the decision or the appeal. Once all testimony in opposition to the appeal has been heard, the appellant may request time to provide rebuttal testimony. At the conclusion of the rebuttal testimony, if any, the President will close the hearing.
(D) When issued in writing according to the requirements of ORS 279B.425, the LCRB decision is final.

### 5.15 Concession Agreements

Concession agreements are not required to be competitively bid. However, when it is in the District's best interests to do so, the District may obtain competitive proposals for concession agreements using the procedures described in ORS 279B.060.

### 5.16 Purchases from Federal Catalogs

Subject to Board approval requirements stated in the Local Rules, the District may purchase goods from federal catalogs without competitive bidding when the procurement is under to 10 USC 381, the Electronic Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347). Purchases under other federal laws will be permitted upon a finding by the LCRB that the law is similar to such Act in effectuating or promoting transfers of property to contracting agencies.
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### 5.17 Intergovernmental Agreements

(A) Applicability. This policy provides guidance for approval and execution of, Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) as defined by ORS chapter 190 and for non-IGA agreements between the District and other government agencies.
(B) Policy. The Board will exercise authority to approve and authorize the Manager to execute IGAs. The Manager is delegated authority to approve and authorize non-IGA agreements for general business with other government agencies that meet any of the following conditions:
(1) Agreements where the funding does not exceed $\$ 100,000$, exclusive of staff time for business in the following categories:
(a) acquisition of services;
(b) membership; and
(c) facility use / property leases;
(2) Agreements for compensation to the District that do not exceed \$100,000 and do not adversely affect District physical assets; or
(3) Grant applications that do not require Board approval.

## 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, October 3, 2011. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Bob Scott
Larry Pelatt
Joseph Blowers
William Kanable
John Griffiths
Doug Menke

President/Director
Secretary/Director
Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
Director
Director
General Manager

Agenda Item \#1 - Executive Session (A) Legal (B) Land
President, Bob Scott, 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.
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 - Presentations

A. Beaverton School District Superintendent Jerome Colonna

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Jerome Colonna to be recognized for his career in public service to the community as Beaverton School District's Superintendent for the past nine years. Doug described how under Jerome's leadership, the Beaverton School District has been a great partner with the Park District and that the two agencies have been successful in uniting together under a common interest to serve the children and adults of the community.

President, Bob Scott, presented Jerome with a plaque thanking him for his service to the Park District and community.
$\checkmark$ Jerome thanked the Board of Directors for the recognition this evening, noting that governmental partnerships are even more important during difficult economic times such as these and that the relationship between the School District and Park District is a great example of how such partnerships can benefit the community.

## B. Stuhr Center Advisory Committee

Lisa Novak, Superintendent of Programs \& Special Activities, introduced David Magee, Stuhr Center Advisory Committee member, and Linda Jo Enger, Center Supervisor for the Stuhr Center, to make a presentation to the Board of Directors regarding the activities of the Committee during the past year as well as their goals for the coming year.

David provided an overview of the Stuhr Center Advisory Committee's current focuses as well as their goals for the future via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, and which included the following topics:

- Past \& Future Special Events
- Fundraising \& Donations
- 2008 Bond Measure Funded Expansion Project
- Past \& Future Committee Goals

David offered to answer any questions the Board may have.
John Griffiths recalled that the original plan was to expand the current fitness room.
$\checkmark$ Linda Jo agreed, noting that through the design process, the consultants did a wonderful job of repurposing the existing rooms at the center and that it was a better fit to develop a larger fitness room in a different area within the center.

Larry Pelatt asked whether funds for new furnishings and fitness equipment for the fitness room expansion project were included within the bond measure.
$\checkmark$ Doug Menke, General Manager, replied that funding was not included; however, the Committee has done a wonderful job of raising funds for such items in the past.
$\checkmark$ Linda Jo confirmed that the Committee has committed \$175,000 of their funds to this.
President, Bob Scott, thanked David and Linda Jo on behalf of the Board of Directors for the informative presentation.

## Agenda Item \#5 - Audience Time

Pavel Goberman, PO Box 1664, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening requesting that the District facilitate a forum for candidates running for public office, noting that as a tax-funded agency, it is the District's duty to help educate the public in this area.

Priscilla Christenson, 15062 SW Barcelona Way, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding Consent Agenda Item I, Resolution Adopting Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan. She thanked the Board for their recent decision to approve a lower impact, more environmentally sensitive, master plan for the site. She stated that she hopes that the site forever showcases the natural beauty of Beaverton and will be a testimony of what can be accomplished when the District and its citizens work together in partnership.

## Agenda Item \#6 - Board Time

John Griffiths referenced Consent Agenda Item I, Resolution Adopting Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan, and asked whether the adjustments to the parking lot discussed at the September 12, 2011 Regular Board meeting were able to be accommodated.
$\checkmark$ Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, confirmed that the parking lot was able to be moved closer to Hart Road and that by doing so the tree impact was further reduced by three.

John described an article in Parks \& Recreation magazine about how increasing participation can have a greater impact on revenues than raising fees, as well as by providing new recreational opportunities that have not been traditionally provided by park and recreation agencies, such as zip lines.

Bill Kanable described how the affiliated sports groups have been adjusting to the field use fee increases and how the fees have spurred the groups into using fields more efficiently than in the past. He stated that although there will be some who claim that the fees are disproportionate and have not been worth the cost, he believes that ultimately it is being worked out by most groups and has benefited the management of the fields to make better uses of the resources and that such resources that have been closed in the past are now available for others to use.

Agenda Item \#7 - Consent Agenda
Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of September 12, 2011 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Resolution Appointing Trails Advisory Committee Member, (E) Service District Initiated Annexation Resolution, (F) Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro to Accept Regional Transportation Options Grant for Trail Signage, (G) Resolution Adopting the Supplemental Budget for Personnel and Professional Services Costs for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2011, (H) Resolution Adopting Fee Study Adjustments, (I)
Resolution Adopting Lowami Hart Woods Master Plan, (J) Resolution Authorizing
Execution of Oregon Coalition Brownfields Cleanup Fund Grant Contract, and (K) Resolution Supporting Passage of Beaverton School District Local Option Levy. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:
Larry Pelatt Yes
John Griffiths Yes
Joe Blowers Yes
Bill Kanable Yes
Bob Scott Yes
The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.
Bill Kanable was excused from the meeting.
Agenda Item \#8 - Unfinished Business
A. 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:

- Fanno Creek Trail Project Update
- Westside Trail Project Funding
- Bond Issuance Update
o Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, provided a detailed overview of the recent bond issuance, noting that the recent economic activity greatly benefitted the municipal bond market, resulting in numerous bids with very aggressive rates. As a result:
- The bid will achieve the desired levy rate of 30 cents per thousand for the combined tax levies (the original projection used in the election material was 37 cents per thousand).
- The District sold a par amount of $\$ 40,060,000$ generating a net premium of $\$ 1,435,000$ totaling to $\$ 41,495,000$ available for projects. No additional interest cost will result from the net premium received.
- The cost of issuance was fully offset by the premium received. This means that the $1.5 \%$ budgeted for issuance costs can be used for other items related to the bond capital program.
- The True Interest Cost (TIC) on the issue is $3.2518 \%$ - lower than the original issue in April 2009 when the TIC came in at $4.1916 \%$.
- Due to changes in the municipal bond market since the November 2008 election, taxpayers will save almost $\$ 17$ million in interest expense on the bonds from the forecasted amount at the time of the election.
- Because of the District's sound financial position, the rating agencies affirmed the Aa1 and AA ratings, resulting in the excellent results achieved with this final issue.
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule
- The Oregonian's Focus on Beaverton Insert

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

Larry Pelatt congratulated staff on the excellent credit rating received.
$\checkmark$ Keith noted that the rating agencies were also impressed with the District's fiscal policies, which are determined by the Board of Directors.

President, Bob Scott, noted that although he realizes that there have already been some newspaper articles on this topic, he asked whether there is any further public outreach work that could be done to further promote the successful bond issuance.
$\checkmark$ Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Outreach, replied that extensive outreach has been done on this information, but that he will continue to look for new opportunities. Joe Blowers suggested phrasing the information in a tangible manner by listing an example of something that could be funded in an equivalent amount as a result of the savings.

## Agenda Item \#9 - New Business

A. Recommended Goal Outcomes for Fiscal Year 2012-13 Planning and Budgeting Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager, provided an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that a priority list of performance measures with associated goal outcomes has been compiled for consideration by the Board for use in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 planning and budget process. The list has been updated to include an additional four priority goals to the original list. In addition, the list has also been stratified between primary and secondary measures with the intent to identify performance measures that are more directly related to the core functions of the District as primary with supporting measures as secondary. Ann noted that the action requested this evening is Board adoption of the goal outcomes for the established priority performance measurements for use in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 planning and budget process and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Bob Scott, referenced Goal 6G1, "Provide professional development and training for staff, including participation in professional organizations." He asked how the professional organizations are chosen and whether it is ensured that those organizations are relevant to the staff member's position.
$\checkmark$ Ann clarified that the number of hours shown in terms of the measurement are for internal staff hours for training done onsite. In terms of membership to professional organizations, that is a goal that does not yet have specifics.
$\checkmark$ Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, added that part of the District's employee evaluation process includes development of leadership functions for the following year and that is where a supervisor could establish with an employee in which professional organizations they would like the employee to be involved.

Joe Blowers referenced the service level measurements throughout the chart that are referenced as "not available." He asked whether there is a plan in place to develop that information.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that obtaining the necessary information to develop these service level measurements is being addressed through a variety of angles, one being an update to the Comprehensive Plan, which will be discussed later this evening, and will address the acreage/proximity standards that are missing. In terms of maintaining and monitoring the condition of natural areas, that service level measurement is currently being developed through a business plan and should have information for consideration by the end of the fiscal year. Basically, the service level measurements that are shown as "not available" are still in process and may take another year or two to address all of them.

John Griffiths referenced the basis of measurement of number of acres per 1,000 residents for Neighborhood and Community Parks.
$\checkmark$ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that these standards would be addressed through the update to the Comprehensive Plan in order to take into consideration how those standards may need to change in order to accommodate the Park District Sites Reclassification Project recently approved by the Board of Directors.
John asked whether a similar standard exists for natural areas.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that it does not.
John noted that since parks and playing fields are being monitored this way, perhaps it would be appropriate to explore monitoring natural areas in the same way.
$\checkmark$ Joe Blowers expressed agreement, noting that in terms of the "nature deficit disorder" phrase that has been coined, the question could be asked what is the minimum amount of natural area needed in order to get kids out into nature? At what point does the natural area become overloaded?
Ann noted that this could be included in the research for the Comprehensive Plan update.
$\checkmark$ Keith agreed, noting that the standards listed are taken directly from the existing Comprehensive Plan, so the timing for this request is perfect.

Joe Blowers moved the Board of Directors adopt the goal outcomes for the established priority performance measurements for use in the Fiscal Year 2012-13 planning and budget process. 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.

## B. Comp Plan Update

Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that an update to the 2006 Comprehensive Plan is proposed for completion by June 30, 2012. Elements to be updated in the plan include demographics (taking into consideration the 2010 census information), park standards (taking into consideration the Park District Sites Reclassification Project) and a future needs assessment. In addition, a new plan structure is also being proposed. The Comprehensive Plan would serve as an umbrella document providing general policy direction
for functional plans, which would contain the actual implementation details per service area. The underlying functional plans would be updated or developed in subsequent years and include: the Parks Functional Plan, the Trails Functional Plan, the Natural Resources Functional Plan, the Athletic Fields Functional Plan and the Programs Functional Plan.

Larry Pelatt asked whether the proposed functional plans would restrict the Board's flexibility.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that it would actually allow for more flexibility. The Comprehensive Plan would contain the demographics and standards that remain fixed until updated, while the functional plans' action steps to achieve the identified goals could become more fluid.
$\checkmark$ Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, noted that this proposed new structure reflects to some degree what is already in existence with the Trails Master Plan.
$\checkmark$ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that it would also allow the opportunity to take a plan such as the Natural Resources Management Plan, which is more of an operational prospective, and end up with a functional plan for natural resources. Both the natural resources and parks functional plans would be able to assist in addressing situations, such as that which was seen with the Lowami Hart Woods master planning process, in answering the question of what is the best practice for developing within natural areas. The functional plans would provide a baseline of criteria and a framework for the Board to make future decisions.
Larry expressed support for the concept.
Ann described the planned public outreach efforts for the update, noting that although staff is not anticipating conducting surveys, they would take the process being described this evening to the Advisory Committees, Citizen Participation Organizations and Neighborhood Association Committees. In addition, Ann provided an overview of the timeline for the project via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record.

Joe Blowers commented that although it seems like a shift in philosophy to go from master plans to functional plans, he likes the idea. The idea of a master plan seems fixed in time and he is not sure if that is the best way to look at plans such as the Trails Master Plan. As an example, he referenced a trail segment north of Brookhaven Park that he had mentioned in previous Board meetings and noted that perhaps a functional plan would enable looking at such segments not quite as set in stone as they seem when included within a master plan.
$\checkmark$ Larry replied that, while he does not disagree, he also likes to have an overall, big picture goal that is fixed. Without a fixed, long-range master plan, he worries that the District could get tied down in the smaller plans and lose sight of the major goals. Joe commented that what Larry is referencing sounds like it would be addressed via the Comprehensive Plan.
$\checkmark$ Ann confirmed this, noting that the Comprehensive Plan would still maintain the main goals, and that the functional plans would be formed around those goals, but would be allowed to be fluid and change more.
Larry commented that he likes having both options available as is being proposed.
Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, described how the term "functional plan" was developed, noting that one of the reasons staff is proposing that terminology is because the term "master plan" is used for specific site plans.

Hearing no further questions or comments, President, Bob Scott, requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

## C. Greenhouse Gas Inventory

Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager, referenced the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that in spring 2011, the District engaged the consulting firm The Good Company to assist in the development of its baseline greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory. This inventory quantifies the amount of carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)$ equivalents generated and emitted by the District in one year.

Ann provided a detailed overview of the GHG Inventory Report prepared for the District via a PowerPoint Presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, noting that GHG emission sources are considered either direct or indirect. In order to distinguish between the two, three "scopes" are defined for traditional GHG accounting and reporting purposes per The World Resources Institute Greenhouse Gas Protocol. Scope 1 sources are direct sources that originate from equipment and facilities owned or operated by the District, while Scope 2 and Scope 3 are indirect emission sources. Scope 2 sources are from District-purchased electricity heat or steam, while Scope 3 sources are all other activities of the District that occur from sources owned or controlled by another company or entity.

Joe Blowers referenced the standard mentioned for electricity of dollars spent generating xamount of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. He asked, assuming in the future electricity becomes more sustainable through wind generation or something else, how would that be adjusted within the calculation?
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that this is only one of the ways to calculate this item and is something that is going to have to be checked on each year through one of the many websites available on this topic. The standards being presented this evening were developed in 2005, so they are already somewhat dated.
Joe asked for confirmation that there is a set of standards so to speak.
$\checkmark$ Ann confirmed this.
Joe asked whether these standards would change over time.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that unless something changes drastically within the environment, the standards will probably stay the same since they were developed in 2005 and are indexed for inflation.

Larry Pelatt commented that it seems like the information should be indexed by an industry standard. He offered an example of a 20 -story office building versus the District and asked how the particular activities for which the electricity is being used is taken into consideration. In some cases, the electricity being used by the District is for activities that may be eliminating $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, such as by plantings, whereas an office building does not have that.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that the model is based on units used, not what those units are being used for, whether lighting a baseball field or lighting an office building. She asked the Board to keep in mind that this information is all very early in its development. She recalled attending a seminar two years ago offered by the same company and how much advancement has been made in that little time. The calculating of GHG is still a relatively new concept, but the Economic Input-Output Life Cycle Analysis (EIO-LCA) standard is being promoted as the best that is available today, as it was developed by a reputable university and breaks down each expenditure by specific category of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ generation, so this is the best that is currently available.
$\checkmark$ Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, explained that the information is also not meant as a scorecard to compare against other agencies. Comparing $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ amounts is meaningless unless there is another agency that is absolutely identical to the District. The $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ generated is a factor of the activities that take place and each agency has unique activities and service levels. A more meaningful use of the information will be to identify the District's highest impact areas that can be targeted for reduction and tracking over time the progress made in those areas.

President, Bob Scott, referenced Ann's comments regarding the time intensiveness of compiling some of the data. He asked whether some of it could be disregarded so that efforts could be focused on the larger areas of impact.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that would depend on what the Board determines is a priority area.
John Griffiths commented that it seems that the only outputs the District has control over are those in Scope 1.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that the District also has control over the items in Scope 3 based on what it purchases. According to the EIO-LCA categories, some are more $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ intensive than others. If the District could identify what it is buying that is more $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ intensive, perhaps there is something else that could be bought instead that has a lower impact. The ranges can vary quite a bit and may be worth investigating.
Joe suggested that going from products that use new plastic to those using recycled plastic could be a big impact.
$\checkmark$ Ann agreed, noting that some of it would have to play out as those choices are made because the categories are not as specific as they could be. For example, new versus recycled plastic is not included. It is not that sophisticated yet.
$\checkmark$ Keith noted that one thing already included within the District's lifecycle costing analysis and will also be included in the sustainable purchasing policy is the source of the product. Buying local has a much lower $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ impact than buying something from a location that requires it to be shipped a long way. He does not know whether the standards take this into consideration either. The District could make great strides in these types of decisions, but it is not necessarily going to show up using this model. President, Bob Scott, noted that addressing items in Scope 3 does not have to be an all or nothing approach. Similar to Scope 1, the District could focus on the larger impact areas and disregard the smaller items that take a lot of time to address.
$\checkmark$ Ann agreed, noting that the District would still need to complete a certain degree of data sorting to get to those categories, but it is doable.

Larry Pelatt described efforts by the City of Portland in this area and their requirement of vendors to provide information about the products they are selling and from where the products came. Such information is beginning to be integrated into their purchasing process.
$\checkmark$ Ann noted that it has been stated throughout this process that it will take agencies like the District to pressure vendors into taking $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions into consideration.
Larry agreed, noting that until agencies ask, the vendors are not going to willingly take it into consideration. Ultimately, it could be used as a selling point.
$\checkmark$ Joe questioned how an agency could verify the vendors' claims.
Larry replied that there is a term for what Joe is describing, "green-washing," and until there is more verifiable information, it is going to be difficult to ensure that the information is truthful.
$\checkmark$ Ann agreed that until manufacturers are required to report the information and be penalized for not reporting it or using false data, the information will be somewhat speculative.
Larry noted that sourcing and verifying products made overseas is especially difficult.
Joe referenced the large $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ impact patron commute has and questioned whether there is a way to quantify this impact, such as by the cost of a parking space. He described how Metro charges per car for visitors to the zoo.
$\checkmark$ Larry noted that visitors to the zoo that arrive by public transit get a discount on the admission.
Joe questioned whether the District could offer something similar. He described the money that could be saved on constructing parking lots if the District were able to encourage patrons through a fee break to carpool or use public transit instead.
$\checkmark$ Ann replied that another method to consider may be dedicated parking spaces for carpoolers.

Hearing no further Board questions or comments, President, Bob Scott, thanked District staff for the informative presentation.

## Agenda Item \#10 - Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Recording Secretary, Jessica Collins

| Tualatin Hills <br> Park \& Rec. |  | Accounts Payable | September 30, 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name | Check Amount |  |
| 256709 | 09/01/11 | Star Medical, Inc. Accounts Payable | 4,675.59 |  |
|  |  | Accounts Payable | \$ | 4,675.59 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256809 \\ & 257356 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 09 / 06 / 11 \\ & 09 / 29 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Community Newspapers, Inc. Oregonian Publishing Company Advertising | $\begin{aligned} & 1,958.54 \\ & 2,671.26 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 4,629.80 |
| 256886 | 09/08/11 | Mersereau \& Shannon, LLP Bank Charges and Fees | 5,600.00 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 5,600.00 |
| 257099 | 09/15/11 | Coastwide Laboratories <br> Building \& Pool Equipment Support Replacement | 13,516.49 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 13,516.49 |
| 256790 | 09/06/11 | Atlas Track \& Tennis Capital Outlay-Athletic Facility Replacement | 13,600.00 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 13,600.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256733 \\ & 257034 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 09 / 06 / 11 \\ & 09 / 15 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Otak, Inc. <br> Otak, Inc. <br> Capital Outlay-Bond Youth Athletic Field Development | $\begin{array}{r} 18,321.51 \\ 3,950.50 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ 22,272.01 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256899 \\ & 257021 \\ & 257243 \\ & 257274 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 09 / 08 / 11 \\ & 09 / 15 / 11 \\ & 09 / 26 / 11 \\ & 09 / 26 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Standard and Poor's <br> Moody's Investors Service <br> D.A. Davidson \& Co. <br> Mersereau \& Shannon, LLP <br> Capital Outlay-Bond-Debt Service | $\begin{aligned} & 13,500.00 \\ & 17,000.00 \\ & 18,492.00 \\ & 28,500.00 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 77,492.00 |
| 256728 | 09/06/11 | OPSIS Architecture, LLP | 6,708.09 |  |
| 256794 | 09/06/11 | BBL Architects | 8,889.81 |  |
| 256820 | 09/06/11 | Earth Engineers, Inc. | 3,443.55 |  |
| 257040 | 09/15/11 | Peterson Structural Engineers, Inc. Seabold Construction Co., Inc. |  |  |
| 257057 | 09/15/11 |  | 441,134.52 |  |
| 257140 | 09/19/11 | Seabold Construction Co., Inc. <br> Skyward Construction | 288,631.85 |  |
| 257292 | 09/26/11 | Pinnell Busch, Inc. |  | 3,799.93 |
| 257299 | 09/26/11 | Professional Service Industries, Inc. <br> Capital Outlay-Bond-Facility Expansion \& Improvements | 2,402.74 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 756,834.49 |
| 256735 | 09/06/11 | Pacific Habitat Services, Inc. <br> Capital Outlay-Bond-Land Acquisition | 2,973.00 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 2,973.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256789 \\ & 257244 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 09 / 06 / 11 \\ & 09 / 26 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Ash Creek Forest Management, LLC | $\begin{aligned} & 1,890.00 \\ & 2,960.00 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | Daneal Construction, Inc. |  |  |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Bond-Natural Resources Projects | \$ | 4,850.00 |
| 256815 . | 09/06/11 | David Evans \& Associates, Inc. Capital Outlay-Bond-New/Redeveloped Community Parks | 21,356.72 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 21,356.72 |
| 256721 | 09/06/11 | MIG, Inc. | 9,967.50 |  |
| 56733 | 09/06/11 | Otak, Inc. | 1,166.00 |  |
| 256740 | 09/06/11 | Paul Brothers, Inc. |  |  |
| 257126 | 09/15/11 | J.D. Walsh \& Associates | 5,428.30 |  |
| 257261 | 09/26/11 | GreenWorks, PC | 1,288.00 |  |
| 257315 | 09/26/11 | Treecology, Inc. <br> Capital Outlay-Bond-New/Redeveloped Neighborhood Parks | 36,002.00 |  |
|  |  |  | \$ | 55,231.35 |

Check Number
$256892 \quad \frac{\text { Check Date }}{09 / 08 / 11}$

## 09/08/11

09/06/11
09/06/11
09/06/11
09/26/11
09/28/11

09/15/11
09/19/11

09/26/11

09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/20/11
09/26/11
09/26/11
09/26/11
09/29/11

09/06/11

09/06/11

09/06/11
09/13/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/20/11
09/26/11

09/26/11

09/13/11
09/13/11
09/13/11
09/15/11

## $\xrightarrow[\text { Vendor Name }]{\text { Parr Lumber Company }}$ <br> Capital Outlay-Bond-Replacements \& Improvements

Vigil-Agrimis, Inc.
Western Wood Structures, Inc.
David Evans \& Associates, Inc.
Walker Macy
Washington County
Capital Outlay-Bond-Trails/Linear Parks
3J Consulting, Inc.
City of Beaverton
Capital Outlay-Bridge \& Boardwalk Repair
Knorr Systems, Inc.
Capital Outlay-Building Improvements
Peterson Structural Engineers, Inc.
RMS Pump, Inc:
Toughstuff Industrial Floors
Brandsen Hardwood Floors, Inc.
Brandsen Hardwood Floors, Inc.
Bruner Plumbing, Inc.
Koeber's, Inc.
Safer Floors NW, LLC
AYM Corporation
Capital Outlay-Building Replacements

MacKay \& Sposito, Inc.
Capital Outlay-Commonwealth Park North Trail Realignment

Cistus Design Nursery, LLC
Capital Outlay-JQAY House Renovation

Aloha Backflow Testing \& Inspection
Web Steel Sales, Inc.
Robert Gray Partners, Inc.
Scott Edwards Architecture LLP
3J Consulting, Inc.
Brian C Jackson, Architect, LLC
DataComm, LLC
Scott Edwards Architecture, LLP
Capital Outlay-Maintenance Facility Renovation Costs

City of Beaverton
Capital Outlay-Matrix Hill park Renovation

Alta Planning \& Design, Inc.
Brown Contracting, Inc.
Hahn \& Associates
Topper Industries, Inc.

