# Board of Directors Regular Meeting <br> February 2, 2015 <br> 5:45 p.m. Executive Session; 7:00 p.m. Regular Meeting <br> HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Meeting Room 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton 

## AGENDA

1. Executive Session*
A. Legal
B. Land
2. Call Regular Meeting to Order
3. Action Resulting from Executive Session
4. Presentation: Bonny Slope West (Area 93) Update
5. Audience Time**
6. Board Time
7. Consent Agenda***
A. Approve: Minutes of January 13, 2015 Regular Board Meeting
B. Approve: Monthly Bills
C. Approve: Monthly Financial Statement
D. Approve: Resolution Appointing Audit Committee Members
E. Approve: Resolution Reappointing Stuhr Center Advisory Committee Members
8. Unfinished Business
A. Update: Bond Program
B. Approve: Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 - Sponsorships/Naming of District Property/Memorials
C. Information: General Manager's Report
9. Adjourn
*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/Audience Time: 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.

DATE: January 26, 2015
TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager
RE: Information Regarding the February 2, 2015 Board of Directors Meeting

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

Attached please find a memo reporting that Washington County principal planner Theresa Cherniak and senior planner Suzanne Savin will be in attendance at your meeting to present information on the concept planning process for Bonny Slope West, a 160-acre group of properties formerly known as Area 93.

## 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: <br> A. Approve: Minutes of January 13, 2015 Board Meeting <br> B. Approve: Monthly Bills <br> C. Approve: Monthly Financial Statement <br> D. Approve: Resolution Appointing Audit Committee Members <br> E. Approve: Resolution Reappointing Stuhr Center Advisory Committee Members

Agenda Item \#8 - Unfinished Business
A. Bond Update

Attached please find a memo providing an update regarding recent activities centered around the Bond Program. Aisha Willits, director of Planning, will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the board may have.
B. Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 - Sponsorships/Naming of District Property/Memorials
Attached please find a memo requesting amendment of District Compiled Policies Chapter 8, District Property, in order to amend sections 8.05, Naming of District Property; 8.06 Private Sponsorships; and addition of a new section, 8.07 Memorials and Tributes on District Property. Geoff Roach, director of Community Partnerships, will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the requested amendments and to answer any questions the board may have.

Action Requested: Board of directors' approval of Resolution No. 2015-04, amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 - District Property.

## C. General Manager's Report

Attached please find the General Manager's Report for the February regular board meeting.
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## Other Packet Enclosures

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

DATE: January 21, 2015
TO: $\quad$ Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Aisha Willits, Director of Planning
RE: Washington County's Bonny Slope West Planning Process
Washington County principal planner Theresa Cherniak and senior planner Suzanne Savin will be in attendance at the February 2, 2015 board of director's meeting to present information on the concept planning process for Bonny Slope West, a 160-acre group of properties formerly known as Area 93. Bonny Slope West became part of Washington County on January 1, 2014. This unincorporated community was previously under the jurisdiction of Multnomah County, which had crafted an earlier concept plan that was not implemented. Washington County began planning efforts soon after the transfer with the intent to leverage the earlier Multnomah County process. The district intends to pursue a blanket annexation of the entire area in 2015 and would like the area to be officially annexed to the district by March 31, 2016 so that the November 2016 tax statement includes taxes to THPRD.

The area is characterized by natural resources and will likely support low-density development. Working with THPRD, other service providers, property owners, residents, and the development community, the project team has developed a preferred concept plan that will be taken to the county's Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners for public hearings later this year. County staff have worked to create a concept plan that balances the needs of stakeholders and meets state, regional, and county development standards.

The concept planning work covers the area generally located north of Thompson Road, south of Laidlaw Road, east of the district's future park location at the southeast corner of Laidlaw and Saltzman Roads.

Questions now being asked by the county's project team relate to park priorities and infrastructure costs. County staff will provide a brief description of the work done to date, answer any questions from the board and solicit feedback on the preferred concept plan scenario.


## PROPOSED PLAN ELEMENTS

- R-6 (Residential 6 Units per Acre) Land Use Designation over the majority of the plan area; this designation allows single family attached or detached homes at no more than 6 units per acre and no less than 5 units per acre
- R-9 (Residential 9 Units per Acre) Land Use Designation on approximately 12 acres in the southwest portion of the plan area; this designation allows single family attached or detached homes at no more than 9 units per acre and no less than 7 units per acre
- One or two Neighborhood Parks, approximately 1.5 to 2 acres in size to be located within Neighborhood Park Study Areas.
- Potential Neighborhood Park amenities include a play structure, loop trail and/or picnic shelter
- Optimal Neighborhood Park sites would:
- include a level area for a play structure,
- be located near the creek and/or adjacent to a trail corridor and provide trail access.
- The Hypothetical Neighborhood Parks shown above are examples of locations that have these features.
- A potential Bike \& Pedestrian Bridge over Ward Creek, connecting the north and south halves of Bonny Slope West
- A multi-use Community Trail on the south side of Ward Creek, connecting to the potential Bike \& Pedestrian Bridge over Ward Creek
- A potential Automobile, Bike \& Pedestrian Creek Crossing at the east end of Bonny Slope West, connecting Thompson Road to Laidlaw Road via Marcotte Road



## POTENTIAL PARKS INFRASTRUCTURE

- Neighborhood Parks - one to two parks (1.5 to 2 acre size)
- Community Trail(s) - trails on one side or a loop trail, linear feet to be determined
- Pedestrian / Bicycle Creek Crossing - potential cost sharing?