Check Amount

|  | Check Amount <br> $2,329.43$ <br> $\$$$\quad \mathbf{2 , 3 2 9 . 4 3}$ |
| :--- | ---: |


| $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 0 1 5 . 1 2}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | $1,532.90$ |
|  | $1,001.33$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 , 5 3 4 . 2 3}$ |
|  | $22,465.00$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 2 , 4 6 5 . 0 0}$ |


| $6,935.00$ |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $3,883.00$ |  |
| $4,005.00$ |  |
| $10,155.00$ |  |
| $10,148.00$ |  |
| $12,905.00$ |  |
| $9,115.00$ |  |
| $4,200.00$ |  |
|  | $1,318.00$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 6 6 4 . 0 0}$ |



|  | $1,200.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ \quad \mathbf{1 , 2 0 0 . 0 0}$ |  |

2,157.00
14,528.40
493,036.10
5,723.53
7,774.95
10,283.23
5,000.00
10,287.83
\$ 548,791.04

|  | $3,000.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ \quad 3,000.00$ |  |

3,612.67
180,150.00
2,600.00
12,438.00
Check Number
257238
257285
257293
257093
257040

256855

256848
256993
257216

257010
257384
257387
257388
257394
257004
257008
257011
257012
257379
257385
257389
257391
257393

257068

256717
256767
257015
257029

256847
257215

256816

| Check Date |
| :--- |
| $09 / 26 / 11$ |
| $09 / 26 / 11$ |
| $09 / 26 / 11$ |

09/15/11

09/15/11

09/07/11

09/07/11

09/06/11
09/26/11
Vendor Name
Caswell/Hertel Surveyors, Inc.
OR Dept. of Transportation
Pinnell Busch, Inc.
Capital Outlay-SDC-Park Development/Improvements
Beighley \& Associates, Inc.
Capital Outlay-Signage Master Plan

Peterson Structural Engineers, Inc.
Contracts Payable
Joe Wentworth
District Credit (Refund)
09/07/11
09/15/11
09/26/11

09/15/11
09/30/11
09/30/11
09/30/11
09/30/11

09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/30/11
09/30/11
09/30/11
09/30/11
09/30/11

09/15/11

09/06/11
09/06/11
09/15/11
09/15/11

09/26/11
NW Natural
NW Natural
Heat

Dell Marketing L.P.
GovernmentJobs.com, Inc.
Information Technology Replacement

Check Amount
1,886.00
69,322.50
5,496.49
\$ 275,505.66

|  | $1,858.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 5 8 . 0 0}$ |


|  | $3,517.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 , 5 1 7 . 0 0}$ |
|  | $1,423.00$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 2 3 . 0 0}$ |

44,175.02
7,544.77
5,051.90
\$ 56,771.69

214,310.68
180,411.16
26,326.21
12,136.53
1,280.14
$\$ \quad 434,464.72$

6,987.48
7,357.43
29,378.87
3,839.83
6,987.48
8,280.68
29,092.95
3,498.33
6,830.69
$\$ \quad 102,253.74$

|  | $29,287.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 9 , 2 8 7 . 0 0}$ |

2,289.57
17,326.70
2,224.54
1,357.91

12,813.13
11,400.09

13,934.16
8,000.00
\$ 21,934.16

| Check Number |  |  | Check Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 256731 |  | $09 / 06 / 11$ |  |
| 256744 |  | $09 / 06 / 11$ |  |
| 256799 |  | $09 / 06 / 11$ |  |
| 256890 |  | $09 / 08 / 11$ |  |
| 257033 |  | $09 / 15 / 11$ |  |
| 257043 |  | $09 / 15 / 11$ |  |
| 257328 |  | $09 / 27 / 11$ |  |
| 257355 |  | $09 / 29 / 11$ |  |

256895
257061
257074
257121
257134
257307

256711
256734
256743
256752
09/08/11
09/15/11 Stark Street Lawn \& Garden West
09/15/11 Western Equipment Distributors, Inc.
09/15/11 Guaranteed Pest Contro
09/15/11
09/26/11
Vendor Name
Oregon Fencing Alliance
Play-well TEKnologies
Beaverton Volleyball
NSAOUA
Oregon Fencing Alliance
Portland Community Med
River Drifters Whitewater
NSAOUA
Instructional Services

| Summary |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| Check Amount |  |
| $5,780.00$ |  |
|  | $6,771.00$ |
| $1,139.50$ |  |
| $2,854.50$ |  |
|  | $2,565.00$ |
|  | $1,200.00$ |
|  | $1,125.00$ |
|  | $1,662.50$ |
|  | $23,097.50$ |
|  | $2,187.13$ |
| $\$$ | $10,642.00$ |
|  | $2,453.49$ |
|  | $1,626.00$ |
|  | $3,168.00$ |
|  | $5,957.12$ |
|  | $26,033.74$ |

09/06/11
09/06/11
09/06/11
09/06/11
09/06/11
09/06/11
09/06/11
09/08/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/15/11
09/20/11
09/26/11
09/26/11
09/26/11
09/26/11
09/26/11
09/29/11
09/29/11

257063
$09 / 15 / 11$

| Check Number |  | Check Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 256727 |  | $09 / 06 / 11$ |
| 256901 |  | $09 / 08 / 11$ |
| 257283 |  | $09 / 26 / 11$ |
| 257303 |  | $09 / 26 / 11$ |

US Postmaster

## Vendor Name

| OfficeMax - A Boise Company | Check Amount |
| :--- | ---: |
| USI Education | $1,676.01$ |
| OfficeMax - A Boise Company | $1,294.49$ |
| Ricoh Americas Corp. | $2,056.85$ |
| Office Supplies | $2,222.64$ |

THPRD - Petty Cash
Petty Cash

United States Postal Service
Postage

09/15/11 Lazerquick
Printing \& Publication
256758
257018
257083
257116
257231
257326

256706
256723
256724
256727
256747
257045
257063
257076
257091
257107
257122
257123
257165
257249
257263
257322

256800
257003

256784
256798
257303

257255

09/06/11

09/06/11
09/26/11

09/26/11

09/06/11
09/15/11

09/06/11 Social Bridge Media, LLC
09/15/11 Mediawrite

Angelo Planning Group, Inc.
09/15/11 FCS Group
09/26/11 Beery, Elsnor \& Hammond, LLP
09/27/11 Navigator Group Consulting, LLC
Professional Services

09/01/11 Purchase Advantage Card
New System Laundry, LLC $\quad 1,465.43$
NSA
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { OfficeMax - A Boise Company } & 1,050.00 \\ 1,157.10\end{array}$
Portland Rent All - East
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Precision Locksmith Service } & 1,695.98 \\ & 1,090.96\end{array}$
THP Foundation
Wilson Sporting Goods
Beaverton Sch. District \#48
Dream Ridge Stables, LLC
Head/Penn Racquet Sports
HSBC Business Solutions
Oaks Park
Evergreen Aviation Museum
City of Hillsboro
Beaverton Sch. District \#48
Program Supplies

Best Buy In Town, Inc.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Waste Management of Oregon } & \underline{7,416.78}\end{array}$
Refuse Services

American Barricade Company
Beaverton School District \#48
Ricoh Americas Corp.
Rental Equipment
Fred Shearer \& Sons
Rental Facility
$\mathbf{7 , 4 1 6 . 7 8}$
$\mathbf{8 , 5 0 7 . 2 8}$

1,886.60
4,752.80
2,760.06
\$ 9,399.46

|  | $8,224.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ \quad 8,224.00$ |  |



## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District



Program Resources:
Aquatic Centers
Tennis Center
Recreation Centers \& Programs
Sports Programs \& Field Rentals
Natural Resources
Total Program Resources

## Other Resources:

Property Taxes
Interest Income
Facility Rentals/Sponsorships
Grants
Miscellaneous Income
Total Other Resources

## Total Resources

Program Related Expenditures:
Parks \& Recreation Administration
Aquatic Centers
Tennis Center
Recreation Centers
Programs \& Special Activities
Athletic Center \& Sports Programs
Natural Resources \& Trails
Total Program Related Expenditures

## General Government Expenditures:

Board of Directors
Administration
Business \& Facilities
Planning
Capital Outlay
Total Other Expenditures:

## Total Expenditures

Revenues over (under) Expenditures

## Beginning Cash on Hand

Ending Cash on Hand

General Fund Financial Summary
September, 2011

|  |  |  | \% YTD to | Full |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current | Year to <br> Month | Prorated <br> Budget | Prorated <br> Budget | Fiscal Year <br> Budget |


| $\$$ | 131,942 | $\$$ | 630,453 | $\$$ | 530,413 | $118.9 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 41,935 | 144,584 | 171,908 | $84.1 \%$ | $2,326,372$ |  |  |
| 315,881 | $1,258,139$ |  | $1,439,112$ | $87.4 \%$ | $4,945,402$ |  |
| 52,170 | 188,999 |  | 160,769 | $117.6 \%$ | $1,164,993$ |  |
|  | 6,437 | 58,846 | 38,662 | $152.2 \%$ | 251,054 |  |
|  | 548,365 | $2,281,021$ | $2,340,865$ | $97.4 \%$ | $9,556,045$ |  |


| 47,953 | 47,953 | - | $0.0 \%$ | $24,222,230$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2,650 | 10,838 | 16,900 | $64.1 \%$ | 100,000 |
| 27,780 | 65,801 | 121,406 | $54.2 \%$ | 461,620 |
| 600 | 156,688 | 156,688 | $100.0 \%$ | 985,025 |
| 62,167 | 175,296 | 202,277 | $86.7 \%$ | 702,351 |
| 141,150 | 456,576 | 497,271 | $91.8 \%$ | $26,471,226$ |


| $\$$ | 689,515 | $\$ 2,737,597$ | $\$ 2,838,136$ | $96.5 \%$ | $\$ 36,027,271$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

General Fund Financial Summary

September, 2011

## General Fund Resources



## General Fund Expenditures



## MEMO

DATE: October 25, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Jim McElhinny, Director of Park \& Recreation Services
RE: $\quad$ Resolution Appointing Sports Advisory Committee Member
Introduction
The Sports Advisory Committee requests Board of Directors approval of one new Committee member appointment.

## Background

At their October 20, 2011 meeting, the Sports Advisory Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve and appoint Jerry Jones, Jr. to the Committee via the attached resolution.

Please note that the respective applicant's application and Sports Advisory Committee current roster are attached.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of Resolution No. 2011-30, appointing Jerry Jones, Jr. to the Sports Advisory Committee.

Resolution No. 2011-30
Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon
A RESOLUTION APPOINTING JERRY JONES, JR. AS A MEMBER OF THE SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors must appoint committee member by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Committee member shall be appointed by the Board for a two or three-year term; and

WHEREAS, the Committee member has demonstrated their interest and knowledge in the Committee's area of responsibility; and

## THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

The Board of Directors approves the appointment of Jerry Jones, Jr. (3year term).

Duly passed by this $7^{\text {th }}$ day of November 2011.

Bob Scott, Board President

Larry Pelatt, Board Secretary

ATTEST:

Jessica Collins
Recording Secretary

## TUALATIN HUS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMTTEE APPUCATION

| Name: Jerry Jones Jr. | Date: 10/12/11 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | City: | Zell |
| Phone \# (H) |  | Email: |

Advisory Committee you are applying for: (You must reside within the Park District boundaries)

## Recreation $\square$ Aquatics $\square$ Sports $\boxtimes$ Trails $\square$ Elsie Stuhr Center $\square$ Historic Facilities $\square$ Natural Resources $\square$ Parks $\square$

1. Please explain your interest in serving on the Advisory Committee:

I have lived in the District since 1984 and have enjoyed it! I want to be involved to help continue the successful District for my kids.
2. How long have you lived in the community? 27 Years
3. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities?

What:
Softball, toddler activities, \& volleyball.

When:
At various times since 2005

Where:
Various facilities

Number of Years: $\underline{6 \text { Years. }}$

```
*CONTINUES ON NEXT
```


## TUALATNH HUSPARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMTIEE APPUCATION

4. Have you served on other volunteer committees? YES $\backslash$ NO $\square$ If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were:

THPRD's last SDC Committee. City of Beaverton: BURA, VAC and Chamber Board of Directors. Washington County Development Liaison Committee.
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee:

Vast development and construction background, local volunteer activities and community outreach.
6. Term of Office preferred:

2-YEAR TERM $\boxtimes$ or 3 -YEAR TERM $\square$ Please check one

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District

# SPORTS <br> ADVSORY COMMTIEE ROSTER 

Last Updated: 10/24/11

| Committee Member | Member Since | Address | Phone | Email | Term Expires |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Janet Alison Chair | February 2010 |  |  |  | February 2013 |
| Caroline Fisher | February 2010 |  |  |  | February 2013 |
| Greg Cody | February 2010 |  |  |  | February 2013 |
| Ex-Officio Member | Representing | Address | Phone | Email | Term Expires |
| Scott Brucker | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Staff } \\ \text { THPRD } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton 97006 | 503/645-6433 | sbrucker@thprd.org | NA |
| Julie Rocha | $\begin{gathered} \text { Staff } \\ \text { THPRD } \end{gathered}$ | 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton 97006 | 503/629-6330 | jrocha@thprd.org | NA |

DATE: October 26, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution for Annexation of Properties per Washington County Ordinance 624 in Accordance with ORS 198.857(2)

## Introduction

Staff is seeking Board of Directors approval of a blanket resolution for the purpose of approving the future annexation of properties to the Park District during 2012 per ORS 198.857 pursuant to Washington County Ordinance 624.

## Background

ORS 198.857(2) states:
(2) When the owner of a parcel of land wants to annex that land to a district, the owner may file an annexation petition with the county board. The petition shall declare that the petition is filed pursuant to this section, state the name of the affected district and all affected counties, indicate the principal Act of the affected district and be signed by the owner of the parcel of land. Before the petition is filed with the county board, the petition must be approved by endorsement thereon by the board of the affected district and by any other agency also required by the principal Act to indorse or approve the petition.

In August of 2004, the Washington County Board of Commissioners adopted Ordinance 624. The key provision of that ordinance requires new development ${ }^{1}$ on property that is not addressed by an urban service agreement or located in a park and recreation district to annex to a park district:

- When a park district has been identified as the long-term service provider to the area the development is located in, and
- When the proposed development is subject to a development application (e.g., a subdivision). The new development would also be subject to the Park District's park SDC upon annexation.

As part of this Ordinance, the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District was established as the park and recreation service provider for the portion of the urban unincorporated area of the county between the Hillsboro, Portland and Tigard urban service boundaries for which the District has adopted a Park Master Plan. Ordinance 624 amended the County Community Development Code to include a requirement that all new development in that area annex to the

[^2]Park District. Typically, the developer will have to show compliance with this requirement before the County will record the plat or issue building permits.

Since obtaining an endorsement from the Park District is a statutory requirement for annexation, staff worked previously with the Park District's legal counsel Beery Elsner \& Hammond, LLP to identify a process that would endorse annexation of all properties pursuant to Ordinance 624 for one calendar year, instead of individually on a project-by-project basis. This process has been previously completed and adopted by the Board for the years 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011.

## Proposal Request

This resolution will endorse the annexation of all such properties to the Park District during 2012, so developers will be able to promptly comply with the terms of the County's land use decision process. The Park District's legal counsel has reviewed and approved the attached resolution.

## Benefits of Proposal

By approving the blanket resolution for the purpose of approving the future annexation of properties to the Park District, per Ordinance 624, the Park District will not have to process the endorsement of annexation for each development on a project-by-project basis. The resolution will endorse annexation of all properties for an entire calendar year.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There does not appear to be any downside to this proposal.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of and signature on Resolution No. 2011-31 for the purpose of approving future annexation of properties in Washington County, per Ordinance 624, during 2012. Additionally, the Board of Directors authorizes staff to submit the resolution to Washington County for processing.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2011-31

## A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE <br> TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT APPROVING ANNEXATIONS OF PROPERTY TO THE DISTRICT IN 2012 (Ordinance 624 Annexation)

WHEREAS, Washington County adopted Ordinance No. 624 in August, 2004, amending the Washington County Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area and the Community Development Code to recognize the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District ("District") as the long term park and recreation service provider in part of urban unincorporated Washington County; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 624 requires developing properties in the area served by the District to annex to the District as a condition of any development approval; and

WHEREAS, ORS 198.857(2) requires that proposed annexations to the District be approved by the District Board; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that properties will be seeking development approval in 2012, and will thus be subject to the application of Ordinance 624 and ORS 198.857(2); and

WHEREAS, the District Board wishes to express its formal approval of annexations proposed in 2012 and to file the approval in the form of this Resolution with the Washington County Board of Commissioners for consideration at hearings during 2012.

## NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT:

Section 1. The Board hereby approves the proposed annexation of properties to the District during 2012 pursuant to Washington County Ordinance No. 624.

Section 2. The District staff is hereby authorized and directed to file this Resolution and Exhibits with the Washington County Board of Commissioners.

Section 3. This Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its adoption by the Board.

Adopted this $7^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2011.

Bob Scott, Board President

Larry Pelatt, Board Secretary
Adoption and date attested by:

[^3]
## MEMO

DATE: October 28, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: Bond Program

## Introduction

The information and discussion in this memo adds to that which has been provided to the Board at previous meetings relating to implementation of the Bond Program. This memo provides the latest information on a recent meeting related to the Bond Program and addresses the status of construction work at Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center and the Stuhr Center.

## Recent Public Meeting

AM Kennedy Park: On October 26, 2011, the City of Beaverton Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on three applications (for conditional use approval, design review and a tree preservation plan) for improvements at the park. After a detailed discussion and review of testimony, the Commission ultimately voted to approve the plans with conditions of approval included. Park District staff will work with City staff as we move through the bidding and permitting process to reach agreement and understanding on the approval conditions.

Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center and the Stuhr Center Construction Progress Construction at both of the subject sites is moving ahead with completion anticipated in the Spring or Summer of 2012. Staff will have photos of the status of construction at both sites to show the Board at the November 7 meeting.

## MEMO

DATE: October 21, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Adopting the Decrease in the Out-of-District Drop-in Surcharge Rate

## Summary

Staff completed an update of the market survey of user fees first compiled for the 2006 Fee Study. Staff is requesting Board of Directors adoption of the out-of-District (OD) drop-in fee surcharge findings and recommendations through resolution at the November 7, 2011 Board of Directors meeting.

## Background

Staff conducted an update of the 2006 THPRD Fee Study market survey and presented the findings to the Board of Directors at the September 12, 2011 meeting. At that meeting, three recommendations were made requesting changes to current fee practices. Two of the three recommendations were adopted through resolution at the October 3, 2011 Board of Directors meeting. The third recommendation, to decrease the OD drop-in surcharge from $200 \%$ to $100 \%$, required additional analysis. This analysis has been conducted and the results have been summarized in the attached memo (Exhibit B to the proposed resolution).

## Proposal Request

Based on the results of the analysis staff is requesting that the Board of Directors approve the attached resolution to decrease the OD premium surcharge rate on drop-in fees from 200\% to 100\% effective January 2012.

The attached resolution has been reviewed by District legal counsel.

## Benefits of Proposal

Adoption of the decrease in the OD premium surcharge from $200 \%$ to $100 \%$ will better align the THPRD premium rate with those of other agencies in the market area and may increase OD patron participation in drop-in programs.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

Decreasing the OD premium surcharge may decrease total OD revenue. However, the District has observed a trend of decreasing OD drop-in revenue as the OD drop-in fee has been increased. As such there is an equally likely possibility that increased participation will offset the decreased fee and result in an increase in OD drop-in revenue.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2011-32, adopting the decrease in the out-of-District drop-in surcharge rate.

# RESOLUTION No. 2011-32 <br> TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT 

## A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE DECREASE IN THE OUT-OF-DISTRICT DROP-IN SURCHARGE RATE

WHEREAS, in 2006, Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District ("District") conducted a market study of user fees charged by area park and recreation providers;

WHEREAS, the market study included recommendations for scheduled adjustments to certain District user fees;

WHEREAS, the market study and scheduled fee adjustments were adopted by the Board of Directors in 2007;

WHEREAS, the 2006 market study included a provision that requires it to be updated every five years;

WHEREAS, in 2011, the District again conducted a market survey of user fees charged by area park and recreation providers, the results of which are described in the memorandum entitled Fee Market Survey Update Findings \& Recommendations, dated August 22, 2011, and attached as Exhibit A to this resolution;

WHEREAS, as described in the 2011 market survey, there is a need to decrease certain District fees in order to bring District fees in line with similar fees charged by other area park and recreation providers;

WHEREAS, in 2011, subsequent analysis on out-of-District drop-in fees was completed by the District, the results of which are described in the memorandum entitled Out-ofDistrict Drop-in Fee Surcharge, dated October 21, 2011, and attached as Exhibit B to this resolution; now therefore,

## THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The District Out-of-District drop-in fee surcharge will be decreased from 200\% to $100 \%$ as of January 1, 2012.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVAL:
November 7, 2011

> | Bob Scott |
| :--- |
| President / Director |

Adoption and date attested by:

## Jessica Collins <br> Recording Secretary

DATE: August 22, 2011
TO: $\quad$ Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities

## RE: $\quad$ Fee Market Survey Update Findings \& Recommendations

## Summary

Staff has completed an update of the market survey of user fees first compiled for the 2006 Fee Study. Staff is requesting Board of Directors review and concurrence of the findings and recommendations of the 2011 market survey. With Board concurrence of the recommendations, those that require Board action to implement will be brought back through resolution at the October 3, 2011 Board of Directors meeting. The remaining recommendations that implement the approved 2007 fee adjustments would proceed as scheduled with many adjustments occurring January 2012.

## Background

In 2006 THPRD conducted an extensive fee study. One component of the study was a comprehensive market survey of program user fees charged by area park \& recreation agencies. The 2006 Fee Study findings, including the market survey results, were adopted by the Board of Directors in June 2007. One provision of the 2006 Fee Study called for a market survey update every five years after adoption. The 2011 update, which is attached, satisfies that provision.

## Proposal Request

The 2011 market survey of program user fees has resulted in the following findings:

- Current THPRD drop-in fee rates and pass fees still lag behind the average market rates by $25 \%$ to $37 \%$ despite three years of THPRD rate increases. Further pass fee analysis showed that the number of visits that the pass fee effectively covered for other park \& recreation agencies was higher than that of THPRD.
- THPRD does not offer a discount on youth passes, ages $0-18$, while all other agencies surveyed do offer a discount for this age group.
- The majority of registration classes and program fees are within $+/-10 \%$ of the average market fee.
- The average age for senior discounts is 56 years with an average discount rate of $20 \%$ for all agencies surveyed.
- $93.4 \%$ of all THPRD classes are now recovering all direct costs and a portion of overhead costs. The Elsie Stuhr Center remains on the low end of the recovery scale at $67.7 \%$.
- The THPRD out-of-district (OD) premium surcharge for drop-in fees at $200 \%$ of the in-district rate is the highest OD premium charged for all agencies surveyed.

Based on the market survey findings described above, staff is proposing the following recommendations:
I.) Proceed with 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
II.) Bring a resolution to October 3, 2011 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


## Benefits of Proposal

Board agreement with the recommendations that do not require Board of Directors action will ensure that THPRD user fees do not fall further behind the average market fees charged by other area park \& recreation agencies, along with making sure that programs are recovering full costs.

Board adoption of the pass fee recommendations that do require Board of Directors action will align pass fee rates and visitations counts with those of other agencies in the market area while increasing pass revenue. Adoption of the decrease in the OD premium surcharge from 200\% to $100 \%$ will better align the THPRD premium rate with those of other agencies in the market area and may increase OD patron participation in drop-in programs.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

Implementation of the fourth year of user fees adjustments as adopted with the original 2007 fee adjustments could potentially have a negative impact on patron participation and revenue. Increasing pass fees to effectively cover more visits could also result in decreased participation and revenue. However, the THPRD Family Assistance program is available for patrons facing affordability issues. Implementing a discount on youth passes could result in lost revenue from the rate decrease, but since youth pass sales only account for eight percent of total pass sales and the discount would be applies to the adult pass rate after the year four increase, the revenue effect should not be material. Decreasing the OD premium surcharge may also decrease total OD revenue. It is possible however that this decrease could be offset by increased OD patron participation.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors review and concurrence with the market survey findings and recommendations. Direct staff to bring a resolution to the October 3, 2011 Board of Directors meeting making fee adjustments requiring Board approval.

MEMO

DATE: October 21, 2011
TO: Keith Hobson, Director of Business and Facilities
FROM: Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager

## RE: Out-of-District Drop-in Fee Surcharge Decrease

An update of the 2006 THPRD Fee Study market survey was conducted by staff in the spring of 2011 and the findings were presented to the Board of Directors at the September 12, 2011 meeting. A recommendation to decrease the out-of-District (OD) drop-in surcharge from 200\% to $100 \%$ based on the market survey results required additional analysis as follows.

The 2011 update to the market survey shows that the THPRD OD drop-in surcharge is larger than that charged by any other agency surveyed. The findings of this survey can be seen in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1: 2011 Out-of-District Fees

| Agency | Annual Fee | Percent Added to ID | Per Person Per Program Add-on Fee | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| THPRD | \$280.00 | OR 200\% Drop-in |  | Annual assessment fee or $200 \%$ premium |
| Bend Park \& Recreation |  | 35\% All programs |  |  |
| City of Albany | \$40 (individual) <br> $\$ 80$ (family) |  |  | non-resident card |
| City of Bellevue |  | 25\% All programs |  |  |
| City of Eugene |  | 20\% All programs |  |  |
| City of Hillsboro |  | 50\% All programs |  |  |
| City of Lake Oswego |  | 15\% All programs |  |  |
| City of Medford |  |  | \$6/program |  |
| City of Portland Park \& Rec Southwest Community Center | \$170.00 | OR 30\% All programs |  | SWCC-non-resident card fee |
| City of Seattle |  |  |  | Currently under consideration |
| Clackamas County |  | 30\% All programs |  |  |
| Metro Parks Tacoma |  | 8-10\% All programs |  |  |
| Vancouver-Clark |  |  |  | Rates blended- no differentiation |
| Willamalane |  | 15-20\% All programs |  |  |

Although OD patrons are not our primary customers, total OD revenue (assessments plus dropin fees) accounts for almost 11\% of total annual user fee revenues (down from 15\% in fiscal year 2006-07. Total preliminary user fee revenue for fiscal year 2010-11 totaled approximately $\$ 8.8$ million dollars with OD revenue accounting for approximately $\$ 965,000$ of this total, or enough revenue to run either the Elsie Stuhr Center (annual budget - approximately $\$ 890,000$ ) or the THPRD Tennis Center (annual budget - approximately $\$ 929,000$ ) for a full year.

Access to OD drop-in programs is controlled so that, in the event a drop-in program reaches capacity, in-District (ID) patrons are given priority for access over OD patrons. As such an increase in OD drop-in participation will not negatively impact ID patrons.

According to the article Mastering Revenue by author Harvey Chipkin in the September 2011 Parks and Recreation magazine, some park and recreation directors consider usage a key to successful fee based systems. Per Jodie Adams, director of the Springfield-Greene County Park Board, "increasing participation is more revenue positive than increasing fees." Bill Beckner, NRPA Manager of Research, concurs adding "if managers are looking to increase revenues, it's more effective to look at utilization of the facilities to see what spaces are being used to their optimum and then find people to fill those spaces."

Since the second year of fee increases after the adoption of the 2006 Fee Study, THPRD has experienced a consistent decrease in OD drop-in participation and revenue. Table 2 shows the OD drop-in revenue change from fiscal year 2006-07 to fiscal year 2010-11 with the corresponding individual drop-in rates for those years. Total OD drop-in revenue has decreased by $12 \%$ from a high mark in fiscal year 2008-09 of $\$ 608,552$ to the current level of $\$ 492,302$ in fiscal year 2010-11.

TABLE 2: OD Drop-in Revenue


The total number of OD assessments sold has also decreased during the same five year period, as seen in Table 3, although this may be due more to the $\$ 52$ per year fee increase after the passage of the 2008 bond than to drop-in fee increases.

TABLE 3: OD Assessment Sales (Count)


The decision to decrease the OD drop-in surcharge rate from $200 \%$ to $100 \%$ should not be made simply because of the downward revenue trend, but should also consider whether the visiting OD patrons live within the THPRD future (ultimate) service boundary (FSB). A decrease in drop-in fees might discourage possible annexation of households inside of the THPRD FSB.

Unfortunately there is no way to obtain OD drop-in patron residence information as it is not required for an OD patron to utilize a drop-in program. What can be analyzed, however, is where OD passes are being sold. Figure A shows a GIS map of all the household locations within Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas counties for all OD passes sold in fiscal year 2010-11. Of these OD passes sold: $17.1 \%$ are within the THPRD FSB, $26.3 \%$ are outside the FSB but inside the Beaverton School District (BSD) boundary, and $56.6 \%$ are outside both the THPRD FSB and BSD boundaries. It is impossible to conclude that the same distribution holds for OD drop-in patrons, but it does show that THPRD draws OD patrons from a wide geographic area with $82.9 \%$ coming from outside the THPRD FSB.

A similar distribution can be seen for OD Assessments sold in fiscal year 2010-11 for the same three counties: $22.9 \%$ are within the THPRD FSB, $14.4 \%$ are outside the FSB but inside the Beaverton School District (BSD) boundary, and $62.7 \%$ are outside both the THPRD FSB and BSD boundaries. A GIS map of OD Assessments sold can be seen in Figure B.

FIGURE A: OD Household Passes Sold
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FIGURE B: OD Assessments Sold


## Summary

THPRD earns a significant portion of its user fee revenue from its out-of-District patrons and this source of revenue has been eroding consistently since fiscal year 2008-09. Although it is impossible to conclude with certainty the household locations of the OD drop-in patrons, GIS mapping shows the diverse area from which OD patrons travel to use THPRD facilities. Since the adoption of the 2006 Fee Study fee increases, both OD drop-in participation/revenue and the number of OD assessments sold have decreased (although OD assessment drop may be due more to the rate impact of the 2008 bond passage than fee increases). In addition, the 2011 market survey update of comparable Northwest park \& recreation agencies clearly shows that the $200 \%$ drop-in fee surcharge charged by THPRD is by far the highest surcharge level in the region. Increasing utilization of THPRD facilities by OD patrons will not negatively impact ID patrons since they are given priority access to drop-in programs.

## Recommendation

Decrease the out-of-District drop-in surcharge rate from 200\% to 100\% as of January 1, 2012 to increase OD patron drop-in revenue and enhance utilization of THPRD facilities.

DATE: October 21, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities
Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources \& Trails Management

## RE: Sustainability Program Update

## Introduction

During the last year, THPRD sustainability efforts yielded a variety of immediate benefits such as energy, staff, and resources savings through the use of centralized printers, as well as longterm investments in the form of pervious parking lots to improve water quality. Big picture projects such as a greenhouse gas emissions study were completed, and its results will guide future sustainability investments.

## Background

Since 2008 when the program grew from a few individual practices to a more holistic approach, staff have made consistent progress on the path to sustainability. The program has three coordinated working groups with overlapping responsibilities.

The Sustainability Program's key principles call on staff to do the following:

- Use resources and materials wisely.
- Respect and conserve natural systems.
- Educate our patrons and ourselves.


## Recent Activities

Over the last year, staff have pursued many planned goals and also completed several opportunity projects as noted below.

| Activity | Status | Next Steps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Create green purchasing <br> practices for commonly used <br> items. | Staff are researching practices. A draft is <br> expected at the end of December. | Upon completion, policy will be presented <br> for Board of Directors adoption. |
| Train more staff on the <br> sustainability costing model. | Use will be expanded with implementation <br> of Sustainable Purchasing Policy. <br> Additional training will be provided at that <br> time. | Create training opportunities for staff using <br> the model under anticipated sustainable <br> purchasing rules. |
| Implement the Energy <br> Savings Performance <br> Contract. | Project complete. First year energy <br> savings expected to exceed original <br> projection by approximately $\$ 9,000$. | Continue to monitor savings to ensure <br> guaranteed results. Pursue phase 2 of <br> ESPC when viable. |


| Activity | Status | Next Steps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase in the use of central printers instead of individual desktop printers as feasible. | Information Services removed 50\% of the desktop printers at Nature Park, Garden Home Recreation Center, and Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center. Each of these centers now prints to community printers, one each at Nature Park \& Garden Home and two at Conestoga. | Based on results of pilot sites, this will continue to be phased in as existing desktop printers become due for replacement. |
| Program select computers to go into sleep mode when unused to save electricity. | Not being actively pursued due to technical issues. | None. |
| Implement trip reduction program that reduces the number of miles District vehicles are driven, while providing a higher level of service in parks. | Service areas have been divided by north \& south regions with local support shops in each. We are now using crew cab pickup trucks to maximize staff vehicle ratios and will add more to our fleet. We have completely modified our service delivery model by consolidating services. | Staff is measuring results based on miles driven per acre maintained. Will continue to monitor results and adjust routes to capture greater efficiencies. |
| Pursue an Eco-Biz Landscape certification for Maintenance staff. | Our Fleet and Parks Departments are now certified through the DEQ Eco-Biz program. | We will pursue certification at the new $112^{\text {th }}$ operations center. |
| Pursue increased recycled content in custodial paper products. | Not being actively pursued. | None, although this will be addressed in the Sustainable Purchasing Policy. |
| Implement phase 2 of a pilot recycling in parks project. | New portable recycling containers were ordered and installed at Party in the Park and Concerts in the Parks. This has resulted in a significant increase in event recycling. | Ensure that staff managing events at facilities or parks are both aware of the containers and use them during events. |
| Month of Green events. | Presentations about sustainability were made to 20 work groups, reaching 150 staff. Facilitated discussions generated a list of additional sustainability activities to pursue in each facility or operations area. | Staff will be phasing out the Month of Green, but will continue with more regular staff trainings and updates. Operational ideas will be pursued during the remainder of the 2011/12 fiscal year. |
| Create sustainable materials standard specifications for upcoming projects including bond projects. | Not yet started. Staff are using some sustainable materials such as recycled plastic lumber. | Staff intends to begin this project by the first of the year. A draft should be ready for interdepartmental review in early April 2012. |
| Sustainable purchases fund. | The 2010-11 sustainable purchases fund granted $\$ 11,200$ for projects including: water efficient shower head and toilet upgrades, a utility bicycle to reduce driving, and hand dryers to reduce paper towel usage. | Ten thousand dollars in funds are allocated for the current fiscal year. Project proposals will be due in January 2012. New projects will be completed by June 2012. |
| Reorganize Sustainability Committee. | The new committee includes staff from Recreation, Maintenance, Planning, and Natural Resources staff. The committee was responsible for the trainings noted above. | The committee will be focusing on employee behavior and training. They will coordinate with the Sustainability Business Plan team which is focusing on physical assets. |


| Activity | Status | Next Steps |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Researched and chose greenhouse gas emissions as primary metric of sustainability. | Inventory completed, results presented to Board of Directors October 2011. | Will use the highest impact GHG sources as targets for sustainability activities. We will update the inventory periodically to measure results or activities. |
| Electric vehicle charging stations. | An electric vehicle charging station is now in service at the HMT parking lot (parking section D, south of the Schlottman House). Installation costs were funded through an ECOtality grant intended to encourage alternative vehicle use. | None at this time. |
| OfficeMax delivery system. | Staff have arranged with OfficeMax to use sustainable, reusable delivery boxes and to reduce delivery trips. | None at this time. |
| Partners for a Sustainable Washington County Community. | Staff continued to participate in operations team and trainings. Staff also pursued a joint solar assessment/purchase with other partners. | Staff will continue as active partners. Bruce Barbarasch is serving as co-chair of the operations team. |
| Solar Panel Analysis. | A 10,000 kilowatt solar panel array was installed and is operational at the PCC maintenance shed. | Staff is monitoring actual power generation to ensure that array meets expectations. Feed In Tariff credits become available again, staff will investigate other possible sites. |
| Determine how to integrate sustainability into the 2011/12 budget process. | 3 Sustainability Business Plans funded in FY 2011/12 budget: automate 2 irrigation systems, begin using ethanol in all flex-fuel vehicles, purchase paperless HR recruiting applicant tracking system. <br> 1 Maintenance Business Plan funded in FY 2011/12 budget: <br> Service Consolidation/Trip Reduction. | FY 2011/12 measures will be updated at end of year to measure effectiveness of Business Plans. New Business Plans are currently being developed for inclusion in the FY 2012/13 Budget. |
| Integrated Pest Management Program. | The program provides guidance to staff on ways to control weeds and other pests. It encourages the use of mechanical or cultural methods before using chemicals. The written program booklet was revised and updated. | The booklet will be posted on our intranet. Training will be provided to applicable staff. |

## Next Steps

One of the most important long-term accomplishments made over the past year was the selection of greenhouse gasses (GHG) as a key measure of sustainability success. Using this measure will allow staff to target specific areas based on logical and measurable criteria.

The GHG Inventory correlates nicely with the adopted priority goal outcomes to give us overall strategies to pursue:

1. GHG Tier 1 - Fleet
a. Continue to reduce vehicle miles traveled in Maintenance Department through geographic based organization.
b. Continue to increase percent of vehicle miles travelled through alternate fuel vehicles.
2. GHG Tier 1 - Natural Gas
a. Monitor the results of the Energy Savings Performance Contract and pursue a second phase when viable.
b. Continue to design new facilities in an environmentally and cost conscious manner.
3. GHG Tier 2 - Electricity
a. Same as Tier 1 - Natural Gas
4. GHG Tier 3 - Supply Chain
a. Implement a Sustainable Purchasing Policy to consider life cycle costing and environmental impacts in procurement activity.

Specific plans for the 2012/13 fiscal year will be developed by business plan team, and those selected for funding in the proposed budget will ultimately be passed through the Budget Committee and Board of Directors.

The development of a Sustainable Purchasing Policy has been underway for several months now and a draft of the Policy is under final review. Once completed, this plan will be brought to the Board of Directors, possibly as early as the December meeting, for review and approval.

## Action Requested

This is an informational presentation. No action is requested.

## MEMO

DATE: $\quad$ October 26, 2011
TO:
The Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager

## RE: $\quad$ General Manager's Report for November 7, 2011

## $112^{\text {th }}$ Facility Update

The build-out of the $112^{\text {th }}$ facility is proceeding on schedule. The first phase consisting of renovation of offices in the front of the building was competed on October 19 and staff at the East Annex relocated to the $112^{\text {th }}$ facility October 20 and 21 . Work on the balance continues with an expected completion by early December. Grading on the maintenance yard is complete and paving is expected to occur in mid-November. Maintenance staff have nearly completed their relocation and transition plan and the Maintenance staff located at the HMT Complex are expected to move to the $112^{\text {th }}$ facility in mid-January. At this point the project is well within the budget approved by the Board of Directors at bid award and has not used any of the authorized contingency.

## Intertwine Testimony

Along with other members of The Intertwine Alliance, I testified before the Metro Council on September 22 in support of approving $\$ 100,000$ of funding to the Alliance. The funding was subsequently approved and will be allocated to a sole source contract for coalition building and communications efforts for The Intertwine.

## Veterans Day Event

American Legion Post \#124 would like to invite the Board of Directors and public to attend the upcoming Veterans Day event taking place on Friday, November 11, beginning at 11 a.m. at the Bethel Congregational United Church of Christ, 5150 SW Watson Avenue, Beaverton (across the street from the Veterans Memorial Park).

## Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Please note the following upcoming Board of Directors meetings:

- December Regular Board Meeting - Monday, December 5, 2011
- January Regular Board Meeting - Monday, January 9, 2012
o Please note that due to the holidays, this meeting is scheduled to occur on the second Monday in January.
- February Regular Board Meeting - Monday, February 6, 2012

DATE: October 24, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Amending the Comprehensive and Trails Plans Pertaining to North Bethany

## Introduction

THPRD needs to amend its Comprehensive Plan and its Trails Plan to recognize the North Bethany Subarea Plan recently adopted by Washington County as it pertains to parks and trails in the area. Staff has prepared a resolution for Board approval to authorize proposed amendments.

## Background

With the Board of Washington County Commissioners' adoption of A-Engrossed Ordinance No. 739 on October 25, 2011, Washington County completed a long public process allowing development to begin in the North Bethany area. It is anticipated that development applications will be submitted soon.

Section 501-12.2 of the Washington County Community Development Code states, in part, that:
"...an application for development approval within the North Bethany Subarea Plan shall be denied unless the applicant demonstrates that:
B. Master plans for the following service districts, including a financing plan that substantially implements the master plan, have been adopted by the applicable service district.
(1) Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (THPRD): parks and trails..."

As a result of this code language, proposed developments in North Bethany cannot be approved by Washington County until all service districts for the area, including THPRD, have added to or amended their relevant plans so as to recognize and implement elements of the North Bethany Subarea Plan that pertain to them. For THPRD, that means adding the plan for parks and trails in North Bethany adopted by Washington County to the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan, adding a finance plan for acquisition and development of parks and trails planned in North Bethany to the Comprehensive Plan, and amending maps in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan to reflect the County's plan for parks and trails in North Bethany.

THPRD Board members, Trails Advisory Committee members, and staff have been actively involved in the North Bethany planning process. On behalf of the Board, THPRD staff has
previously expressed THPRD's acceptance of and support for the County's plan for parks and trails in the area.

## Proposal Request

Staff is seeking approval of a resolution that would:

1. Add the "Park, Trails and Pedestrian Connections Map" for the North Bethany Subarea of the Bethany Community Plan to the THPRD 2006 Comprehensive Plan and to the Trails Plan (October, 2006);
2. Add a "North Bethany Parks and Trails Financing Plan" to the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. Direct amendment of maps in the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan to reflect the "Park, Trails and Pedestrian Connections Map" for the North Bethany Subarea of the Bethany Community Plan.

Staff has drafted Resolution No. 2011-33 for Board approval (attached).

## Benefits of Proposal

By Board approval of the proposed resolution, THPRD will help to enable development to proceed in the North Bethany area. That development will generate revenue for THPRD from systems development charges that can be used to fund acquisition of land and improvements for parks and trails to serve those who will live and work in the area.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There is no downside to this proposal.

## Maintenance Impact

Approval of the proposed resolution will have no maintenance impact.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval and signature of Resolution No. 2011-33 adding to and directing amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan pertaining to the North Bethany Area.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2011-33

## A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADDING TO AND DIRECTING AMENDMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE TRAILS PLAN PERTAINING TO THE NORTH BETHANY AREA

WHEREAS, after a long public process Washington County recently adopted an ordinance that allows development to proceed in the North Bethany area; and

WHEREAS, THPRD Board members, Trails Advisory Committee members, and staff were actively involved in the North Bethany planning process; and

WHEREAS, on behalf of the Board of Directors, District staff has previously expressed the District's acceptance of and support for the County's plan for parks and trails in the area; and

WHEREAS, as a result of code language adopted by Washington County proposed developments in North Bethany cannot be approved until all service districts for the area, including THPRD, have added to or amended their relevant plans so as to recognize and implement elements of the North Bethany Subarea Plan that pertain to them; and

WHEREAS, for THPRD that means adding the plan for parks and trails in North Bethany adopted by Washington County to the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan, adding a finance plan for acquisition and development of parks and trails planned in North Bethany to the Comprehensive Plan, and amending maps in both the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan to reflect the County's plan for parks and trails in North Bethany.

## LET IT HEREBY BE RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT IN BEAVERTON, OREGON, that:

1. Exhibit A to this resolution, the "Park, Trails and Pedestrian Connections Map" for the North Bethany Subarea of the Bethany Community Plan is hereby added to the THPRD 2006 Comprehensive Plan and to the Trails Plan (October, 2006);
2. Exhibit B to this resolution, a "North Bethany Parks and Trails Financing Plan", is hereby added to the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. The General Manager is hereby directed to have maps in the Comprehensive Plan and the Trails Plan amended to reflect the "Park, Trails and Pedestrian Connections Map" for the North Bethany Subarea of the Bethany Community Plan.

Approved by the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors on the $7^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2011.

> Bob Scott, President

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

## ATTEST:

Jessica Collins, Recording Secretary


## Comprehensive Plan Addendum

North Bethany Parks and Trails Financing Plan

This document has been prepared pursuant to Section 501-12.2 of the Washington County Community Development Code which states, in part, the following:
"...an application for development approval within the North Bethany Subarea Plan shall be denied unless the applicant demonstrates that:
B. Master plans for the following service districts, including a financing plan that substantially implements the master plan, have been adopted by the applicable service district.
(1) Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (THPRD): parks and trails..."

This Financing Plan has been prepared so as to allow for and support future development in the North Bethany area. It reflects the North Bethany Subarea Plan as described in A-Engrossed Ordinance No. 739, adopted by the Washington County Board of Commissioners on October 25, 2011.

## Estimated Park and Trail Costs

The Park, Trails and Pedestrian Connections Map for the North Bethany Subarea identifies planned park locations and trail routes for the area. The map shows specific locations for two community parks, one of the neighborhood parks, linear parks, and trail alignments. Areas for location of five of the neighborhood parks are generally shown. The acreage of the East Community Park will be approximately 15 acres and the area of the West Community Park will be approximately 5.5 to 6 acres. The size of each neighborhood park can range between 1.5 and 2 acres. It is assumed that off-street trails will be built to District standards for community trails within a corridor averaging 20 feet in width. It is assumed that the Park Blocks area linking the East and West Community Parks will be built as described in Area of Special Concern No. 8 for the North Bethany Subarea.

Based on the Park, Trails and Pedestrian Connections Map and the foregoing assumptions, Table A to this Financing Plan has been prepared to estimate the costs of implementing the North Bethany Subarea Plan as it relates to trails and parks. As noted in the table, the total cost of plan implementation is approximately $\$ 30$ million in 2011 dollars, with primary variable being the amount of acreage acquired for each neighborhood park site. About $40 \%$ of the total cost is for land acquisition with the remainder for park and trail development.

It should be noted that the type of improvements provided in neighborhood and community parks, and thereby the cost of park development, is variable, dependent upon the size of the park, its topography, and input provided by neighborhood and community residents on the park
amenities desired. Typical amenities provided in a neighborhood park include play equipment, a picnic area, pathways, a drinking fountain, benches, open grass areas for passive use, outdoor sport courts, and multipurpose sports fields. Similar amenities are also provided in community parks but possibly in multiples or at a larger scale or at a higher level of quality, such as a lighted synthetic surface multipurpose sports field rather than an unlighted grass field. Special amenities such as a skate park or a splash pad might also be provided in a community park.

## Projected Funding Sources

There are at least three relatively certain sources of funding for acquisition and development of parks and off-street trails in the North Bethany area - systems development charge (SDC) revenues, funds from the 2008 THPRD Bond Measure dedicated to acquisition of a park site in North Bethany and local share money from the 2006 Metro Bond Measure assigned to THPRD and Washington County and dedicated to land acquisition in North Bethany. Washington County has also committed to spending money from its Opportunity Fund (derived from timber sale revenues) for land acquisition in North Bethany. Table B to this Financing Plan shows anticipated funding from each of these sources.

The main source of funds for acquisition and development of parks and off-street trails in North Bethany is SDC revenues. As noted in Table B, the amount of SDC revenues that will be derived from North Bethany is dependent on the density of residential development.

## Costs vs. Funding

If developers choose to maximize the amount of development that is possible under the plan designations that are applied by Washington County to the area, SDC revenues in combination with other funding sources should be sufficient to cover the estimated cost of acquisition and development of parks and off-street trails as shown in Table A. If, on the other hand, developers choose to build at the minimum densities required by Washington County then there may not be sufficient funds to completely develop all planned parks and off-street trails although there will be enough money to acquire all the land needed for parks and trails in the area. If the latter scenario becomes reality, other sources of funding will need to be pursued to achieve sufficient development funding, especially from regional, state and federal competitive grant programs. Area developers who realize the value of parks as amenities that add to the attractiveness of their projects may also choose to voluntarily assist in park development.

## Prioritization of Expenditures

This plan gives the highest priority to acquiring land for parks and trails in locations designated by the North Bethany Subarea Plan, generally in the following order:
(1) The East Community Park.
(2) Parts of the subarea where development is most likely in the near term, which at this time would appear to be the southern part of the Central Neighborhood.
(3) The West Community Park.
(4) Parts of the subarea where development is unlikely to occur in the near term.

Only after land acquisition is substantially complete will the District begin park and trail development. Development of parks and trails will be started in areas that are most built out.

It should be noted that some developers may want to dedicate land to the District or develop parks and trails in exchange for receiving SDC credits. If credit requests are consistent with District plans and standards they may be approved by the Board of Directors. If this happens to
a significant extent projected SDC revenues will decline and there could be a loss of discretion for the District in setting priorities for expenditure of SDC revenues.

## Timing of Expenditures

SDC revenues for land acquisition will become available as land develops. Prior to adoption of this plan, to begin acquiring land before initiation of development in the area the District chose to use its Metro local share and 2008 Bond Measure funds dedicated to land acquisition in the area to buy a parcel of land that encompasses a substantial portion of the east end of the designated community park. In the near term, the District also intends to use some of its undesignated SDC revenues derived from development in other parts of the District to acquire other land in the eastern portion of the designated community park and at least one neighborhood park site in the southern portion of the Central Neighborhood in advance of development in that area. It is anticipated that in the near term Washington County will also use its Metro local share money dedicated to land acquisition in the area as well as undesignated money from its Opportunity Fund to assist THPRD in acquiring in the eastern portion of the designated community park. After these funds are exhausted, the District will not pursue other acquisitions until sufficient SDC revenues have been received from development in the area. When this happens will depend on the rate at which development occurs in the area.

## Other Considerations

It is generally the District's practice to buy land from willing sellers where opportunities arise. In the case of the North Bethany Subarea Plan, however, park locations have been pre-planned. If the District is unable to negotiate acquisition of land in a designated park location for a reasonable price, it may be in a position of having to consider use of eminent domain to acquire a designated park site. Should that occur, the cost of acquisition could increase due to legal costs associated with the condemnation process. If the District does not choose to use its eminent domain powers to acquire land in the area, the District may be unable to acquire and develop all land designated for park and trails in the area.

## TABLE A

## PROJECTED COSTS

OF
PLANNED NORTH BETHANY PARKS AND TRAILS

| Facility Type | Estimated <br> Acres or Miles | Estimated Average Land Cost/Acre | Total Land Cost | Estimated Development Cost/Acre or Mile | Total <br> Development Cost | Total Estimated Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhood Parks (6 @ 1.5 to 2 ac. each) | 9-12 ac. | \$350,000* | \$3,150,000 to \$4,200,000 | \$350,000 | \$3,150,000 to \$4,200,000 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 6,300,000 \text { to } \\ \$ 8,400,000 \end{array}$ |
| East \& West Community Parks | 21 ac . | \$350,000* | \$7,350,000 | \$400,000 | \$8,400,000** | \$15,750,000 |
| Linear Parks/Trail Corridors*** | 15 ac. | \$100,000 | \$1,500,000 |  |  | \$1,500,000 |
| Off Street Trails | 6.23 miles |  |  | \$1,000,000 | \$6,230,000 | \$6,230,000 |
| All Facilities |  |  | \$11,650,000 to \$12,700,000 |  | \$17,380,000 to \$18,430,000 | \$29,780,000 to <br> \$31,880,000 |

* Assumes all land acquired is developable and density transfer is not possible. Also factors in soft costs associated with acquisition such as staff time, title reports, appraisals, environmental site assessments, legal review, closing costs and in some cases, property line adjustments or partitions.
** Does not include the cost of a community center in the western portion of the East Community Park.
Outside stream corridors. No cost is assigned to the value of land in stream corridors, which should be minimal.

| ```TABLE B PROJECTED FUNDS* FOR NORTH BETHANY PARKS AND TRAILS``` |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Funding Source | Revenue per Residential unit or Employee (2011 rates) |  | Projected Number of dwelling units and employees at build-out (minimum and maximum) according to County staff |  | Projected Total Funds |
| Systems Development Charges | Single <br> Family (SFR) <br> Multi Family <br> (MFR) <br> New <br> Employee <br> (Emp) | $\$ 5,551$ <br> $\$ 4,151$ <br> \$144 | Minimum <br> 2682 SFR <br> 1073 MFR <br> 100 Emp | Maximum <br> 3300 SFR <br> 1353 SFR <br> 200 Emp | Minimum: $\$ 19,046,505^{* *}$ <br> Maximum: $\$ 30,970,323^{* *}$ |
| Metro 2006 Bond Measure Dedicated Local Share <br> - THPRD <br> - Washington County |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 872,000 \\ & \$ 360,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| THPRD 2008 Bond Measure Dedicated Funds |  |  |  |  | \$1,559,575 |
| Washington County Opportunity Fund |  |  |  |  | \$150,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | Minimum: $\$ 21,988,080$ <br> Maximum: $\$ 33,911,898$ |

* This does not include revenue that might be derived from competitive regional, state and federal grant programs.
** Reflects a $1.6 \%$ reduction for Washington County's handling fee for collections.

DATE: October 18, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Jim McElhinny, Director of Park \& Recreation

## RE: $\quad$ Garden Home Recreation Center Project List Funded by City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services

## Introduction

A list of projects has been developed and is proposed to provide improvements to THPRD's Garden Home Recreation Center and a portion of the Fanno Creek Trail. These projects will be funded by fees paid by the City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) as a result of the sanitary sewer replacement project that crosses the Garden Home Recreation Center property as well as a portion of the Fanno Creek Trail.

## Background

In 2009, BES staff identified the need to replace an existing and failing sanitary sewer line (and add another line) on and near the Garden Home Recreation Center and the Fanno Creek Trail. In the fall of 2009, BES staff first met with THPRD staff to outline the project and to identify the land needed from THPRD.

After several months of negotiations, a final package of easements and proposed compensation was agreed upon. The package was presented to the THPRD Board of Directors at their January 11, 2010 meeting. The Board approved the package as submitted.

As a part of the compensation package, BES agreed to provide $\$ 325,000$ for community benefit projects at the Garden Home Recreation Center. The projects were to provide improvements to benefit the Center and its affected patrons.

The THPRD Trails Advisory Committee, the Garden Home Recreation Center Friends Group and Park District staff all provided input on an initial project list concept for a variety of projects to improve the Center and the trail area. The initial project list was internal to the Center and was supported by the Friends Group. During the course of our due diligence, staff learned that the proposed project list included room conversions and modifications that would have required significant structural changes and would have triggered jurisdictional requirements that exceeded the funding available for the project. In addition, the proposed projects were contrary to the Aging Facilities Study for the Center which recommended against significant structural changes.

Because the initial project proposal exceeded the available budget and was contrary to the Aging Facilities Study, a second proposal was developed with input from the Recreation and Trails Advisory Committees and Park District staff (after the Friends Group disbanded). This proposal used the same priorities as the first proposal, and did so without the major renovation components and costs.

The current proposal accomplishes what the initial proposal did, but instead of removing walls, program areas were changed and moved to different rooms. For example, the weight room and the gymnastics room will change places. This results in a better space for the weight room with the potential to grow. It does reduce the gymnastics room, but will be comparable in size to the Cedar Hills Recreation Center's gymnastics room. There has been significant discussion regarding room design and layout and staff has received a number of comments from patrons.

Park District staff has conducted meetings with program staff leads in the areas that will be affected by the projects to receive their input and make any adjustments that were deemed necessary. Staff has also consulted with program experts (non-Park District staff) in the metro area and received positive comments.

## Proposal Request

The current proposal will include the following facility upgrades, new equipment and renovations as well as associated costs. Attachment A is the proposed location for the trail exercise equipment. Attachments $B$ and $C$ identify the rooms involved with the projects.

Fanno Creek Trail Exercise Equipment $\quad \$ 20,000$
Fanno Creek Trail Equipment: A variety of exercise stations placed along the trail near the northern edge of the Garden Home Recreation Center property.

## New Fitness Room <br> \$197,316

New Fitness Room: Move weight room to the current gymnastics room. Provide new cardio and weight equipment. New mirrors and flooring. Lighting and power supply improvements. Independent heating system.

New Gymnastics Room $\quad \$ 27,600$
New Gymnastics Room: Move the gymnastics program to the current weight room. New mat flooring and upgraded mats. New and upgraded equipment.

Dance and Exercise Room (Room 8) $\$ 24,200$
Room 8: New hardwood floor, new ballet bar and exercise equipment.
After School Program updates (Room 15) \$10,000
After School Room 15: Built in counter/desk space, storage, furniture and area rug.
Contingency (15\%)
\$41,867
Total \$320,983
A public informational meeting was held on September 29, 2011 at the Center to present the proposal and to Center patrons and to seek their input about the projects. There were 21 people in attendance. Overall, the comments were very positive with few concerns. There were some patrons who felt the exercise stations proposed to be installed along the trail were not needed and that improvements should be focused inside the Center. This point was brought to the Trails Advisory Committee at their October meeting. The Committee reaffirmed their support for the exercise equipment along the trail and the intent to benefit others affected by the project.

Following the public meeting, the recommended plan was also presented to the Recreation Advisory Committee at their October meeting. The public meeting comments were reviewed with the Committee. The plan as presented was unanimously approved.

Additional Projects: Should funds remain after the project list is complete, additional projects are proposed to be funded including additional exercise equipment, flooring improvements, improved access to the Center for those with disabilities, additional playground equipment and other program related equipment.

Assuming Board of Directors approval, the proposed projects will be completed (based on the agreement with BES) by December 31, 2012. All work will commence as soon as possible and the schedule will be based on low use times at the Center as much as possible to minimize the impact to patrons.

## Benefits of Proposal

The completion of the proposed projects will be upgrades to the Garden Home Recreation Center without structural changes to or major remodeling of the facility. It will also provide expansion space for the very popular and heavily used weight room. The Fanno Creek Trail users will also benefit from the addition of several exercise stations along the trail adjoining the Garden Home Recreation Center property.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There is no apparent downside to the proposal other than the small reduction in space to the gymnastics room. The new space, however, is very appropriate for beginning and intermediate level classes and is consistent in size with other THPRD facilities.

## Maintenance Impact

No significant maintenance impacts are expected from this proposal. Interior building space changes and the exterior trails exercise stations may result in maintenance adjustments and, in some cases, increased maintenance service levels. However, given the relatively minor adjustments (under $\$ 2,500$ ) these can be resolved through the normal annual budget process.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the project list as submitted and direction to staff to proceed with the implementation of the projects.



## GARDEN HOME RECREATION CENTER

## 7475 SW Oleson Rd

Portland, OR 97223
503/629-6341


DATE: October 25, 2011
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Acknowledging Recent Property Acquisitions and Describing Funding Source(s) and Purpose

## Introduction

THPRD has recently completed several property acquisitions for a variety of purposes using multiple funding sources. The Board of Directors always approves of an acquisition at a public meeting prior to its closing, but, to retain confidentiality until the acquisition is completed, does not disclose details about it at the time of approval. To increase public knowledge and establish a record of the details and purpose of each completed acquisition, it is proposed that the Board regularly disclose such information through approval of a resolution, starting with a resolution acknowledging completed acquisitions for the last fiscal year.

## Background

Seven acquisitions were completed in FY 2010/11. In some cases, the purpose of the acquisition may not be clear to members of the public and over time it may become less clear to THPRD staff and Board members unless a record is made of the purpose of the acquisition. For example, a property was acquired at the south end of NW $114^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, on the east side, next to George Foege Park. It will be added to the park but was acquired using bond funds, resulting from approval of THPRD's 2008 Bond Measure, set aside for acquisition of natural areas and acquisition of trail corridors/linear parks. Despite being part of a park, the intent of the acquisition is for this property to be retained in its natural state except for building a segment of the Cedar Mill Trail through the property.

It should be noted that not all acquisitions "closed" in the last fiscal year are "completed" acquisitions. In at least one case, a property was acquired but an additional property needs to be acquired to have a site that will function as intended. Since that property closing was not part of a completed acquisition, it is not listed by the staff's proposed resolution.

## Proposal Request

Staff is seeking the Board's approval of the attached resolution.

## Benefits of Proposal

The benefit of this proposal is that by approving the resolution, confusion about when, how and why a property was acquired and how it should be used in the future can be avoided by establishing a clear, Board-acknowledged record of the acquisition.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There is no downside to this proposal.

## Maintenance Impact

The proposal will have no maintenance impact other than to provide guidance about how acquired properties should be maintained in the future.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2011-34, Acknowledging Recent Property
Acquisitions and Describing Funding Source(s) and Purpose.

## A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE <br> TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ACKNOWLEDGING RECENT PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS AND DESCRIBING FUNDING SOURCE(S) AND PURPOSE

WHEREAS, the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District has recently completed several property acquisitions for a variety of purposes using multiple funding sources; and

WHEREAS, a completed acquisition is hereby defined as one where all properties needed to create a functional site have been acquired; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors always approves of an acquisition at a public meeting prior to its closing but to retain confidentiality until the acquisition is completed does not disclose details about it at the time of approval; and

WHEREAS, to increase public knowledge and establish a record of the details and purpose of each completed acquisition the Board of Directors deems that from this time forward it should be their practice to regularly disclose such information through approval of a resolution; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit A to this resolution lists acquisitions completed between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011 (FY 2010-11) and Exhibit B maps the locations of those acquisitions.

## LET IT HEREBY BE RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT IN BEAVERTON, OREGON, that:

Exhibits $A$ and $B$ to this resolution shall be made available to interested members of the public including THPRD Advisory Committees, the Beaverton City Council, the Washington County Board of Commissioners, Washington County Citizen Participation Organizations within THPRD boundaries, Beaverton Neighborhood Advisory Committees, and the Washington County office of the Oregon State University Extension Service.

Approved by the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors on the $7^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2011.

Bob Scott, President

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

## ATTEST:

[^4]
## Completed THPRD Land Acquisitions

July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011

| Site Number | Location | Total Size | Acquisition Date | Property Cost ${ }^{1}$ | Property Interest Acquired | Tax Lots | Purpose | Classification | Funding Source(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Southeast corner of Sexton Mtn. Drive and Murray Blvd. | 8.65 acres | 8/18/2010 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$2.8 } \\ & \text { million } \end{aligned}$ | Fee Simple | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S128BB00700 } \\ & \text { 1S128BB00600 } \end{aligned}$ | Future <br> Neighborhood Park | Park | \$2.5 million in 2008 Bond Measure funds for acquisition of a neighborhood park site in the SE quadrant of the Park District and $\$ 300,000$ in City of Beaverton Local Share funds from the 2006 Metro Bond Measure ${ }^{2}$ |
| 2 | Northeast corner of $174^{\text {th }}$ Ave. and Bronson Road | 2.84 acres | 1/19/2011 | \$424,500 | Fee Simple | 1N130DB01700 | Future trailhead for the Bronson Creek Trail and Natural Area | Greenway Natural Area | 2008 Bond Measure funds for acquisition of trail corridors and linear parks |
| 3 | Northeast corner of $165^{\text {th }}$ Ave. and Farmington Rd. | 6.67 acres | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 19 / 2011 \\ & \text { to } 2 / 2 / 2011^{3} \end{aligned}$ | \$930,000 | Fee Simple | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1S117BC02290 } \\ & \text { 1S117BC02400 } \\ & \text { 1S117BC02300 } \\ & \text { 1S117BC02202 } \\ & \text { 1S117BC02201 } \\ & \text { 1S117BC02200 } \end{aligned}$ | Future <br> Neighborhood Park | Park | 2008 Bond Measure funds for acquisition of a park site in the SW quadrant of the Park District. |
| 4 | East side of the southern end of $114^{\text {th }}$ Ave., south of Leahy Rd. | 0.76 acre | 4/8/2011 | \$340,000 | Fee Simple | 1N134DC03600 | Natural Area and segment of the Cedar Mill Trail | Park (part of George Foege Park) | 2008 Bond Measure funds for acquisition of natural areas (\$170,000) and for acquisition of trail corridors and linear parks (\$170,000) |
| 5 | Between $150^{\text {th }}$ Ave. and Roy Dancer Park, south of Village Lane | $10^{\prime} \times 112 '$ | 4/26/2011 | \$60,000 | Easement | 1S117DD10500 | Soft surface trail connection to Roy Dancer Park from the | Neighborhood Trail | 2008 Bond Measure funds for acquisition of trail corridors and linear parks |

[^5]|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Four Seasons <br> Neighborhood |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | East side of <br> Miller Road, <br> North of Barnes <br> Road | 22.37 <br> acres | $4 / 29 / 2011$ | $\$ 8$ million | Fee <br> Simple | 1S101AB00200 <br> 1S101AB00600 <br> 1S101AB00700 <br> 1S101AB00100 | Future <br> Community <br> Park | Park | 2008 Bond Measure <br> funds for acquisition of <br> a community park in <br> the NE quadrant of the <br> Park District |
| 7 | Southwest <br> corner of <br> Farmington <br> Road and Menlo <br> Drive | 0.6 acre | 6/2/2011 | $\$ 500,000^{4}$ | Fee <br> Simple | 1S116BD02101 | Expansion of <br> Eichler Park | Park | THPRD local share of <br> Metro 2006 Bond <br> Measure (\$250,000) |
| and the remainder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^6]


# Management Report to the Board November 7, 2011 

## Administration

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning
Jessica Collins, Executive Assistant
Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities
Jim McElhinny, Director of Park \& Recreation Services
Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Outreach

1. Based on patron survey results, THPRD has made two important changes that will affect winter and spring registration. Enrollment for winter classes begins December 10, a month earlier than before. And registration for spring classes will be done separately, starting March 3. THPRD continues to produce one activities guide covering both terms. In mid-November, a promotional mailing will be sent to in-District residents to let them know about registration and the new winter/spring activities guide (available online or in print at any center, Administration, or one of several community locations).
2. The holidays are coming, and THPRD's charitable spirit will once again be in evidence throughout the District. The Centers and Administration will participate in THPRD's annual food and toy drive, which starts right after Thanksgiving. All items collected will go to the Sunshine Pantry, which benefits those in need in the Beaverton area.
3. THPRD has again been invited to participate in the City of Beaverton's Holiday Open House, scheduled for Friday, December 2, from 5 to 7 p.m. It is a popular event that draws citizens from throughout Beaverton to learn about opportunities in their community. THPRD staff will provide a variety of information about recreation programs, activities and special events. The city's annual tree lighting ceremony will follow the open house.
4. THPRD's Annual All-Staff Meeting was held October 27-28 and featured a change of venue this year: the new $112^{\text {th }}$ Avenue facility. Among the topics covered were a bond measure update, staff success stories, $112^{\text {th }}$ Avenue facility transition plan, park sites reclassification, communications outreach, and the THPRD Leadership Academy.

Aquatics
Sharon Hoffmeister, Superintendent of Aquatic Program Services

1. Some exciting changes are taking place at the pools; beginning November 1, 2011 three of our Aquatics Center Supervisors have been reassigned. Diana Waterstreet is now at the Aquatic Center; Laurie Conlin is at Harman Swim Center and Sabrina Taylor-Schmitt is at Aloha Swim Center. These new placements will provide immeasurable opportunities for staff and Center Supervisors, as this new rotation will allow for the sharing of new ideas which will only strengthen the Aquatics Department.
2. The High School Water Polo season is winding down and the High School Swimming season will get underway following the Veterans Day weekend. The High School PE classes at Aloha Swim Center are also underway while the McKay Elementary swim lessons are happening at Harman.
3. We have had that opportunity to send staff to conferences this fall, Oregon Recreation \& Park Association, Aquatic Health Conference, and Washington Recreation \& Park Association Aquatics Training Retreat. Staff have come away with many ideas to incorporate what we already are doing very well. In January, the Aquatics Full Time and Regular Part Time staff will get together for their annual one-day retreat. This is a tremendous opportunity for staff to share what they have learned at these conferences as well as discuss a variety of topics pertinent to Aquatics.

## Maintenance <br> Dave Chrisman, Superintendent of Maintenance Operations

1. Athletic Fields Department staff prepared ball fields for baseball and softball through the end of October and maintained football fields through the first week of November. As the season winds down, staff will top dress, aerate, seed and fertilize in an effort restore fields for the following spring. Other athletic facility projects currently underway include a complete restoration of the softball field turf arcs at PCC Rock Creek and removal of invasive tree roots undermining the tennis courts at Vista Brook Park. The Vista Brook Park tennis surface will be temporarily restored this fall and is expected to be resurfaced next summer.
2. The building seismic structural enhancement project is now underway at the HMT Recreation Complex Administration Center. The purpose of the project is to stabilize the buildings for safe egress of patrons and staff in the event of a seismic event. The Administration building is currently connected to both the Tennis Center and Aquatic Center buildings, and during a seismic event this would cause the three buildings to shake each other violently. The project disconnects the three buildings by introducing a seismic joint between the buildings and additional cross-bracing at the Administration building. The project is on schedule and expected to be complete in early December.
3. Relocation of Natural Resources, Planning \& Development and Building Maintenance staff to the new offices at $112^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is now complete. Staffed packed their belongings and moved to the new site on October 21. Computer networks, phone systems, and printing equipment at the new site are now fully operational. While the office project is complete, the warehouse and maintenance yard will not be complete until late November. Maintenance Operations staff now working at the HMT Recreation Complex will relocate in mid-January.

## Natural Resources \& Trails Management

Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources \& Trails Management

1. Cooper Mountain Prescribed Burn. Metro, Tualatin Valley Fire \& Rescue, and THPRD Natural Resources staff partnered to burn approximately 20 acres. The burn successfully reduced non-native plants and flammable materials, improved habitat for rare native species, and provided great training opportunities for firefighters.
2. Nature Day at Hyland Forest. Staff introduced visitors to trails, wildlife, and the soon-toopen nature play area in the park through activities, ranger and education staff presence, and printed information.
3. Natural Resources Quality Maps. As part of a business plan, staff used GIS to create maps delineating natural and developed areas in parks. The previous estimate of natural area acreage was 1,300 , but the new analysis shows 1,400 acres in our care. The maps also show estimates of native plant cover in each natural area which will be used to prioritize staff efforts.
4. Bond Round-Up
A. Jenkins Estate. Contractors have started ivy, blackberry, and non-native tree removal in the westerly portions of the Estate.
B. Roy Dancer. Initial clearing of non-natives and limbing up of trees to improve security has been completed.
5. Bethany Lake Projects. Construction of the sewer line near the dam is largely complete. Expansion of $185^{\text {th }}$ Avenue continues on the east side of the lake. Revegetation of the area is expected in spring 2012.

## Planning \& Development

 Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning \& Development1. Bond Program Additional Temporary Planner: Thirty-two applications were received for the additional temporary planner needed to support the bond program. The chosen candidate has over 15 years' experience as a Registered Landscape Architect and will begin work with THPRD on October 31.

Programs \& Special Activities
Lisa Novak, Superintendent of Programs \& Special Activities

1. The Conditional Use Permit for the Southminster Community Garden was submitted to the City of Beaverton two weeks ago.
2. The annual Cedar Mill Cider Festival was held on Sunday, October 14 at the John Quincy Adams Young House. Attendance was estimated at 1,000, with activities provided for all ages.
3. The fall Junior Team Tennis season is underway, and THPRD had seven teams in the league, with three of the teams in the new 10 and under division. In other tennis-related news, both air structures are up and operational.
4. Volunteer Service \& Special Events staff recruited 120 student volunteers for the Cedar Hills Fall Festival on October 15. Staff also recruited volunteers for Spooktacular, Pumpkin Fest and Newt Day and met with the City's Beaverton International Celebration Committee to begin planning the 2012 event in conjunction with Party in the Park.
5. The $38^{\text {th }}$ Annual Painter's Showcase was held at the Jenkins Estate October 7-9. Attendance was estimated at 500 for the weekend.

## Recreation

Eric Owens, Superintendent of Recreation

1. Garden Home Recreation Center had over 60 children attend the first after school, inservice day of the school year, held on October 14. The children enjoyed a field trip to Lakeview Farms where they went to the pumpkin patch.
2. Cedar Hills Recreation Center's annual Fall Festival was held on Saturday, October 15. There were 1,750 attendees which is a $15 \%$ increase over attendance last year. Several new games and activities were added such as a cupcake walk, spooky salon (hair tinsel and beading) and a cosmic maze. Toastmasters were a contributing partner and developed an event video.
3. Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center hosted the first of three middle school age dance's on October 7. THPRD has partnered with Blackboard Music to provide the music and the onsite security. Blackboard Music has years of experience providing dances to Beaverton-area youth. There were 65 students in attendance for dancing and social activities. The next dance will be held on November 4.

## Security Operations

Mike Janin, Superintendent of Security Operations

1. We now have an intern position for Park Patrol. This will be a volunteer position and the candidate will be required to complete a volunteer application and background check. Like many local police agencies that have reserve positions, the intern will closely emulate a reserve. In preparation for at least two anticipated openings for Park Patrol, the intern, who must be a State-certified Private Security Officer at time of application will learn the job responsibilities for Park Patrol while always working in the company of a regular Park Patrol Officer.

## Sports

Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports

1. Sports Leagues: Winter basketball registration for adults and youth remains open. All sports league registration is online this year, with a paper option, including coaching applications. Youth team formation will be completed the last week of November with practices beginning the first week of December. For the 2011 youth basketball season, THPRD will be focusing on recreational-based basketball programs, competitive basketball for the youth (Metro-Junior) will be offered by the Beaverton School District.
2. Affiliated Users: Staff continues to work on a more efficient and detailed field allocation process with the youth baseball programs. A pilot allocation process based on the previous year's use will be implemented in late November and early December. Depending on the success, spring soccer and lacrosse will pilot the process in January.

## Business Services

Cathy Brucker, Finance Manager
Nancy Hartman-Noye, Human Resources Manager
Mark Hokkanen, Risk and Contract Manager
Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager
Phil Young, Information Services Manager

1. Pilot classes for the new THPRD Leadership Academy were conducted in October. Participants, consisting of management staff, provided a good deal of feedback to the instructors for incorporation into the programs for a January launch. Classes for the first "live" group of participants are scheduled for four consecutive Thursday mornings from January 12 through February 2.
2. Talbot, Korvola and Warwick, THPRD's auditors, were on-site October 12-28 completing the review of the FY 2010/11 financial records and statements. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report will be available for Board review in late November.
3. The Portland State Population Research Center has been engaged to begin the demographic update component of the Comprehensive Plan update. As noted to the Board at the October meeting, the 2010 census information will not be available for this update until December 2011.
4. THPRD is eligible to receive a Longevity Credit from Special Districts Insurance Services (SDIS) in the amount of $\$ 51,961$. This credit is made available only to Districts that have been with SDIS for the past five years and have maintained a loss ratio below $65 \%$. In order to receive the credit, THPRD must agree to extend its Property and Liability coverage through December 31, 2013. In addition, SDIS will guarantee a maximum rate increase of $5 \%$ for 2013 policy, if the loss ratio remains at $50 \%$ or better in policy year 2012. THPRD's current annual loss ratio is $23 \%$.
5. On October 19 the Information Services Department completed the move of the file server and networking equipment from the East Annex to the $112^{\text {th }}$ Avenue facility. The equipment was moved and running at the new facility by the end of the day. On October 24 , the first full day of activity at $112^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, the IS Department staff was on hand to help staff. The move went smoothly and little assistance was needed.
6. All appropriate staff now have the ability to access financial information on demand through Springbrook, completing the financial software update begun earlier this year. These staff are now able to view real time information on financial activity as posted; creating efficiencies and time savings as well as reducing paper used to print reports.




# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District 

Monthly Capital Project Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget

| Through 09/30/11 | Project Budget |  |  |  |  | Project Expenditures |  | Estimated Total Costs |  |  |  | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Prior Year Budget Amount | Budget Carryover to Current Year | New Funds Budgeted in Current Year | $\underset{\text { Budget }}{\text { Cumulative Proct }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current Year } \\ \text { Budget Amount } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Expended Prior } \\ \text { Years } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Expended } \\ \text { Year-to-Date } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated Cost to } \\ \text { Complete } \end{gathered}$ | Basis of Estimate | Project Cumulative | Current Year | Project Cumulative | Current Year |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1+3) | (2+3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | ( $4+5+6$ ) | (5+6) |  |  |
| GENERAL FUND CAPITAL OUTLAY DIVISION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CARRY FORWARD PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Off-leash Dog Park Construction | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 2,555 | 7,695 | 42,305 | Budget | 52,555 | 50,000 | $(2,555)$ |  |
| Land Acquisition- Jenkins Estate Right of Way | 90,000 | 90,000 |  | 90,000 | 90,000 |  |  | 90,000 | Budget | 90,000 | 90,000 |  |  |
| John Quincy Adams Young House Renovation | 100,000 | 3,000 |  | 100,000 | 3,000 | 86,171 | 1,200 | 1,800 | Budget | 89,171 | 3,000 | 10,829 |  |
| Stuhr Center- Bequest Funded Project | 75,000 | 63,000 |  | 75,000 | 63,000 | 6,443 |  | 63,000 | Budget | 69,443 | 63,000 | 5,557 |  |
| Challenge Grant Competitive Fund | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 5,275 |  | 50,000 | Budget | 55,275 | 50,000 | $(5,275)$ |  |
| Signage Master Plan | 75,000 | 58,000 |  | 75,000 | 58,000 | 995 | 5,781 | 52,219 | Budget | 58,995 | 58,000 | 16,005 |  |
| Rock Creek Trail Improvement | 6,500 | 5,000 |  | 6,500 | 5,000 | 259 |  | 6,241 | Award | 6,500 | 6,241 |  | $(1,241)$ |
| Commonwealth Park North Trail Alignment | 69,000 | 69,000 |  | 69,000 | 69,000 | 18,541 | 12,403 | 41,294 | Award | 72,238 | 53,697 | $(3,238)$ | 15,303 |
| Matrix Hill Park Renovation | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 27,124 | 12,930 | 5,723 | Award | 45,777 | 18,653 | (5,777) | 21,347 |
| Bridge \& Boardwalk Repair | 120,000 | 120,000 |  | 120,000 | 120,000 | 20,334 | 17,792 | 91,332 | Award | 129,458 | 109,124 | (9,458) | 10,876 |
| Energy Savings Improvements | 1,675,000 | 25,000 |  | 1,675,000 | 25,000 | 1,302,473 |  | 25,000 | Award | 1,327,473 | 25,000 | 347,527 |  |
| Maintenance Facility Renovation Costs | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 |  | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 244,324 | 917,286 | 1,238,390 | Award | 2,400,000 | 2,155,676 |  | 244,324 |
| Community Benefit Fund Project | 325,000 | 321,031 |  | 325,000 | 321,031 | 3,969 |  | 321,031 | Budget | 325,000 | 321,031 |  |  |
| Outdoor Tent | 1,500 |  |  | 1,500 |  |  | 1,500 |  | Complete | 1,500 | 1,500 | - | $(1,500)$ |
| TOTAL CARRYOVER PROJECTS | 5,077,000 | 3,294,031 |  | 5,077,000 | 3,294,031 | 1,718,463 | 976,587 | 2,028,335 |  | 4,723,385 | 3,004,922 | 353,615 | 289,109 |
| ATHLETIC FACIIITY REPLACEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resurface Tennis Courts (4 sites) |  |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 13,600 | 11,400 | Budget | 25,000 | 25,000 |  |  |
| TOTAL ATHLETIC FACILITY REPLACEMENT |  |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | 13,600 | 11,400 |  | 25,000 | 25,000 |  |  |
| ATHLETIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indoor Basketball Score Boards (AC) |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 8,500 | - |  | 7,167 | Award | 7,167 | 7,167 | 1,333 | 1,333 |
| TOTAL ATHLETIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENT |  |  | 8,500 | 8,500 | 8,500 | - | - | 7,167 |  | 7,167 | 7,167 | 1,333 | 1,333 |
| PARK AND TRAIL REPLACEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drinking Fountains |  |  | 4,500 | 4,500 | 4,500 |  |  | 4,500 | Budget | 4,500 | 4,500 |  |  |
| Asphalt Path Rplcmnt \& Repair |  |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | - |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  |
| Play Structure (3 sites) |  |  | 117,000 | 117,000 | 117,000 |  |  | 117,000 | Budget | 117,000 | 117,000 |  |  |
| Irrigation System Repair |  |  | 81,000 | 81,000 | 81,000 |  |  | 81,000 | Budget | 81,000 | 81,000 |  |  |
| total park and trail replacements |  |  | 252,500 | 252,500 | 252,500 | - |  | 252,500 |  | 252,500 | 252,500 |  |  |
| PARK AND TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Memorial Benches |  |  | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | - | 8,000 | Budget | 8,000 | 8,000 |  |  |
| LGGP Grant - PCC Complex Rstrms |  |  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | - |  | 35,000 | Budget | 35,000 | 35,000 |  |  |
| RTP Grant - Cedar Mill Trail |  |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | - |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  |
| LGGP Grant - Camille Park |  |  | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 |  |  | 70,000 | Budget | 70,000 | 70,000 |  |  |
| OBP Grant - Walker Rd. Mid-Block Crossing |  |  | 121,500 | 121,500 | 121,500 | - | 5,650 | 115,850 | Budget | 121,500 | 121,500 |  |  |
| LWCF Grant - Schiffler Park Pavilion |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - | - | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 12,600 | 12,600 | 12,600 | . | 1,030 | 12,600 | Budget Complete | 12,600 1,030 | 12,600 1,030 | $(1,030)$ | $(1,030)$ |
| EVSE Unit @ HMT Complex $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL PARK AND TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS }\end{aligned}$ |  |  | 337,100 | 337,100 | 337,100 | - | $\frac{1,030}{6,680}$ | 331,450 |  | 338,130 | 338,130 | (1,030) | (1,030) |
| Challenge grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenge Grants |  |  | 97,500 | 97,500 | 97,500 | - | - | 97,500 | Budget | 97,500 | 97,500 | - |  |
| TOTAL CHALLENGE GRANTS |  |  | 97,500 | 97,500 | 97,500 | - | - | 97,500 |  | 97,500 | 97,500 | - |  |
| BUILIING REPLACEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSC Pool Tank Resurface |  |  | 65,000 | 65,000 | 65,000 | - | - | 65,000 | Budget | 65,000 | 65,000 |  |  |
| Tennis Air Structure Fabric |  |  | 153,000 | 153,000 | 153,000 | - | - | 153,000 | Budget | 153,000 | 153,000 | - |  |
| GHRC Tile (3 Rooms) |  |  | 21,500 | 21,500 | 21,500 | - | 7,755 | 13,745 | Budget | 21,500 | 21,500 | - |  |
| CRA Sand/Refinish Gym |  |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | - | 21,856 | Award | 21,856 | 21,856 | 3,144 | 3,144 |
| CHRC Floor Room 9 |  |  | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | - | - | 27,000 | Budget | 27,000 | 27,000 | - |  |
| CRA Resurface Shower Floors |  |  | 8,400 | 8,400 | 8,400 | - | 8,400 | - | Complete | 8,400 | 8,400 | - |  |
| AC Refinish Hardwood Floors |  |  | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | - | 10,155 | - | Complete | 10,155 | 10,155 | 1,845 | 1,845 |
| CHRC Refinish Hardwood Floors |  |  | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | - |  | 2,424 | Award | 2,424 | 2,424 | (924) | (924) |
| CRA Refinish Hardwood Floors |  |  | 4,700 | 4,700 | 4,700 | - |  | 6,411 | Award | 6,411 | 6,411 | (1,711) | (1,711) |
| GHRC Refinish Hardwood Floors |  |  | 3,500 1,500 | 3,500 1,500 | 3,500 1,500 | $:$ | - | 1,639 1,581 | Award Award | 1,639 1,581 | 1,639 1,581 | ${ }_{\text {1,861 }}$ |  |

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Monthly Capital Project Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Through 09/30/11} \& \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Project Budget} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Project Expenditures} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Estimated Total Costs} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget} \\
\hline \& Prior Year Budget Amount \& Budget Carryover to Current Year \& New Funds Budgeted in Current Year \& Cumulative Project Budget \& Current Year Budget Amount \& Expended Prior Years \& Expended Year-to-Date \& Estimated Cost to Complete \& Basis of Estimate \& \begin{tabular}{c}
\(\begin{array}{c}\text { Project } \\
\text { Cumulative }\end{array}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& Current Year \& Project Cumulative \& Current Year \\
\hline \& (1) \& (2) \& (3) \& (1+3) \& (2+3) \& (4) \& (5) \& (6) \& \& ( \(4+5+6\) ) \& (5+6) \& \& \\
\hline GHRC Carpet \& \& \& 5,500 \& 5,500 \& 5,500 \& - \& - \& 5,500 \& Budget \& 5,500 \& 5,500 \& - \& \\
\hline GHRC Locker Room Floor Rplc \& \& \& 7,500 \& 7,500 \& 7,500 \& \& \& 7,500 \& Budget \& 7,500 \& 7,500 \& \& \\
\hline Administrative Office Carpet \& \& \& 5,000 \& 5,000 \& 5,000 \& \& 4,508 \& \& Complete \& 4,508 \& 4,508 \& 492 \& 492 \\
\hline SSC Non-skd Firs(hll, 1 ckr rm) \& \& \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& \& \& 22,000 \& Budget \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& \& \\
\hline RSC Pook Deck Strctrr Survey \& \& \& 8,500 \& 8,500 \& 8,500 \& - \& 6,935 \& 1,565 \& Award \& 8,500 \& 8,500 \& \& \\
\hline HSC Carpet \& \& \& 5,200 \& 5,200 \& 5,200 \& \& \& 5,200 \& Budget \& 5,200 \& 5,200 \& \& \\
\hline CRA Carpet \& \& \& 4,700 \& 4,700 \& 4,700 \& - \& 4,607 \& \& Complete \& 4,607 \& 4,607 \& 93 \& 93 \\
\hline AC Metal Trnstn Plate Rplcment \& \& \& 12,587 \& 12,587 \& 12,587 \& \& 10,148 \& 3,499 \& Award \& 13,647 \& 13,647 \& \((1,060)\) \& \((1,060)\) \\
\hline ssc Clssm \& Spctr Windows \& \& \& 25,000 \& 25,000 \& 25,000 \& - \& \& 25,000 \& Budget \& 25,000 \& 25,000 \& - \& \\
\hline TC Front Doors \& \& \& 13,500 \& 13,500 \& 13,500 \& \& \& 13,500 \& Budget \& 13,500 \& 13,500 \& \& \\
\hline CHRC Windows \& \& \& 4,000 \& 4,000 \& 4,000 \& - \& 4,000 \& \& Complete \& 4,000 \& 4,000 \& \& \\
\hline RSC Outsd Doors (Ickr \& storg) \& \& \& 4,500 \& 4,500 \& 4,500 \& \& \& 4,500 \& Budget \& 4,500 \& 4,500 \& \& \\
\hline Aq Ctr NW Corner Door \& \& \& 3,500 \& 3,500 \& 3,500 \& \& \& 3,500 \& Budget \& 3,500 \& 3,500 \& \& \\
\hline Aq Ctr Front Door Hinges \& \& \& 2,600 \& 2,600 \& 2,600 \& \& \& 2,600 \& Award \& 2,600 \& 2,600 \& \& \\
\hline GHRC Exterior Boiler Rm Doors \& \& \& 5,000 \& 5,000 \& 5,000 \& \& 4,867 \& \& Complete \& 4,867 \& 4,867 \& 133 \& 133 \\
\hline CRA Locker Rm Doors \& \& \& 10,000 \& 10,000 \& 10,000 \& \& \& 9,586 \& Award \& 9,586 \& 9,586 \& 414 \& 414 \\
\hline CRA Chlorine Rm Door \& \& \& 2,920 \& 2,920 \& 2,920 \& - \& \& 2,920 \& Budget \& 2,920 \& 2,920 \& \& \\
\hline Aquatic Pumps \& Valves (8) \& \& \& 55,950 \& 55,950 \& 55,950 \& \& 11,273 \& 33,687 \& Award \& 44,960 \& 44,960 \& 10,990 \& 10,990 \\
\hline SSC Recharge Pool Filter \& \& \& 6,500 \& 6,500 \& 6,500 \& \& \& 5,876 \& Award \& 5,876 \& 5,876 \& 624 \& 624 \\
\hline RSC Soda Ash Tank Relocate \& \& \& 4,200 \& 4,200 \& 4,200 \& - \& \& 4,090 \& Award \& 4,090 \& 4,090 \& 110 \& 110 \\
\hline CRA Filter Media \& \& \& 12,000 \& 12,000 \& 12,000 \& - \& 12,479 \& \& Complete \& 12,479 \& 12,479 \& (479) \& (479) \\
\hline Aquatic Pnmatic \& HVAC valves \& \& \& 8,400 \& 8,400 \& 8,400 \& - \& 1,425 \& 7,797 \& Award \& 9,222 \& 9,222 \& (822) \& (822) \\
\hline Aquatic Diving Boards \& Stands \& \& \& 15,900 \& 15,900 \& 15,900 \& \& \& 15,900 \& Budget \& 15,900 \& 15,900 \& \& \\
\hline SSW Chlorine Tank Scale \& \& \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& - \& 1,595 \& \& Complete \& 1,595 \& 1,595 \& 405 \& 405 \\
\hline CRA Slide Steps \& \& \& 10,500 \& 10,500 \& 10,500 \& \& 11,100 \& 25022 \& Complete \& 11,100

25022 \& 11,100 \& (600) \& (600) <br>
\hline HSC Lockers \& \& \& 31,000 \& 31,000 \& 31,000 \& \& \& 25,022 \& Award \& ${ }^{25,022}$ \& ${ }^{25,022}$ \& 5,978 \& 5,978
4,150 <br>
\hline TC Back Drop Court Curtains \& \& \& 15,000
4,400 \& 15,000
4.400 \& 15,000
4,400 \& \& 3.058 \& 10,850 \& Award
Complete \& $\begin{array}{r}10,850 \\ 3,058 \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ \& $\begin{array}{r}10,850 \\ 3,058 \\ \hline\end{array}$ \& 4,150
1342
1 \& 4,150
1,342
1 <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {A }}$ AC Dieldswasher Concessioncession) \& \& \& 4,400
4,400 \& 4,400
4,400 \& 4,400
4,400 \& - \& 3,058
3,058 \& - \& Complete \& 3,058
3,058 \& 3,058
3,058 \& ${ }_{1}^{1,342}$ \& 1,342
1,342 <br>
\hline Jenkins Main Hs Dishwasher \& \& \& 8,000 \& 8,000 \& 8,000 \& - \& \& 7,816 \& Award \& 7,816 \& 7,816 \& 184 \& 184 <br>
\hline CRA Gym Divider Curtain \& \& \& 11,800 \& 11,800 \& 11,800 \& \& 7,230 \& \& Complete \& 7,230 \& 7,230 \& 4,570 \& 4,570 <br>
\hline Stuhr Light Fxtrs (dining rm) \& \& \& 2,500 \& 2,500 \& 2,500 \& - \& - \& 2,500 \& Budget \& 2,500 \& 2,500 \& - \& <br>
\hline Jenkins Main Hs Interior Paint \& \& \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& \& \& 22,000 \& Budget \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& \& <br>
\hline GHRC Exterior Siding \& \& \& 40,000 \& 40,000 \& 40,000 \& \& \& 40,000 \& Budget \& 40,000 \& 40,000 \& \& <br>
\hline AC Wall Sealing \& \& \& 6,800 \& 6,800 \& 6,800 \& \& 895 \& 5,905 \& Budget \& 6,800 \& 6,800 \& \& <br>
\hline AC Add/Connect Downspouts \& \& \& 25,500 \& 25,500 \& 25,500 \& - \& 12,905 \& 12,595 \& Budget \& 25,500 \& 25,500 \& - \& <br>
\hline AC Reseal Skylights \& \& \& 10,500 \& 10,500 \& 10,500 \& - \& \& 12,160 \& Award \& 12,160 \& 12,160 \& $(1,660)$ \& $(1,660)$ <br>
\hline Bldng Exterior Paint (6 sites) \& \& \& 23,850 \& 23,850 \& 23,850 \& - \& \& 23,850 \& Budget \& 23,850 \& 23,850 \& - \& <br>
\hline GH \& CH Circuit Panels \& \& \& 25,000 \& 25,000 \& 25,000 \& \& \& 25,000 \& Budget \& 25,000 \& 25,000 \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }^{\text {HSC Roof Exhaust Fans }}$ \& \& \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& \& \& 2,000 \& Budget \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& \& <br>
\hline GHRC Steam Heat Coils (8) \& \& \& 28,800 \& 28,800 \& 28,800 \& \& \& 28,800 \& Budget \& 28,800 \& 28,800 \& \& <br>
\hline GHRC Gas Pak \& \& \& 33,500 \& 33,500 \& 33,500 \& \& - \& 33,500 \& Budget \& 33,500
2,000 \& 33,500
2,000 \& $\div$ \& <br>
\hline GHRC Air Handler South Wing \& \& \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& \& \& 2,000 \& Budget \& 2,000 \& 2,000 \& \& <br>
\hline TC Air Condensing Unit \& \& \& 8.000 \& 8,000 \& 8.000 \& - \& 50 \& 6,985 \& Award \& 6,985 \& 6,985 \& 1,015 \& <br>
\hline CRA Condensing Unit \& \& \& 85,000 \& 85,000 \& 85,000 \& \& 250 \& 84,518 \& Award \& 84,768 \& 84,768 \& 232 \& 232 <br>
\hline Dryland HVAC Upgrade \& \& \& 12,000 \& 12,000 \& 12,000 \& - \& \& 12,000 \& Budget \& 12,000 \& 12,000 \& \& <br>
\hline STR DDC HVAC ZT Controller \& \& \& 3,300 \& 3,300 \& 3,300 \& - \& \& 3,200 \& Award \& 3,200 \& 3,200 \& 100 \& 100 <br>
\hline GHRC Unit Heater (Showers) \& \& \& 3,500 \& 3,500 \& 3,500 \& - \& - \& 3,500 \& Budget \& 3,500 \& 3,500 \& \& <br>
\hline CRA Floor Drains \& Pipes \& \& \& 8,500 \& 8,500 \& 8,500 \& - \& \& 8,008 \& Award \& 8,008 \& 8,008 \& 492 \& 492 <br>
\hline SSC Domestic Holding Tank \& \& \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& 22,000 \& - \& 21,865 \& \& Complete \& 21,865 \& 21,865 \& 135 \& <br>
\hline GHRC Shower Stalls \& \& \& 18,500 \& 18,500 \& 18,500 \& - \& \& 18,500 \& Budget \& 18,500 \& 18,500 \& $\stackrel{-}{-}$ \& <br>
\hline CHRC Water Heaters \& \& \& 2,500 \& 2,500 \& 2,500 \& - \& \& 3,260 \& Award \& 3,260 \& 3,260 \& ${ }^{(760)}$ \& <br>
\hline Aq Ctr Mchncl Rm Replmb P-Trap \& \& \& 2,250 \& 2,250 \& 2,250 \& \& \& 2,229 \& Award \& 2,229 \& 2,229 \& 21 \& 21 <br>
\hline HSC Shower Valve Rplcmnt (3) \& \& \& 2,600 \& 2,600 \& 2,600 \& - \& - \& 1,840 \& Award \& 1,840 \& 1,840 \& 760 \& <br>
\hline GHRC Design for Showers
Exercise Equipment (2) \& \& \& 6,000
12,550 \& 6,000
12,550 \& 6,000

12,550 \& - \& - \& \[
$$
\begin{array}{r}
6,000 \\
12,550
\end{array}
$$

\] \& | Budget |
| :--- |
| Budget | \& 6,000

12,550 \& 6,000
12,550 \& - \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

Monthly Capital Project Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 09/30/11


TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY DIVISION $\qquad$ 3,294,031 $1,889,276$ 6,966,276 5,183,307 1,718,463 1,168,782 3,701,962 6,589,207 4,870,744 377,069 $\xlongequal{312,563}$

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Monthly Capital Project Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 09/30/11

|  | Project Budget |  |  |  |  | Project Expenditures |  | Estimated Total Costs |  |  |  | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Prior Year Budget Amount | Budget Carryover to Current Year | New Funds Budgeted in Current Year | Cumulative Project Budget | Current Year Budget Amount | $\underset{\text { Expended Prior }}{\text { Years }}$ Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Estimated Cost to Complete | Basis of Estimate | Project Cumulative | Current Year | Project Cumulative | Current Year |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1+3) | (2+3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (4+5+6) | (5+6) |  |  |
| information services department |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| System/workstn Replcmnt |  |  | 65,000 | 65,000 | 65,000 | - | 13,934 | 51,066 | Budget | 65,000 | 65,000 | - |  |
| Server Replacements |  |  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 |  | 7,247 | 27,753 | Budget | 35,000 | 35,000 |  |  |
| LAN/WAN Replcmit |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 6,299 | 39,551 | Award | 45,850 | 45,850 | $(5,850)$ | $(5,850)$ |
| Printers/Network Printers |  |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |  | 287 | 4,713 | Budget | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  |
| Telephones |  |  | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |  |  | 20,075 | Award | 20,075 | 20,075 | (75) | (75) |
| Misc. Application Software |  |  | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 |  | 8,664 | 11,336 | Budget | 20,000 | 20,000 |  |  |
| Fiber Line Instalation |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  | 36,041 | Award | 36,041 | 36,041 | 3,959 | 3,959 |
| Applicant Tracking Software Tool |  |  | 15,500 | 15,500 | 15,500 |  | 8,000 |  | Complete | 8,000 | 8,000 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Backup Server @ 112th Maintenance Facility |  |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  |  | 10,000 | Budget | 10,000 | 10,000 |  |  |
| total information technology improvements |  |  | 250,500 | 250,500 | 250,500 |  | 44,431 | 200,535 |  | 244,966 | 244,966 | 5,534 | 5,534 |
| total information systems department |  | . | 250,500 | 250,500 | 250,500 | . | 44,431 | 200,535 |  | 244,966 | 244,966 | 5,534 | 5,534 |
| maintenance department |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BULLIING EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Autoscrubber (2) |  |  | 18,100 | 18,100 | 18,100 | - | 11,997 | 10,404 | Award | 22,401 | 22,401 | $(4,301)$ | $(4,301)$ |
| Autoscrubber Batteries |  |  | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |  | 1,857 | - | Complete | 1,857 | 1,857 | 643 | 643 |
| Robotic Pool Tank Cleaner |  |  | 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 |  | 4,890 | - | Complete | 4,890 | 4,890 | 1,610 | 1,610 |
| Floor Buffer (2) |  |  | 3,568 | 3,568 | 3,568 |  | 3,039 |  | Complete | 3,039 | 3,039 | 529 | 529 |
| Slow Speed Scrubber (3) |  |  | 5,918 | 5,918 | 5,918 |  | 813 | 5,105 | Budget | 5,918 | 5,918 |  |  |
| Carpet Extractor |  |  | 3,500 | 3,500 | 3,500 |  |  | 2,759 | Award | 2,759 | 2,759 | 741 | 741 |
| Cleaning Equipment |  |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |  |  | 1,000 | Budget | 1,000 | 1,000 |  |  |
| Wet Floor Vacuum |  |  | 1,250 | 1,250 | 1,250 | - |  | 662 | Award | 662 | 662 | 588 | 588 |
| Walk Behind Sweeper |  |  | 3,200 | 3,200 | 3,200 | - | 4,523 |  | Complete | 4,523 | 4,523 | $(1,323)$ | $(1,323)$ |
| Product Storage Bin |  |  | 1,650 | 1,650 | 1,650 | - |  | 1,650 | Budget | 1,650 | 1,650 |  |  |
| TOTAL BUILDING EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT |  |  | 47,186 | 47,186 | 47,186 | - | 27,119 | 21,580 |  | 48,699 | 48,699 | $(1,513)$ | (1,513) |
| FLEET REPLACEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tractor Shed Replacement |  |  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 |  |  | 35,000 | Budget | 35,000 | 35,000 | - |  |
| Vehicle Hoist |  |  | 24,000 | 24,000 | 24,000 |  |  | 24,000 | Budget | 24,000 | 24,000 |  |  |
| Soil Reliever |  |  | 22,500 | 22,500 | 22,500 | - |  | 23,045 | Award | 23,045 | 23,045 | (545) | (545) |
| Sod Cutter |  |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  | 5,000 | Budget | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  |
| Cargo Van (2) |  |  | 42,000 | 42,000 | 42,000 | - |  | 40,480 | Award | 40,480 | 40,480 | 1,520 | 1,520 |
| Utility Truck |  |  | 28,000 | 28,000 | 28,000 |  |  | 20,567 | Award | 20,567 | 20,567 | 7,433 | 7,433 |
| Pressure Washer |  |  | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | - |  | 7,500 | Budget | 7,500 | 7,500 |  |  |
| 12 Passenger Van |  |  | 26,000 | 26,000 | 26,000 | - |  | 22,698 | Award | 22,698 | 22,698 | 3,302 | 3,302 |
| Quad-cab Flatbed Truck |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - |  | 29,423 | Award | 29,423 | 29,423 | 10,577 | 10,577 |
| Dump Truck (2-3 YD) |  |  | 31,000 | 31,000 | 31,000 | - |  | 31,273 | Award | 31,273 | 31,273 | (273) | (273) |
| Infield Rake (2) |  |  | 22,000 | 22,000 | 22,000 | - | 21,585 | 2,783 | Award | 24,368 | 24,368 | $(2,368)$ | $(2,368)$ |
| Electric Utility Venicle |  |  | 9,500 | 9,500 | 9,500 | - |  | 8,593 | Award | 8,593 | 8,593 | 907 | 907 |
| Compact Pickup |  |  | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | - | 13,431 |  | Complete | 13,431 | 13,431 | 569 | 569 |
| 15-Passenger Van (2) |  |  | 52,000 | 52,000 | 52,000 | - | - | 45,396 | Award | 45,396 | 45,396 | 6,604 | 6,604 |
| Lubrication |  |  | 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 | - | - | 6,500 | Budget | 6,500 | 6,500 | - |  |
| Compressed Air |  |  | 7,800 | 7,800 | 7,800 | - | - | 7,800 | Budget | 7,800 | 7,800 |  |  |
| Exhaust Ventilation |  |  | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 | - | - | 13,000 | Budget | 13,000 | 13,000 | $\underline{-}$ |  |
| TOTAL FLEET REPLACEMENTS |  |  | 385,800 | 385,800 | 385,800 | - | 35,016 | 323,058 |  | 358,074 | 358,074 | 27,726 | 27,726 |
| FLEET IMPROVEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Forklift |  |  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | - | 29,287 | 5,713 | Complete | 35,000 | 35,000 | - |  |
| Floor Scrubber |  |  | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | - |  | 12,424 | Award | 12,424 | 12,424 | 2,576 | 2,576 |
| TOTAL FLEET IMPROVEMENTS |  |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | 29,287 | 18,137 |  | 47,424 | 47,424 | 2,576 | 2,576 |
| total maintenance department |  |  | 482,986 | 482,986 | 482,986 | . | 91,422 | 362,775 |  | 454,197 | 454,197 | 28,789 | 28,789 |
| GRAND total general fund | 5,077,000 | 3,294,031 | 2,622,762 | 7,699,762 | 5,916,793 | 1,718,463 | 1,304,635 | 4,265,272 |  | 7,288,370 | 5,569,907 | 411,392 | $\underline{346,886}$ |

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Monthly Capital Project Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 09/30/11

|  | Project Budget |  |  |  |  | Project Expenditures |  | Estimated Total Costs |  |  |  | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Prior Year Budget Amount | Budget Carryover to Current Year | New Funds Budgeted in Current Yea | Cumulative Project Budget | Current Year Budget Amount | Expended Prior Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Estimated Cost to | Basis of Estimate | Project Cumulative | ar | Project Cumulative | Current Year |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1+3) | (2+3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (4+5+6) | (5+6) |  |  |

## SDC FUND

SDC FUND
$\frac{\text { LAND ACQUUSTIION }}{\text { Land Acquisition (FY 11) }}$
Land Acquisision (FY 12)
IMPROVEMENT/DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS Fanno Creek Trail
MTIP Grant Match for Westside Trail
Bonny Slope/BSD Trail Development
LWCF Grant Match/Schiffler Park Pavillion
PCC Rec Complex Site Amenities
LGGP Grant Match-PCC Restroon
112 th St. Field Construction
Winkleman Park Phase I
Progress Lake Dock Modification
MTIP Grant Match-Westside Trail Segment 18 OBP Grant Match-Waterhouse Trail/Walker Rd Crossing 112 th St. Site Improvements
Undesignated Projects Undesignated Projects TOTAL DEVELOPMENTIMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Total - SDC Fund

| 260,000 | 260,000 | 500,000 500,000 | 500,000 760,000 | 500,000 | 7,808 | 2,683 | 500,000 757,317 | Budget | 500,000 | 500,000 | $(7,808)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,311,950 | 1,024,000 | 700,000 | 2,011,950 | 1,724,000 | 492,224 | 232,261 | 1,491,739 | Budget | 2,216,224 | 1,724,000 | $(204,274)$ |  |
| 40,000 | 30,000 | - | 40,000 | 30,000 | - | 30,000 |  | Complete | 30,000 | 30,000 | 10,000 |  |
| 175,000 | 175,000 | - | 175,000 | 175,000 | - | - | 175,000 | Budget | 175,000 | 175,000 |  |  |
| 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  |
| 72,000 | 46,510 | - | 72,000 | 46,510 | 26,286 | 34 | 46,476 | Budget | 72,796 | 46,510 | (796) |  |
| 41,200 | 41,200 | - | 41,200 | 41,200 | 41,089 | - |  | Complete | 41,089 |  | 111 | 41,200 |
| 35,000 | 35,000 | - | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1,145 | - | 35,000 | Budget | 36,145 | 35,000 | $(1,145)$ |  |
| 1,000,000 | 914,995 | 163,748 | 1,163,748 | 1,078,743 | 172,410 | 75,744 | 915,594 | Budget | 1,163,748 | 991,338 |  | 87,405 |
| 282,000 | 282,000 |  | 282,000 | 282,000 |  |  | 282,000 | Budget | 282,000 | 282,000 |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  | 12,438 |  | Complete | 12,438 | 12,438 | $(12,438)$ | $(12,438)$ |
|  |  | 62,205 | 62,205 | 62,205 |  | 69,323 | $(7,118)$ | Budget | 62,205 | 62,205 |  |  |
| - | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | - | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 | - |  |
|  |  | 550,000 | 550,000 | 550,000 |  |  | 550,000 | Budget | 550,000 | 550,000 |  |  |
|  |  | 2,897,575 | 2,897,575 | 2,897,575 | - | - | 2,897,575 | Budget | 2,897,575 | 2,897,575 | - |  |
| 3,007, 150 | 2,598,705 | 4,423,528 | 7,430,678 | 7,022,233 | 733,154 | 419,800 | 6,486,266 |  | 7,639,220 | 6,906,066 | (208,542) | 116,167 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3,267,150 | 2,858,705 | 4,923,528 | 8,190,678 | 7,782,233 | 740,962 | 422,483 | 7,243,583 |  | 8,407,028 | 7,666,066 | $(216,350)$ | $\underline{116,167}$ |

KEY
Budget Estimate based on original budget - not started and/or no basis for change Deferred Some or all of Project has been eliminated to reduce overall capital costs for yea. Award Estimate based on Contract Award amount or quote price estimates
Complete Project completed - no additional estimated costs to complete.

# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District <br> Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report 

Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 09/30/11

| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Quad- } \\ \text { rant } \end{array}\right\|$ | Project <br> Code | Description | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  | Estimated Cost toComplete | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basis of } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \text { (Completed } \\ \text { Phase) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Project Cumulative cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est. Cost } \\ \text { (Over) Under } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | \% Total <br> Expended to Project Cumulative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Initial Project Budget | Adjustments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Current Total } \\ & \text { Project Budget } \\ & \text { FY 11/12 } \end{aligned}$ | Expended Prior Years Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Total Expended to Date |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (1+2) | (4) | (5) | $(4+5)=(6)$ | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | (3-9) | (6)/(9) |
|  |  | BOND CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | New Neighborhood Parks Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 91-901 | AM Kennedy Park | 1,285,250 | 20,050 | 1,305,300 | 117,138 | 29,761 | 146,899 | 1,487,930 | Master Plan | 1,634,829 | $(329,529)$ | 9.0\% |
| sw | 91-902 | Barsotti Park | 1,285,250 | 20,613 | 1,305,863 | 613 |  | 613 | 1,305,250 | Budget | 1,305,863 |  | 0.0\% |
| NW | 91-903 | Kaiser Ridge Park | 771,150 | 12,305 | 783,455 | 42,062 | 4,505 | 46,567 | 736,888 | A\&E Contract | 783,455 |  | 5.9\% |
| sw | 91-904 | Roy Dancer Park | 771,150 | 12,341 | 783,491 | 6,848 | 804 | 7,652 | 775,839 | Budget | 783,491 |  | 1.0\% |
| NE | 91-905 | Roger Tillury Park | 771,150 | 12,368 | 783,518 |  |  |  | 783,518 | Budget | 783,518 |  | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Total New Neighborhood Parks Development | 4,883,950 | 77,677 | 4,961,627 | 166,661 | 35,070 | 201,731 | 5,089,425 |  | 5,291,156 | (329,529) | 3.8\% |
|  |  | Renovate \& Redevelop Neighborhood Parks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE | 91-906 | Cedar Mill Park \& Trail | 1,125,879 | 18,057 | 1,143,936 | 26 | 500 | 526 | 1,143,410 | Budget | 1,143,936 | - | 0.0\% |
| SE | 91-907 | Camille Park | 514,100 | 7,788 | 521,888 | 152,309 | 119,382 | 271,691 | 372,346 | Const. Doc. | 644,037 | $(122,149)$ | 42.2\% |
| NW | 91-908 | Somerset West Park | 1,028,200 | 16,490 | 1,044,690 | 2,389 | 136 | 2,525 | 1,042,165 | Budget | 1,044,690 |  | 0.2\% |
| NW | 91-909 | Pioneer Park and Bridge Replacement | 544,934 | 8,613 | 553,547 | 66,927 | 13,165 | 80,092 | 473,455 | A\&E Contract | 553,547 |  | 14.5\% |
| SE | 91-910 | Vista Brook Park | 514,100 | 8,149 | 522,249 | 54,991 | 17,893 | 72,884 | 487,167 | Master Plan | 560,051 | $(37,802)$ | 13.0\% |
|  |  | Total Renovate \& Redevelop Neighborhood Parks | 3,727,213 | 59,097 | 3,786,310 | 276,642 | 151,076 | 427,718 | 3,518,543 |  | 3,946,261 | (159,951) | 10.8\% |
|  |  | New Neighborhood Parks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NW | 98-880 | New Neighborhood Park - NW Quadrant | 1,500,000 | 23,241 | 1,523,241 | 4,172 | 1,978 | 6,150 | 1,517,091 | Budget | 1,523,241 |  | 0.4\% |
| NE | 98-745 | New Neighborhood Park - NE Quadrant | 1,500,000 | 23,951 | 1,523,951 | 42,097 | 11,112 | 53,209 | 1,470,742 | Budget | 1,523,951 | - | 3.5\% |
| sw | 98-746 | New Neighborhood Park - SW Quadrant | 1,500,000 | 21,071 | 1,521,071 | 1,049,158 | 1,199 | 1,050,357 | 470,714 | Budget | 1,521,071 | - | 69.1\% |
| SE | 98-747 | New Neighborhood Park - SE Quadrant | 1,500,000 | 16,295 | 1,516,295 | 2,555,536 |  | 2,555,536 | $(1,041,004)$ | Budget | 1,514,532 | 1,763 | 168.7\% |
| NW | 98-748 | New Neighborhood Park (North Bethany) | 1,500,000 | 23,866 | 1,523,866 | 57,254 | 1,562,385 | 1,619,639 | (95,773) | Budget | 1,523,866 |  | 106.3\% |
| UND | 98-749 | New Neighborhood Park - Undesignated | 1,500,000 | 23,911 | 1,523,911 | 33,250 | 12,811 | 46,061 | 1,477,850 | Budget | 1,523,911 |  | 3.0\% |
|  |  | Total New Neighborhood Parks | 9,000,000 | 132,335 | 9,132,335 | 3,741,467 | 1,589,485 | 5,330,952 | 3,799,620 |  | 9,130,572 | 1,763 | 58.4\% |
| sw |  | New Community Park Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 92-915 | SW Community Park | 7,711,500 | 123,662 | 7,835,162 | 2,112 | 5,642 | 7,754 | 7,827,408 | Budget | 7,835,162 |  | 0.1\% |
|  |  | Total New Community Park Development | 7,711,500 | 123,662 | 7,835,162 | 2,112 | 5,642 | 7,754 | 7,827,408 |  | 7,835,162 |  | 0.1\% |
| NE |  | New Community Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 98-881 | New Community Park | 10,000,000 | 160,128 | 10,160,128 | 8,094,046 | - | 8,094,046 | 2,066,082 | Budget | 10,160,128 | - | 79.7\% |
|  |  | Total New Community Park | 10,000,000 | 160,128 | 10,160,128 | 8,094,046 | - | 8,094,046 | 2,066,082 |  | 10,160,128 |  | 79.7\% |
|  |  | Renovate and Redevelop Community Parks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 92-916 | Cedar Hills Park | 6,194,905 | 98,656 | 6,293,561 | 110,898 | 716 | 111,614 | 6,134,063 | A\&E Contract | 6,245,677 | 47,884 | 1.8\% |
|  | 92-917 | Schiffler Park | 3,598,700 | 55,594 | 3,654,294 | 452,996 | (443) | 452,553 | 3,126,423 | Design Dev. | 3,578,976 | 75,318 | 12.6\% |
|  |  | Total Renovate and Redevelop Community Parks | 9,793,605 | 154,250 | 9,947,855 | 563,894 | 273 | 564,167 | 9,260,486 |  | 9,824,653 | 123,202 | 5.7\% |
|  |  | Natural Area Preservation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE | 97-963 | Roger Tilbury Memorial Park | 30,846 | 495 | 31,341 | 23 | - | 23 | 31,318 | Budget | 31,341 | - | 0.1\% |
| NE | 97-964 | Cedar Mill Park | 30,846 | 495 | 31,341 | 43 | - | 43 | 31,298 | Budget | 31,341 |  | 0.1\% |
| NE | 97-965 | Jordan/Jackie Husen Park | 308,460 | 4,947 | 313,407 | 65 | 154 | 219 | 313,188 | Planning | 313,407 | - | 0.1\% |
| NW | 97-966 | NE/Bethany Meadows Trail Habitat Connection | 246,768 | 3,958 | 250,726 | - |  | - | 250,726 | Budget | 250,726 | - | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-967 | Kaiser Ridge Park | 10,282 | 165 | 10,447 | - | - | - | 10,447 | Planning | 10,447 | - | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-968 | Allenbach Acres Park | 41,128 | 659 | 41,787 | 38 | 14 | 52 | 41,735 | Budget | 41,787 |  | 0.1\% |
| NW | 97-969 | Crystal Creek Park | 205,640 | 3,298 | 208,938 | 685 | 47 | 732 | 208,206 | Budget | 208,938 | - | 0.4\% |
| NE | 97-970 | Foothills Park | 61,692 | 972 | 62,664 | 16,152 | 5,291 | 21,443 | 39,671 | Planning | 61,114 | 1,550 | 35.1\% |
| NE | 97-971 | Commonwealth Lake Park | 41,128 | 635 | 41,763 | 11,534 | 3,577 | 15,111 | 19,276 | Planning | 34,387 | 7,376 | 43.9\% |
| NW | 97-972 | Tualatin Hills Nature Park and Bridge Replacement | 90,800 | 1,452 | 92,252 | 1,394 | 202 | 1,596 | 90,656 | Planning | 92,252 |  | 1.7\% |
| NE | 97-973 | Pioneer Park | 10,282 | 165 | 10,447 | 142 |  | 142 | 10,305 | Budget | 10,447 |  | 1.4\% |
| NW | 97-974 | Whispering Woods Park | 51,410 | 747 | 52,157 | 21,623 | 5,984 | 27,607 | 23,962 | Planning | 51,569 | 588 | 53.5\% |
| NW | 97-975 | Willow Creek Nature Park | 20,564 | 322 | 20,886 | 2,688 | 1,312 | 4,000 | 16,886 | Planning | 20,886 | - | 19.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page 1 of 4 |

# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District 

Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

Through 09/30/11

|  |  |  | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quad- rant | Project Code | Description | Initial Project Budget Budget | Adjustments | Current Total Project Budget FY 11/12 | Expended Prior Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Total Expended to Date | Estimated Cost to Complete | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basis of } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \text { (Completed } \\ \text { Phase) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Project Cumulative Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. Cost } \\ & \text { (Over) Under } \\ & \text { Budget } \end{aligned}$ | \% Total Expended to Project Cumulative Cost |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (1+2) | (4) | (5) | $(4+5)=(6)$ | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | (3-9) | (6)/(9) |
| SE | 97-976 | AM Kennedy Park | 30,846 | 495 | 31,341 | 45 |  | 45 | 31,296 | Planning | 31,341 |  | 0.1\% |
| SE | 97-977 | Camille Park | 77,115 | 1,236 | 78,351 | 118 | 181 | 299 | 78,052 | Planning | 78,351 |  | 0.4\% |
| SE | 97-978 | Vista Brook Park | 20,564 | 330 | 20,894 |  |  |  | 20,894 | Budget | 20,894 |  | 0.0\% |
| SE | 97-979 | Greenway Park/Koll Center | 61,692 | 988 | 62,680 | 1,203 | 10 | 1,213 | 61,467 | Budget | 62,680 |  | 1.9\% |
| SE | 97-980 | Bauman Park | 82,256 | 1,313 | 83,569 | 7,340 | 72 | 7,412 | 76,157 | Planning | 83,569 |  | 8.9\% |
| SE | 97-981 | Fanno Creek Park | 162,456 | 2,605 | 165,061 | 350 | - | 350 | 164,711 | Budget | 165,061 |  | 0.2\% |
| SE | 97-982 | Hideaway Park | 41,128 | 660 | 41,788 | 29 | 2,982 | 3,011 | 38,777 | Budget | 41,788 |  | 7.2\% |
| sw | 97-983 | Murrayhill Park | 61,692 | 869 | 62,561 | 24,124 | 2,477 | 26,601 | 35,229 | Planting | 61,830 | 731 | 43.0\% |
| SE | 97-984 | Hyland Forest Park | 71,974 | 1,034 | 73,008 | 40,210 | 4,508 | 44,718 | 13,446 | Planning | 58,164 | 14,844 | 76.9\% |
| sw | 97-985 | Cooper Mountain | 205,640 | 3,298 | 208,938 | 5 |  | 5 | 208,933 | Budget | 208,938 |  | 0.0\% |
| sw | 97-986 | Winkelman Park | 10,282 | 165 | 10,447 | 9 | 19 | 28 | 10,419 | Planning | 10,447 |  | 0.3\% |
| sw | 97-987 | Lowami Hart Woods | 287,896 | 4,615 | 292,511 | 2,407 | 999 | 3,406 | 289,105 | Budget | 292,511 |  | 1.2\% |
| SW | 97-988 | Rosa/Hazeldale Parks | 28,790 | 460 | 29,250 | 357 |  | 357 | 28,893 | Budget | 29,250 |  | 1.2\% |
| sw | 97-989 | Mt Williams Park | 102,820 | 1,649 | 104,469 |  |  |  | 104,469 | Budget | 104,469 |  | 0.0\% |
| sw | 97-990 | Jenkins Estate | 154,230 | 2,464 | 156,694 | 2,141 | 1,003 | 3,144 | 153,550 | Planning | 156,694 |  | 2.0\% |
| sw | 97-991 | Summercrest Park | 10,282 | 155 | 10,437 | 2,248 | 2,400 | 4,648 | 4,727 | Planting | 8,258 | 2,179 | 56.3\% |
| sw | 97-992 | Morrison Woods | 61,692 | 989 | 62,681 | 28 |  | 28 | 62,653 | Budget | 62,681 |  | 0.0\% |
| UND | 97-993 | Interpretive Sign Network | 339,306 | 5,439 | 344,745 | 2,467 | 76 | 2,543 | 342,202 | Budget | 344,745 |  | 0.7\% |
| NW | 97-994 | Beaverton Creek Trail | 61,692 | 989 | 62,681 |  | - |  | 62,681 | Budget | 62,681 |  | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-995 | Bethany WetlandsBronson Creek | 41,128 | 660 | 41,788 |  | - |  | 41,788 | Budget | 41,788 |  | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-996 | Bluegrass Downs Park | 15,423 | 247 | 15,670 |  |  |  | 15,670 | Budget | 15,670 |  | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-997 | Crystal Creek | 41,128 | 660 | 41,788 |  | - |  | 41,788 | Budget | 41,788 |  | 0.0\% |
| UND | 97-914 | Restoration of new properties to be acquired | 643,023 | 10,313 | 653,336 |  |  |  | 653,336 | Budget | 653,336 |  | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Total Natural Area Preservation | 3,762,901 | 59,943 | 3,822,844 | 137,468 | 31,308 | 168,776 | 3,627,917 |  | 3,795,576 | 27,268 | 4.4\% |
|  |  | Natural Area Preservation-Land Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND | 98-882 | Natural Area Acquisitions | 8,400,000 | 134,622 | 8,534,622 | 205,845 | 8,010 | 213,855 | 8,320,767 | Budget | 8,534,622 |  | 2.5\% |
|  |  | Total Natural Area Preservation - Land Acquisition | 8,400,000 | 134,622 | 8,534,622 | 205,845 | 8,010 | 213,855 | 8,320,767 |  | 8,534,622 |  | 2.5\% |
|  |  | New Linear Park and Trail Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sw | 93-918 | Westside Trail Segments 1, 4, \& 7 | 4,267,030 | 66,834 | 4,333,864 | 369,784 | 19,225 | 389,009 | 3,179,036 | Design Dev. | 3,568,045 | 765,819 | 10.9\% |
| NE | 93-920 | Jordan/Husen Park Trail | 1,645,120 | 25,036 | 1,670,156 | 225,734 | 35,163 | 260,897 | 1,180,971 | Design Dev. | 1,441,868 | 228,288 | 18.1\% |
| NW | 93-924 | Waterhouse Trail Segments 1,5 and West Spur | 3,804,340 | 59,194 | 3,863,534 | 416,592 | 34,195 | 450,787 | 3,146,722 | Master Plan | 3,597,509 | 266,025 | 12.5\% |
| NW | 93-922 | Rock Creek Trail \# \& Allenbach, North Bethany \#2 | 2,262,040 | 35,344 | 2,297,384 | 381,158 | 41,566 | 422,724 | 1,964,829 | Master Plan | 2,387,553 | $(90,169)$ | 17.7\% |
| UND | 93-923 | Miscellaneous Natural Trails | 100,000 | 1,586 | 101,586 | 3,250 | 1,824 | 5,074 | 96,512 | Budget | 101,586 |  | 5.0\% |
| NW | 91-912 | Nature Park - Old Wagon Trail | 359,870 | 3,029 | 362,899 | 238,688 |  | 238,688 |  | Complete | 238,688 | 124,211 | 100.0\% |
| NE | 91-913 | NE Quadrant Trail - Bluffs Phase 2 | 257,050 | 4,101 | 261,151 | 26,937 | 4,517 | 31,454 | 225,596 | A\&E Contract | 257,050 | 4,101 | 12.2\% |
| sw | 93-921 | Lowami Hart Woods | 822,560 | 12,303 | 834,863 | 186,078 | 30,683 | 216,761 | 636,369 | A\&E Contract | 853,130 | $(18,267)$ | 25.4\% |
| NW | 91-911 | Westside - Waterhouse Trail Connection | 1,542,300 | 24,652 | 1,566,952 | 24,234 | 231 | 24,465 | 1,517,835 | A\&E Contract | 1,542,300 | 24,652 | 1.6\% |
|  |  | Total New Linear Park and Trail Development | 15,060,310 | 232,079 | 15,292,389 | 1,872,455 | 167,404 | 2,039,859 | 11,947,870 |  | 13,987,729 | 1,304,660 | 14.6\% |
|  |  | New Linear Park and Trail Land Acquistion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND | 98-883 | New Linear Park and Trail Acquisitions | 1,200,000 | 19,246 | 1,219,246 | 688,849 | 9,129 | 697,978 | 521,268 | Budget | 1,219,246 | - | 57.2\% |
|  |  | New Linear Park and Trail Land Acquistion | 1,200,000 | 19,246 | 1,219,246 | 688,849 | 9,129 | 697,978 | 521,268 |  | 1,219,246 |  | 57.2\% |
|  |  | Multi-field/Multi-purpose Athletic Field Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sw | 94-925 | Winkelman Athletic Field | 514,100 | 8,199 | 522,299 | 51,001 | 54,143 | 105,144 | 1,247,050 | Master Plan | 1,352,194 | (829,895) | 7.8\% |
| SE | 94-926 | Meadow Waye Park | 514,100 | 6,637 | 520,737 | 405,527 | 1,215 | 406,742 |  | Complete | 406,742 | 113,995 | 100.0\% |
| NW | 94-927 | New Fields in NW Quadrant | 514,100 | 8,245 | 522,345 | 75 |  | 75 | 522,270 | Budget | 522,345 |  | 0.0\% |
| NE | 94-928 | New Fields in NE Quadrant | 514,100 | 8,245 | 522,345 | 932 | 164 | 1,096 | 521,249 | Budget | 522,345 |  | 0.2\% |
| sw | 94-929 | New Fields in SW Quadrant | 514,100 | 8,241 | 522,341 | 669 | - | 669 | 521,672 | Budget | 522,341 |  | 0.1\% |
| SE | 94-930 | New Fields in SE Quadrant | 514,100 | 8,245 | 522,345 | - | - | - | 522,345 | Budget | 522,345 | - | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Total Multi-field/Multi-purpose Athletic Field Dev. | 3,084,600 | 47,812 | 3,132,412 | 458,204 | 55,522 | 513,726 | 3,334,586 |  | 3,848,312 | $(715,900)$ | 13.3\% |

# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District <br> Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report 

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

Through 09/30/11

|  |  | Description | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Quad- } \\ \text { rant } \end{array}\right\|$ | Project Code |  | Initial Project Budget | Adjustments | Current Total Project Budget FY 11/12 | $\underset{\text { Years }}{\text { Expended Prior }}$ Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Total Expended to Date | Estimated Cost to Complete | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basis of } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \text { (Completed } \\ \text { Phase) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Project Cumulative Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. Cost } \\ & \text { (Over) Under } \\ & \text { Budget } \end{aligned}$ | \% Total <br> Expended to Project Cumulative Cost |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (1+2) | (4) | (5) | $(4+5)=(6)$ | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | (3-9) | (6)/(9) |


|  |  | Deferred Park Maintenance Replacements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UND | 96-960 | Play Structure Replacements at 11 sites | 810,223 | 4,065 | 814,288 | 665,070 | 44,841 | 709,911 | 37,294 | various phases | 747,205 | 67,083 | 95.0\% |
| NW | 96-720 | Bridge/boardwalk replacement - Willow Creek | 96,661 | 1,551 | 98,212 | 80,524 | 45,731 | 126,255 | 30,759 | Const. Doc. | 157,014 | $(58,802)$ | 80.4\% |
| sw | 96-721 | Bridge/boardwalk replacement - Rosa Park | 38,909 | 624 | 39,533 | 38,381 |  | 38,381 |  | Complete | 38,381 | 1,152 | 100.0\% |
| sw | 96-722 | Bridge/boardwalk replacement - Jenkins Estate | 7,586 | 33 | 7,619 | 28,430 |  | 28,430 |  | Complete | 28,430 | $(20,811)$ | 100.0\% |
| SE | 96-723 | Bridge/boardwalk replacement - Hartwood Highlands | 10,767 | 170 | 10,937 | 985 |  | 985 |  | Cancelled | 985 | 9,952 | 100.0\% |
| NE | 96-998 | Irrigation Replacement at Roxbury Park | 48,854 | 63 | 48,917 | 41,902 |  | 41,902 |  | Complete | 41,902 | 7,015 | 100.0\% |
| UND | 96-999 | Pedestrian Path Replacement at 3 sites | 116,687 | 150 | 116,837 | 118,040 |  | 118,040 |  | Complete | 118,040 | $(1,203)$ | 100.0\% |
| sw | 96-946 | Permeable Parking Lot at Aloha Swim Center | 160,914 | 1,508 | 162,422 | 195,024 | - | 195,024 |  | Complete | 195,024 | $(32,602)$ | 100.0\% |
| NE | 96-947 | Permeable Parking Lot at Sunset Swim Center | 160,914 | 2,581 | 163,495 |  | - | - | 163,495 | Budget | 163,495 |  | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Total Deferred Park Maintenance Replacements | 1,451,515 | 10,745 | 1,462,260 | 1,168,356 | 90,572 | 1,258,928 | 231,548 |  | 1,490,476 | $(28,216)$ | 84.5\% |
|  |  | Facility Rehabilitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND | 95-931 | Structural Upgrades at Several Facilities | 317,950 | 2,378 | 320,328 | 105,332 | - | 105,332 | 214,996 | Budget | 320,328 |  | 32.9\% |
| sw | 95-932 | Structural Upgrades at Aloha Swim Center | 406,279 | 6,360 | 412,639 | 20,429 | 592 | 21,021 | 391,618 | Const. Doc. | 412,639 |  | 5.1\% |
| SE | 95-933 | Structural Upgrades at Beaverton Swim Center | 1,447,363 | 23,161 | 1,470,524 | 22,757 |  | 22,757 | 1,447,767 | Const. Doc. | 1,470,524 |  | 1.5\% |
| NE | 95-934 | Structural Upgrades at Cedar Hills Recreation Center | 628,087 | 10,073 | 638,160 | - | - | - | 638,160 | Master Plan | 638,160 | - | 0.0\% |
| sw | 95-935 | Structural Upgrades at Conestoga Rec/Aquatic Center | 44,810 | 719 | 45,529 |  | 1,824 | 1,824 | 43,705 | Const. Doc. | 45,529 |  | 4.0\% |
| SE | 95-937 | Structural Upgrades at Garden Home Recreation Center | 486,935 | 7,810 | 494,745 |  |  |  | 494,745 | Master Plan | 494,745 |  | 0.0\% |
| SE | 95-938 | Structural Upgrades at Harman Swim Center | 179,987 | 2,821 | 182,808 | 19,298 |  | 19,298 | 163,510 | Const. Doc. | 182,808 |  | 10.6\% |
| NW | 95-939 | Structural Upgrades at $\mathrm{HMT} / 50$ Mtr Pool/Aquatic Center | 312,176 | 4,762 | 316,938 | 66,373 | - | 66,373 | 250,565 | Const. Doc. | 316,938 | - | 20.9\% |
| NW | 95-940 | Structural Upgrades at HMT Administration Building | 397,315 | 6,178 | 403,493 | 39,750 | 9,913 | 49,663 | 353,830 | Const. Doc. | 403,493 | - | 12.3\% |
| NW | 95-941 | Structural Upgrades at HMT Athletic Center | 65,721 | 85 | 65,806 | 66,000 |  | 66,000 |  | Complete | 66,000 | (194) | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-942 | Structural Upgrades at HMT Dryland Training Center | 116,506 | 1,840 | 118,346 | 19,692 |  | 19,692 | 98,654 | Const. Doc. | 118,346 |  | 16.6\% |
| NW | 95-943 | Structural Upgrades at HMT Tennis Center | 268,860 | 4,290 | 273,150 | 14,382 |  | 14,382 | 258,768 | Const. Doc. | 273,150 | - | 5.3\% |
| SE | 95-944 | Structural Upgrades at Raleigh Swim Center | 4,481 | 6 | 4,487 | 5,703 |  | 5,703 |  | Complete | 5,703 | $(1,216)$ | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-945 | Structural Upgrades at Somerset Swim Center | 8,962 | 12 | 8,974 | 9,333 | 3,035 | 12,368 |  | Complete | 12,368 | $(3,394)$ | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-950 | Sunset Swim Center Structural Upgrades | 1,028,200 | 16,406 | 1,044,606 | 17,303 |  | 17,303 | 1,027,303 | Master Plan | 1,044,606 |  | 1.7\% |
| NE | 95-951 | Sunset Swim Center Pool Tank | 514,100 | 275 | 514,375 | 294,280 |  | 294,280 |  | Complete | 294,280 | 220,095 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Total Facility Rehabilitation | 6,227,732 | 87,176 | 6,314,908 | 700,632 | 15,364 | 715,996 | 5,383,621 |  | 6,099,617 | 215,291 | 11.7\% |
|  |  | Facility Expansion and Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 95-952 | Elsie Stuhr Center Expansion and Structural Improvements | 1,997,868 | 30,861 | 2,028,729 | 273,825 | 576,233 | 850,058 | 1,159,076 | Bid Award | 2,009,134 | 19,595 | 42.3\% |
| sw | 95-953 | Conestoga Rec/Aquatic Expansion \& Splash Pad | 5,449,460 | 84,304 | 5,533,764 | 1,015,994 | 591,620 | 1,607,614 | 3,994,392 | Bid Award | 5,602,006 | (68,242) | 28.7\% |
| sw | 95-954 | Aloha ADA Dressing Rooms | 123,384 | 158 | 123,542 | 178,701 | - | 178,701 |  | Complete | 178,701 | $(55,159)$ | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-955 | Aquatics Center ADA Dressing Rooms | 133,666 | 1,078 | 134,744 | 180,493 | - | 180,493 | - | Complete | 180,493 | $(45,749)$ | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-956 | Athletic Center HVAC Upgrades | 514,100 | 654 | 514,754 | 321,821 |  | 321,821 |  | Complete | 321,821 | 192,933 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Total Facility Expansion and Improvements | 8,218,478 | 117,055 | 8,335,533 | 1,970,834 | 1,167,853 | 3,138,687 | 5,153,468 |  | 8,292,155 | 43,378 | 37.9\% |
|  |  | ADA/Access Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NW | 95-957 | HMT ADA Parking and other site improvement | 735,163 | 11,595 | 746,758 | 13,753 | - | 13,753 | 733,005 | Budget | 746,758 | - | 1.8\% |
| UND | 95-958 | ADA Improvements - undesignated funds | 116,184 | 1,864 | 118,048 | 3,533 | 10,161 | 13,694 | 104,354 | Budget | 118,048 | - | 11.6\% |
| sw | 95-730 | ADA Improvements - Barrows Park | 8,227 | 132 | 8,359 |  | 54 | 54 | 8,305 | Const. Doc. | 8,359 | - | 0.6\% |
| NW | 95-731 | ADA Improvements - Bethany Lake Park | 20,564 | 193 | 20,757 | 25,566 |  | 25,566 |  | Complete | 25,566 | $(4,809)$ | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-732 | ADA Improvements - Cedar Hills Recreation Center | 8,226 | 132 | 8,358 |  | 54 | 54 | 8,304 | Const. Doc. | 8,358 | - | 0.6\% |
| NE | 95-733 | ADA Improvements - Forest Hills Park | 12,338 | 198 | 12,536 | - | 127 | 127 | 12,409 | Const. Doc. | 12,536 | - | 1.0\% |
| SE | 95-734 | ADA Improvements - Greenway Park | 15,423 | 247 | 15,670 | - |  |  | 15,670 | Budget | 15,670 | - | 0.0\% |
| sw | 95-735 | ADA Improvements - Jenkins Estate | 16,450 | 264 | 16,714 |  | 54 | 54 | 16,660 | Const. Doc. | 16,714 |  | 0.3\% |
| SW | 95-736 | ADA Improvements - Lawndale Park | 30,846 | 40 | 30,886 | 16,626 |  | 16,626 |  | Complete | 16,626 | 14,260 | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-737 | ADA Improvements - Lost Park | 15,423 | 247 | 15,670 | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | 670 | Const. Doc. | 15,670 | - | 95.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 of 4 |

# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District 

Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 09/30/11

| $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Quad- } \\ \text { rant } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | Project Code | Description | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  | Total Expended toDate | Estimated Cost to Complete | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basis of } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \text { (Completed } \\ \text { Phase) } \end{gathered}$ | Project Cumulative Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. Cost } \\ & \text { (Over) Under } \\ & \text { Budget } \end{aligned}$ | \% Total Expended to Project Cumulative Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Initial Project Budget | Adjustments | Current Total <br> Project Budget FY 11/12 | Expended Prior Years | Expended Year-to-Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (1+2) | (4) | (5) | (4+5)=(6) | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | (3-9) | (6)/(9) |
| NW | 95-738 | ADA Improvements - Rock Creek Powerline Park (Soccer Fid) | 20,564 | 330 | 20,894 |  | 181 | 181 | 20,713 | Const. Doc. | 20,894 |  | 0.9\% |
| NW | 95-739 | ADA Improvements - Skyview Park | 5,140 | 82 | 5,222 |  | 54 | 54 | 5,168 | Const. Doc. | 5,222 |  | 1.0\% |
| NW | 95-740 | ADA Improvements - Waterhouse Powerline Park | 8,226 | 132 | 8,358 |  | - | - | 8,358 | Master Plan | 8,358 |  | 0.0\% |
| NE | 95-741 | ADA Improvements - West Syivan Park | 5,140 | 82 | 5,222 |  | 127 | 127 | 5,095 | Const. Doc. | 5,222 |  | 2.4\% |
| SE | 95-742 | ADA Improvements - Wonderland Park | 10,282 | 164 | 10,446 |  | 54 | 54 | 10,392 | Const. Doc. | 10,446 |  | 0.5\% |
|  |  | Total ADA/Access Improvements | 1,028,196 | 15,702 | 1,043,898 | 59,478 | 25,866 | 85,344 | 949,103 |  | 1,034,447 | 9,451 | 8.3\% |
|  |  | Community Center Land Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND | 98-884 | Community Center | 5,000,000 | 79,695 | 5,079,695 | 589,963 | 2,116 | 592,079 | 4,487,616 | Budget | 5,079,695 | - | 11.7\% |
|  |  | Total Community Center Land Acquisition | 5,000,000 | 79,695 | 5,079,695 | 589,963 | 2,116 | 592,079 | 4,487,616 |  | 5,079,695 | - | 11.7\% |
|  |  | Bond Administration Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | Debt Issuance Costs | 1,393,000 | - | 1,393,000 | 24,772 | - | 24,772 | - | Budget | 24,772 | 1,368,228 | 100.0\% |
| UND |  | Technology Needs | 18,330 | - | 18,330 | 21,520 | - | 21,520 | - | Complete | 21,520 | $(3,190)$ | 100.0\% |
| UND |  | Office Furniture | 7,150 | - | 7,150 | 3,940 | - | 3,940 | - | Complete | 3,940 | 3,210 | 100.0\% |
| UND |  | Admin/Consultant Costs | 31,520 | - | 31,520 | 35,098 | 1,723 | 36,821 | - | Budget | 36,821 | $(5,301)$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | 1,450,000 | - | 1,450,000 | 85,330 | 1,723 | 87,053 | - |  | 87,053 | 1,362,947 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Grand Total | 100,000,000 | 1,511,224 | 101,511,224 | 20,782,236 | 3,356,413 | 24,138,649 | 75,519,328 |  | 99,656,860 | 1,854,364 | 24.2\% |



## MEMORANDUM

Date: October 21, 2011
To: Board of Directors
From: Keith Hobson, Director of Business and Facilities
Re: $\quad$ System Development Charge Report for August, 2011

Below please find the various categories for System Development Charges, i.e., Single Family, Multiple Family, Manufactured Housing Unit, and Non-residential Development. Also listed are the collection amounts for both the City of Beaverton and Washington County, and the 1.6\% handling fee for collections through August, 2011.

| Type of Dwelling Unit | Current SDC per Type of Dwelling Unit |
| :--- | :---: |
| Single Family | $\$ 5551.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 5,462.18$ |
| Multi-Family | $\$ 4,151.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 4,084.58$ |
| Non-residential | $\$ 144.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 141.70$ |


| City of Beaverton Collection of SDCs |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2,474 | Single Family Units |
| 15 | Single Family Units at $\$ 489.09$ |
| 1,399 | Multi-family Units |
| 0 | Less Multi-family credits |
| $\underline{\mathbf{4 , 0 8 6}}$ | Non-residential |

Receipts
$\$ 6,147,778.89$
$\$ 7,336.35$
$\$ 2,624,822.68$
$(\$ 7,957.55)$
$\$ 461,592.05$
$\$ \underline{9,233,572.42}$

| Collection Fee |
| ---: |
| $\$ 182,718.92$ |
| $\$ 221.45$ |
| $\$ 80,892.66$ |
| $(\$ 229.36)$ |
| $\$ 13,876.34$ |
| $\$ \underline{277,480.01}$ |

Total Revenue
\$6,330,497.81 \$7,557.80
\$2,705,715.34
$(\$ 8,186.91)$
\$475,468.39
\$9,511,052.43

| 6,387 | Single Family Units |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -300 | Less Credits |  |
| 1,848 | Multi-family Units |  |
| -24 | Less Credits |  |
| 97 | Non-residential |  |
| 8,008 |  |  |
| Recap by Agency |  | Percent |
| 4,086 | City of Beaverton | 30.37\% |
| 8,008 | Washington County | 69.63\% |
| $\underline{\underline{12,094}}$ |  | 100.00\% |


| Collection Fee |
| :---: |
| $\$ 479,279.76$ |
| $(\$ 19,285.02)$ |
| $\$ 115,397.74$ |
| $(\$ 1,463.61)$ |
| $\$ 7,694.16$ |
| $\$ \underline{\underline{\$ 81,623.03}}$ |

Total Revenue
\$18,114,665.40
(\$642,834.00)
\$4,019,202.81
(\$48,786.85)
$\$ 368,460.65$
\$21,810,708.01

Recap by Agency
8,008 Washington County

Receipts
\$9,233,572.42
\$21,229,084.98
\$30,462,657.40

Collection Fee
\$277,480.01
\$581,623.03
\$859,103.04

Total Revenue
\$9,511,052.43
\$21,810,708.01
\$31,321,760.44

(1) Net of $\$ 1,029,273$ of SDC Credits awarded for park development projects.

Projected SDC receipts through June 30, 2011 per the budget were $\$ 34,220,890$. Actual receipts were $\$ 29,409,189$. This fiscal year's projected total receipts per the budget are $\$ 2 ; 850,057$.


## TUALATIN HILLS PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT

## Stuhr Center hosts Health and Wellness Fair

STeniors are invited to get a flu shot, be screened for a variety of health issues and learn about important health topics at the 12th annual Health and Wellness Resource Fair at the Elsie Stuhr Center.

The event runs from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Saturday at 5550 S.W. Hall Blvd. The Stuhr Center is owned and operated by the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District for residents " 55 and better."

Forty businesses and 15 to 20 nonprofit organizations will share health and community resource information with the public, said Ann Satterfield, the center's health and wellness program coordinator.
"All realms of wellness will be represented, including physical, mental, spiritual and emotional, environmental, occupational and intellectual," she said. "It's a great opportunity to learn more about health and fitness wellness resources available to individuals 55 and better - all packed into four short hours."

Because of construction activity at the Stuhr Center, Satterfield encouraged visitors to use the entrances on Ninth or 12th Street.

She said the event typically draws nearly 500 people, many who come for their annual flu shot. Supplies vary year to year, but if available, the shot costs $\$ 30$, a charge normally covered by Medicare plans

Attendees also may benefit from free screenings provided by the Lions Club, for blood pressure, hearing, vision, glaucoma and diabetes. Other vendors will provide additional screenings for issues such as balance and flexibility.

Three special presentations are planned.

- At 9:30 a.m., Linda Hunt, an occupational therapist and professor at Pacific University in Forest Grove, will discuss "Driving and Dementia." Most recently, she has studied drivers who get lost due to early stages of dementia.
- At 10:30 a.m., Cory Bolkan will address "How stereotypes influence how we treat elders, affect our own behaviors and actually affect health." Bolkan is an assistant professor of human development at Washington State University in Vancouver, where she teaches courses in gerontology and adult development.
. At 11:30 a.m., Jacqueline Sinke will explain "Exercising with Medical Conditions." Sinke's credentials include fall-proof balance and mobility specialist; certified clinical exercise specialist; and gold certified advanced health and fitness specialist.
"Jacqueline has over 19 years experience in the health fitness industry and specializes in functional fitness exercise programming for individuals to prevent, better manage and treat chronic medical conditions and illness, as well as balance and mobility disorders," Satterfield said.

Sinke instructs several exercise programs at the Stuhr Center for improving functional health and fitness.

Money raised by sponsorships and vendor booths will benefit the Stuhr Center and likely go towards the purchase of new furniture or fitness equipment for the center, which is undergoing renovation as part of a THPRD bond measure project. Typically, the event brings in $\$ 5,000$, Satterfield said.

## TUALATIN HILLS NATURE PARK

## Native plant sale is Saturday

Do you want to attract more birds, butterflies, pollinators and other wildlife to your garden? If so, then you'll want to stop by the Fall Native Plant Sale on Saturday at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park.

The event is from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. at the Nature Park Interpretive Center, 15655 S.W. Millikan Way. Admission is free.

Shoppers will be able to select from an array of trees, shrubs and flowering plants in all price ranges, for every spot in the garden. For more information about the event and a list of 75 plants that will be avail-
able, visit thprd.org.
Once established, native plants have greater wildlife benefits and require less care, water, fertilizers and pesticides than other non-native ornamental plants.
"Fall is a great time of year to shop for native plants," said Karen Munday, program coordinator at the Nature Park Interpretive Center. "Planting them now will give them a head start for next spring."

All proceeds support the Friends of the Tualatin Hills Nature Park and go toward future park improvements and educational programs.

# Where they're going, you won't need roads 

## By DOMINIQUE FON

the oregonian
BEAVERTON - Beyond the asphalt auto lots of Southwest Canyon Road, miles of trails zigzag through forest groves and quiet parks.
You won't need a car here. Sixty miles of trails link Beaverton schools, recreation cen ters, playgrounds, restaurants and shops to nature.


Hidden behind suburban
strip malls, the paths curve strip malls, the paths curve around neighborhood streets, wetlands and dense blackberry thickets.
Michael Janin knows them best. He's the head of security operations for the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, which spans 50 square miles and serves in the greater Beaver ton area. Janin regularly patrols

Look for Steller's jays, Anna's hummingbirds
and other wild life in the nooks and crannies of Beaverton's extensive trails system.
DOUG BEGHTEL
THE OREGONIAN

1,300 acres of greenspace
"Oh, my God, I had no idea," Janin said about the area's natural beauty "You think you'll be gone 20 minutes, and then it turns into 45 minutes."
There's much more to Beaverton than sprawling streets and strip malls, Janin said. He's talked to residents who are "just jazzed" about the Westside Trail, for instance.
The north-south path stretches up a hillside to a viewpoint on Mount Williams in west Beaverton and drops down to Burntwood West Upper Park and shops at Murrayhill. When the trail is complete, it will be a straight shot from Bethany to New Seasons Market at Progress Ridge TownSquare.
Many of Beaverton's trails are works in progress, The park district, using money from a $\$ 100$ millio bond measure that voters passed in 2008, plans to fill in gaps, expand paths and add directional sign over the next three years.
However, there's still ample room to explore, Janin said.
Armed with a trails map, visitors can avoid the traffic headaches of busy boulevards. Hop off the MAX Blue Line at the Merlo Road stop for a dip into the 222-acre Tualatin Hills Nature Park
Inside, an interpretive center offers kids camps and classes about the great blue herons, beavers and


ABOVE | Visitors meandering along Fanno Creek Trail can take a short detour to Fanno Farmhouse, the 1847 home of "Onion King" A.ugustus Fanno, then one of the largest onion producers in Oregon
RIGHT | Fanno Creek trickles through Greenway Park on the border of Beaverton and Tigarc


## "You think you'll be gone 20 minutes, and then it turns into 45 minutes."

Michael Janin, the head of security operations for the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District

river otters that sometimes pad through the natural habitat. Towering trees and bushes muffle noise from the road.
Janin's favorite jaunt is along the Willow Creek Trail, just south of Sunset Highway, where a raised boardwalk meanders along the stream. Farther south, the trail bends into Waterhouse Park and rose gardens.
"It's one of the best kept secrets," Janin said.
Many others find solace among these nooks and crannies of Beaverton, Janin said. The trail roadmap through-
out Beaverton will one day fully plug in to Tigard, Hillsboro and the Rock Creek campus of Portland Community College. Students, athletes, bikers, hikers and families will be able to get to school, work or a park without ever stepping on a gas pedal.
One of the most popular paths, the Fanno Creek and Greenway Park Trail, winds past historic Fanno Farmhouse and spans from Southwest Scholls Ferry Road to the Garden Home Recreation Center near the Multnomah County line. During a tour of the trail,
joggers ran past reeds, ponds and willow trees. Toddlers zipped down slides at a nearby playground.
There are also plenty of community gardens, picnic tables, tennis courts and basketball hoops spaced throughout the district, Janin said.
The Westside and Fanno Creek regional trails sweep around the city's downtown, home to the forest-inspired Beaverton City Library, the farmers market and Old Town stores. Gloria's Secret Cafe for Salvadoran food, Korean restaurant Du Kuh Bee and coffee
shop Ava Roasteria are local favorites for places to eat.
But a shorter route near Stott Avenue in downtown guides visitors off the sidewalk and through shaded alleys to Schiffler Park.
On this side of the Willamette River, there's a surprising amount to see, said park ranger Scott Hinderman.
"Our trail system here is pretty spectacular."

Dominique Fong: 503-294-5934; dfong@oregonian.com

## HIKE BEAVERTON

What: Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District has 60 miles of hiking and biking trails in and around Beaverton, including the 222acre Tualatin Hills Nature Park, 15655 S.W. Millikan Way.
Getting to the nature park: Take the MAX Blue Line to the Merlo Road/SW 158th Avenue stop. From the station, turn left, cross the tracks and turn left onto the paved path of Oak Trail, which leads into the park.
Maps: Printed maps are available at park district buildings, Beaverton libraries, the Washington County Visitors Association, the Beaverton Area Chamber of Commerce and the REI store in the Streets of Tanasbourne shopping center. Digital maps are available online, www.thprd.org/pdfs/document44.pdf
Online: www.thprd.org

FAR LEFT | Dense forest looms over hikers in Tualatin Hills Nature Park, a 222acre park near central Beaverton accessible by the MAX Blue Line.

LEFT | A runner ascends the paved path through Schuepbach Park in Beaverton, The park is a segment of the Westside Regional Trail, which is planned eventually to run from Portland Community College's Rock Creek campus to Tigard.

## Photos by DOUG BEGHTEL
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## Pair of fires were controlled burns

A pair of planned burns caused great concern, but little real danger across Washington County last Thursday and Friday.

Tualatin Valley residents who saw smoke billowing from Cooper Mountain between $10 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. and $6 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. on Sept. 29 weren't witnessing
a rare Metro-area forest fire, or the belching of a newlydiscovered volcano.

It was a controlled burn exercise for Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue - in partnership with Metro and the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District.

Controlled burns in the Cooper Mountain Nature Park, 18892 SW Kemmer Road, reduce field brush posing safety risks in a wild-land-urban interface area, as well as provide firefighters with valuable brush fire training.

Site work was done to ensure a safe and productive prescribed burn, including a tilled and pre-burned perimeter to keep the fire from spreading beyond the designated areas, said spokeswoman Cassandra Ulven.
"We only have a narrow window of time to conduct this kind of essential training," Ulven said. "The air temperature, relative humidity and dry condition

See Burns on A2

## Burns

## From A1

of the vegetation have allowed us to conduct the burn safely before the rain returns. It also reduces the risk of wildfire in a portion of our fire district where natural areas and development meet."

Fires mitigate non-native and invasive plant growth, improve wildlife habitat, restore natural areas, control pest problems and recycle nutrients back into the soil.

Meanwhile, severalWashington County fire departments were called Thursday and Friday concerning a large column of smoke near Hagg Lake that was visible for miles.

The smoke turned out to be emanating from a large slash burn on the Stimson Mainline near the end of Sain Creek Road on Stimson company property. The Oregon Department of Forestry issued a permit for the closely monitored fire.

With more rain in the forecast, Washington County called off its county-wide ban on outdoor burning Sunday.


Courtesy TVF\&R
Firefighters with Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue keep a close eye on a controlled burn in the Cooper Mountain Nature Park, 18892 SW Kemmer Road. Occasional controlled burns reduce field brush posing safety risks in a wildland-urban interface area, as well as provide firefighters with valuable brush fire training.

## Painters Showcase set Oct. 7-9 at Jenkins Estate

The 38th annual Painters Showcase Art Show and Sale will be from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Oct. 7-9 at the Historic Jenkins Estate Stable.

The three-day event features hundreds of pieces of artwork by area artists. An artists' reception will be from 1 to 4 p.m., Saturday, Oct. 8, with live music and refreshments. Special guest artists, Rick and Amy Bain of Hello Moon, and the show judge, Susan McKinnon, will be recognized and member artists will attend.

Painters Showcase is an association of artists which works as a supportive vehicle in the fine arts. Membership is limited to 32 Portland-area artists.

Painters Showcase has hosted a yearly art show and sale for members since 1973, and holds monthly meetings, demonstrations, guest artists, critiques, paint-outs and workshops by nationally known artists.

For information about


Painters Showcase photo
"Oregon Lake," a pastel by Jan Youngman, will be among artworks on display at the annual Painters Showcase and Sale at the Jenkins Estate in Aloha next weekend.
the organization, shows, workshops and memberships, contact Donna Breathouwer, 503-2923066.

Admission is $\$ 5$ for adults; ages 12 and under are free. Proceeds from the event will benefit the Tu-
alatin Hills Park and Recreation District's Camp Rivendale, which is adjacent to Jenkins Estate and serves individuals with disabilities.

Jenkins Estate Stable is at 8005 SW Grabhorn Rd., Aloha.
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A
controlled burn last week at the Cooper Mountain Nature Park accomplished three goals.

It reduced field brush that poses a safety risk to neighboring homes in the event of a fire.

- It provided valuable, hands-on brush fire training to crews of Tualatin Valley Fire \& Rescue firefighters.

And it improved the environmental health of the 30 -acre Big Prairie in the western portion of the 230 -acre nature park, located on the southern edge of Beaverton at 18892 S.W. Kemmer Road.
"The burn went very, very
well," said John Gaddis, natural resource and trails specialist for the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, which maintains the park. "It was contained and performed safely.
"Beyond the biological benefits, the burn met our goal for fuels reduction in the planned area by reducing combustible brush and grass on the site. If a fire were to run through there, it would not burn nearly as hot."

Before setting the fires Thursday morning, TVF\&R crews tilled sections of soil and preburned a perimeter to keep the fire
from spreading beyond the designated areas, using a technique called blacklining, said Cassandra Ulven, fire district spokeswoman.
"We only have a narrow window of time to conduct this kind of essential training," she added. "The air temperature, relative humidity and dry condition of the vegetation have allowed us to conduct the burn safely before the rain returns. It also reduces the risk of wildfire in a portion of our fire district where natural areas and development meet.

- See FIRE, A7


HOLDTHE LINE -
Contract firefighters from C\&R Reforestation, left, water down areas along a road at Metro's Cooper Mountain Nature Park in Beaverton, as TVF\&R crews control a prescribed fire for Big Prairie.

## Fire: 'It was a very labor-intensive operation, Ulven says

## - Continued from A1

Throughout the day and into the night, firefighters controlled the path of the flames.
"The firefighters received hands-on experience on the ground in dealing with a wildfire," Gaddis noted. "During this burn, firefighters were able to see how a fire behaves as it moves in low grasses and along slopes. They got to see it move across the landscape, which is something they don't get when they go to seminars or are in the classroom."

Ulven agreed and added, "The conditions mirrored what we would find in a wildland fire... It was a very labor-intensive operation."

The fire was extinguished before 6 p.m. TVF\&R's team turned the site over to a privately contracted crew, who remained onsite through Saturday to conduct a fire watch and ensure hot spots didn't ignite any remaining vegetation.

## Habitat restoration

The use of controlled burns is an important tool in mitigating non-native and invasive plant growth, improving wildlife habitat, restoring natural areas, recycling nutrients back into the soil and controlling pest problems, Gaddis added.
While this has been the fifth prescribed burn on Cooper Mountain since Metro began protecting portions of the natural area in 1997, this is the first burn performed since the nature park opened to the public two years ago.
The cooperative effort between Metro regional government, which owns the property, and both the park and fire districts is the latest effort to enhance wildlife habitat and improve the health of native species that make their home in the natural area.
"We've been planning this burn in preparation for prairie restoration work that will happen this winter,"


ONTHE GROUND - A team of 18Tualatin Valley Fire \& Rescue firefighters, command and safety staff spent Thursday controlling a fire at the Cooper Mountain Nature Park. Crews from the Cedar Mill, Aloha and Tanasbourne stations gained valuable wildfire training during the burn.

Gaddis said. "We've been collecting grasses and wildflower seeds that are native to this area.
"We're planning another burn for Little Prairie next summer."
Cooper Mountain Nature Park is home to an array of habitats including mixed conifer forests, perched wetlands and rare oak woodlands. For years, logging and other human activities degraded the wildlife
habitat. Since 1997, Metro staff, community partners and volunteers have planted 80,000 native trees and shrubs, seeded native grasses, removed invasive plants and performed a series of controlled burns to enhance oak and upland prairie habitat.

For more information about the nature park, its hiking trails and educational program offerings, visit thprd.org.

## BEAVERTON

## EV owners can charge for free

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District has opened an electric vehicle charging station at its Howard M . Terpenning Recreation Complex, 15707 S.W. Walker Road. EV owners will find it in the parking lot off 158th Avenue, just north of Northwest Schendel Avenue.
It's part of a national pilot program, the EV Project, designed to gauge American use of electric cars. Specifically, a company called ECOtality North America has partnered with Nissan North America and General Motors (among other investors) to create 15,085 charging systems in Oregon, Washington, California, Arizona, Texas, Washington and the District of Columbia.
The $\$ 230$ million project started on Oct. 1, 2009, and is slated for completion on Dec. 31, 2012. It will collect data from 8,300 electric vehicles on the road (5,700 Nissan LEAFs and 2,600 Chevrolet Volts).

Craig Crawford, the park district's vehicle and equipment maintenance coordinator, said it's easy to use the new electric charging station at HMT. "To charge your car batteries, you simply pull up to the station, flip open the
lid on the front of the hood and plug in," Crawford said.

Electric car owners can
do the charging themselves.
However, they first need a Blink network card, which is available at www.blinknetwork.com. The car also needs to be compatible with the charging station's J1772 plug, Crawford said.

Electricity is free for now, but once the pilot project ends, users can expect to pay for it.

## Recycling program to restore area park

BEAVERTON - Restoration work will transform a former gas station lot into green space at Beaverton's Eichler Park.

The transformation comes through the successful partnership between Metro, the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, Business Oregon and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

After the earlier demolition of a Texaco fuel center on the northeast corner of the park, officials at the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District saw an op-
portunity to expand the park at 13710 SW Farmington Road, Beaverton.

Officials were aware of environmental issues on the propertybut were not sure of the extent and exact nature of the contamination.

The plans would include an assessment of the site's contamination, a restoration plan, the purchase of the land and the cleanup.

Metro's Brownfields Recycling Program was the starting point for the park district.

Funds from the brownfields program, provided
through grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, are awarded to sites that sit undeveloped because of real or perceived petroleum-based contamination. In 2008, the park district was awarded funding from Metro for the first step of the process: assessing the land's environmental hazards.

After comprehensive sampling, an assessment team discovered around a third of the soil, including some groundwater, tested unsafe for public use. Worse, an abandoned fuel tank
had been neglected below ground.

With the tank removed as part of the assessment, Metro and its consultants developed a cleanup plan for the park district to present to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Metro also encouraged the park district to apply for cleanup funds with the state.
"Investing in the cleanup of brownfields helps us make the most of what we have in our region," said Metro Council President Tom Hughes. "We have a unique opportunity (here) to create a new community asset out of abandoned property."

## Volunteers sought for education program

The Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District is seeking volunteers to join its new Environmental Education Volunteer Assistants program.

Participants must be at least 18 , physically fit and must attend aone-day training program from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Wednesday, Oct. 19, at the Tualatin Hills Na-
ture Park Interpretive Center, 15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton.

Visit thprd.org/nature/ volunteers/educationvolunteers.cfm for more.

## Two volunteers sought for THPRD budget committee

The Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District is accepting applications to fill two citizen positions on its Budget Committee.

The application deadline is Friday, Nov. 18.

The Budget Committee meets about three times a year and is responsible for providing public oversight of budget preparations, recommending
changes to the proposed budget and supplying information to the public about district business and operations.

The 10 -member committee includes all five district board members and five citizen members. Each citizen member is appointed by the board to a three-year term.

Applications are available online at thprd.org.

## ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

 Park district seeks program volunteersThe Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District is seeking adult volunteers for its new Environmental Education Volunteer Assistants program, for which a training program is scheduled for Wednesday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park Interpretive Center, 15655 S.W. Millikan Way.

Participants must be at least 18 and physically able to participate in various indoor and outdoor assignments, such as helping with interpretive hikes, evening nature programs, preschool classes at Cooper Mountain Nature Park or other tasks.

Participants will be trained to assiṣt the district's environmental education staff in delivering programs for all
ages while learning about district policies and procedures.

Each volunteer will provide at least 50 hours of service during the next year. Volunteers may assist at district activities, such as mayor's picnics, Newt Day, Bug Fest, native plant sales, Nature Days in the Park, summer concerts, summer camp field trips, preschool programs and Nature Mobile events.

Volunteers may receive additional training to widen the scope of their expertise in natural resource topics, such as bugs, wildflowers and animal tracks.

For more information and to register for the training session, visit thprd.org.


CRANK IT UP -<br>Sunset's Zane<br>Bambusch goes up for a shot over the defense of Westview's Devanshu Awasthi during his team's win at Sunset Swim Center last week.

## OregonLive.com

## Washington County Weekend: Woof Walk, Cedar Mill Cider Fest, Pumpkin Bob

Published: Friday, October 14, 2011, 12:00 PM



THPRD
Boy Scouts will be pressing free apple cider at this year's Cedar Mill Cider Festival.

Fall is in the air, and Halloween is just around the corner. Time to celebrate cider, pumpkins and marching bands this weekend in Washington County.

Portland Woof Walk Fun Run and Community Dog Walk: All-ages community dog walk with family and pet-friendly activities including free pet wellness checks by Banfield Pet Hospital, arts, crafts, dance party and more. Registration required. Presented by the YMCA of ColumbiaWillamette and the Power of Pets by Mars Petcare. 9-11 a.m. Sat, Oct. 15. Greenway Park, 8405 S.W. Creekside Place, Beaverton; free;

Beaverton Family Resource Fair: More than 30 family-friendly organizations will present activities and information for families with infants through elementary school (ages newborn-11 years and accompanying adults). There will be free vision screening for ages 3-5 who are not already screened in other programs. 10 a.m.-2 p.m. Sat, Oct. 15. Beaverton City Library, 12375 S.W. Fifth St., Beaverton; free; or 503-350-3600

Fall Festival: Families can enjoy cookie decorating, face-painting, crafts, clowns, magic show, pumpkin painting, a Kid Fit Room and more at the Fall Festival. Noon-4 p.m. Sat, Oct. 15. Cedar Hills Recreation Center, 11640 S.W. Park Way, Beaverton; \$2-\$10 admission (free for ages 1 and younger), some activities free; send email to bbledsoe@thprd.org for more information.

Cedar Mill Cider Festival: Local Scouts turn antique cider presses and offer free cider at the Cedar Mill Cider Festival. Live old-time music; barbecue sandwich lunches and apple crunch available for purchase; community and craft booths; and games and activities for kids. Sponsored by Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District. 1-4 p.m. Sun, Oct. 16. John Quincy Adams Young House, Northwest Cornell Road at 119th Avenue, Cedar Mill; free admission; or 503-645-6433

Pumpkin Bob: Bob around in the 89 -degree pool and choose pumpkins to take home at the Pumpkin Bob.
Activities in the lobby and goodie bags for all. For ages 1-15. Adults must be on hand and may be encouraged to participate in some activities. Registration required. 4-6 p.m. Sat, Oct. 15. Harman Swim Center, 7300 S.W. Scholls Ferry Road, Beaverton; \$6; 503-629-6314

Southridge Spectacle of Sound Marching Band Competition: Competition features 10 high school marching bands and color guard groups. All bands perform in preliminary competition at 2 p.m.; finals 6 p.m. Presented by the

Southridge Instrumental Music and Dance Ensembles and the Northwest Association for the Performing Arts.
2-9 p.m. Sat, Oct. 15. Hillsboro Stadium, 4450 N.W. 229th Ave., Hillsboro; \$5-\$15.
-- Kjerstin Gabrielson
Follow @KjGabrielson
(c) 2011 OregonLive.com. All rights reserved.

## CEDAR MILL, CEDAR HILLS



Boy Scouts operate the apple cider press at last year's Cedar Mill Cider Festival. This year's event is from 1 to 4 p.m. Sunday, October 16, at the John Quincy Adams Young House.

## Events, cider press herald fall's arrival

Two area festivals celebrate fall with food, games, music and fun this weekend. The Cedar Hills Recreation Center, 11640 S.W. Park Way, holds its Fall Festival from noon to 4 p.m. Saturday, Oct. 15. Event planner Bevin Bledsoe says each classroom will stage an event, such as face painting, bingo, cookie decorating, pumpkin painting and more.
"This is super fun for the whole family, and we encourage everyone to come in costume," said Bledsoe, adding that funds raised go toward equipment and building improvements. Admission is $\$ 2$ per person or $\$ 10$ per family. Children under 2 are free. Call 503-629-6340 for more information.
OnSunday, Oct. 16, the Cedar Mill Cider Festival kicks off at 1 p.m. with local Boy

Scouts serving free tastes of freshly pressed cider. Organizer Virginia Bruce says three presses will run this year, so cider samples will come out faster than ever. Bruce also said that canopies will cover the event, so "people should not let a little sprinkle keep them from coming down and having fun."
The New Five Cents will play music at the festival. Sandwiches, hot dogs, apple crunch with ice cream, cider and pumpkins will be for sale. Bruce is asking longtime residents to sign up to share stories about Cedar Mill for a history project. Events continue until 4 p.m. at the John Quincy Adams Young house, 12050 N.W. Cornell Road.

> - Cindy Hudson:
cm-hudson@comcast.net
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## THPRD seeks 2 for budget committee
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The Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District is now accepting applications to fill two citizen positions on its Budget Committee. The deadline is Friday, Nov. 18.

The Budget Committee generally meets three times a year and is responsible for providing public oversight of budget preparations, recommending changes to the proposed budget, and supplying information to the public about district business and operations.

The 10-member committee includes all five THPRD board members and five citizen members. Each citizen member is appointed by the board to a three-year term.

Applications are available at THPRD's Administration Office, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, and online at www.thprd.org. For more information, call Jessica Collins, executive assistant, at 503/645-6433 or send an email to jcollins@thprd.org.
© 2011 OregonLive.com. All rights reserved.


Overlooking the Tualatin River Valley, the Cooper of trails with varying levels of difficulty. Mountain Nature Park offers more than three miles

## Get into fall at Cooper Mountain Nature Park

As the colors of fall begin to emerge, get outside and explore the trails, natural garden and visitor facilities and enjoy the views and rare habitats at the Cooper Mountain Nature Park near Beaverton.

Overlooking the Tualatin River Valley, the Cooper Mountain Nature Park sits on the southern edge of Beaverton, shouldered by dense urban development to the north and open agricultural lands to the south.

The 231-acre park offers visitors $31 / 2$ miles of gravel trails traversing the park's rare habitats and natural features. Cooper Mountain Nature Park is operated through a partnership between Metro and the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District.

Hike, walk, watch wildlife or simply enjoy the views when you visit Coo-
per Mountain Nature Park with your friends or family. More than three miles of trails with varying levels of difficulty traverse the park and include a $3 / 4$-mile loop that is designed for accessibility.

The trails pass through each of Cooper Mountain's distinct habitats -from forest to prairie to oak woodlands. From these trails, visitors are rewarded with grand views of the Chehalem Mountains and Tualatin Valley, closeup looks at Oregon white oaks and wildflowers, and - if you are quiet and lucky - glimpses of rare animal species like the Northern red-legged frog and Western gray squirrel.

The park includes accessible restrooms and a nature house for environmental education programs that will serve as a

> The trails pass through each of Cooper Mountain's distinct habitats -fromforest to prairie to oak woodlands.

base for staff and volunteers. A demonstration garden located next to the nature house showcases native and drought-tolerant plants suited to Cooper Mountain's dry climate and south-facing slopes. The plants have been selected to give back yard gardeners new ideas to try at home.

For the benefit of wildlife please leave your pets at home. No alcohol, smoking, bikes or equestrian use are allowed within the park. Bike racks are available near the nature house. The park is open daily, dawn to dusk.

Getting there: From Highway 217 take the Scholls Ferry Road exit and head west on Scholls Ferry past Murray Boulevard. At Southwest 175th Avenue, turn right and go north, uphill, about 1.8 miles and turn left on Kemmer Road. The park entrance is on the south side of Kemmer Road.

From Southwest Farmington Road (Highway 10), turn south on 185th Avenue, which will become Gassner Road, turn left on 190th Avenue and left on Kemmer Road.


[^0]:    *Executive Session: Executive Sessions are permitted under the authority of ORS 192.660. Copies of the statute are available at the offices of Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District. **Public Comment: If you wish to be heard on an item not on the agenda, or a Consent Agenda item, you may be heard under Audience Time with a 3-minute time limit. If you wish to speak on an agenda item, also with a 3-minute time limit, please wait until it is before the Board. Note: Agenda items may not be considered in the order listed. ${ }^{* * *}$ Consent Agenda: If you wish to speak on an agenda item on the Consent Agenda, you may be heard under Audience Time. Consent Agenda items will be approved without discussion unless there is a request to discuss a particular Consent Agenda item. The issue separately discussed will be voted on separately. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), this material, in an alternate format, or special accommodations for the meeting, will be made available by calling 503-645-6433 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

[^1]:    Jessica Collins
    Recording Secretary

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ New development means development where a land use application must be submitted, such as a new subdivision or commercial building. New development does not include the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot or a lot that has received preliminary land use approval and the expansion or alteration of an existing single family home.

[^3]:    Jessica Collins, Recording Secretary

[^4]:    Jessica Collins, Recording Secretary

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Does not include soft costs associated with the acquisition such as staff time, title reports, appraisals, environmental site assessments, legal review, closing costs and in some cases, property line adjustments or partitions and site clean-up.
    ${ }^{2}$ Since the value of this acquisition significantly exceeds the average amount of money set aside for an average neighborhood park site acquisition (\$1.5 million), it is possible a part of this site will be sold for development in the future with sale proceeds used to acquire neighborhood park sites in other parts of the District.
    ${ }^{3}$ This acquisition involved multiple ownerships with different closing dates.

[^6]:    ${ }^{4}$ The actual closing cost of the property was reduced by $\$ 138,000$ to cover most of the cost of clean-up of petrochemical contaminants from the previous use, a gas station.