## NEXT STEPS

- Discussions ongoing with Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (THPRD)
- Presentation to THPRD Board of Directors on February 2

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

A regular meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, January 13, 2015, at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton. Executive Session 6:30 pm; Regular Meeting 7 pm

## Present:

John Griffiths
Jerry Jones Jr.
Larry Pelatt
Doug Menke

President/Director<br>Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director<br>Director<br>General Manager

Absent:
Bob Scott Secretary/Director
Joseph Blowers
Director
Agenda Item \#1 - Executive Session (A) Legal (B) Land
President Griffiths called executive session to order for the following purposes:

- To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection, and
- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.
Executive session is held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e)\&(f), which allows the board to meet in executive session to discuss the aforementioned issues.

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

Agenda Item \#2 - Call Regular Meeting to Order
President Griffiths called the regular meeting to order at 7:05 pm.
Agenda Item \#3 - Action Resulting from Executive Session
Jerry Jones Jr. moved the board of directors authorize the general manager to continue with and finalize negotiations which ensure all key negotiation points as those that were presented during executive session will be included in a land sale agreement regarding property in the southeast quadrant of the district, subject to review by the district's legal counsel. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:
Larry Pelatt Yes
Jerry Jones Jr. Yes
John Griffiths Yes
The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.
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## Agenda Item \#4 - Audience Time

There was no testimony during audience time.

## Agenda Item \#5 - Board Time

There were no comments during board time.

\author{

Agenda Item \#6 - Consent Agenda <br> Jerry Jones Jr. moved that the board of directors approve consent agenda items (A) <br> Minutes of December 8, 2014 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly <br> Financial Statement, and (D) Auditor Recommendation. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows: <br> | Larry Pelatt | Yes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jerry Jones, Jr. | Yes |
| John Griffiths | Yes | <br> The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

}

Agenda Item \#7 - Unfinished Business
A. General Manager's Report

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

- Diversity \& Inclusion Vision Statement
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Doug offered to answer any questions the board may have.
$\checkmark$ Hearing none, President Griffiths requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

## Agenda Item \#8 - New Business

A. Resolution Appointing Budget Committee Members

General Manager Doug Menke noted that currently there are two positions available on the budget committee for appointment. Three applications were received. At the request of President Griffiths, a scoring matrix was distributed to the board members to complete individually in order to assist with the discussion regarding the applicants. The completed scoring matrix has been provided to the board, a copy of which was entered into the record.

Jerry Jones Jr. moved that the board of directors approve Resolution 2015-01 appointing Shannon Kennedy and Anthony Mills to the budget committee for a term of three years. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:
Larry Pelatt Yes
Jerry Jones, Jr. Yes
John Griffiths Yes
The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.
Agenda Item \#10 - Adjourn
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:10 pm.

| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name | Check Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10526 | 12/10/2014 | Community Newspapers, Inc. | 1,225.00 |  |
|  |  | Advertising | \$ | 1,225.00 |
| 284900 | 12/05/2014 | D \& R Masonry Restoration |  | 7,450.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Athletic Facility Replacement | \$ | 7,450.00 |
| 285037 | 12/15/2014 | BBL Architects |  | 12,872.33 |
| 285094 | 12/22/2014 | Paul Brothers, Inc. |  | 127,449.67 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - Facility Expansion \& Improvements | \$ | 140,322.00 |
| 284902 | 12/05/2014 | Marx Associates |  | 3,400.00 |
| 285085 | 12/22/2014 | Arbor Pro, Inc. |  | 24,300.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - Land Acquisition | \$ | 27,700.00 |
| 285084 | 12/22/2014 | Adam Kuby, LLC |  | 6,016.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - Natural Resources Projects | \$ | 6,016.00 |
| 285091 | 12/22/2014 | MacKay \& Sposito, Inc. |  | 1,545.25 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - New/Redeveloped Community Parks | \$ | 1,545.25 |
| 284874 | 12/01/2014 | Milroy Golf Systems, Inc. |  | 159,135.40 |
| 284904 | 12/05/2014 | T Edge Construction, Inc. |  | 99,155.50 |
| 284905 | 12/05/2014 | Vigil-Agrimis, Inc. |  | 11,853.00 |
| 285096 | 12/22/2014 | T Edge Construction, Inc. |  | 57,327.75 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - New/Redeveloped Neighborhood Parks | \$ | 327,471.65 |
| 284873 | 12/01/2014 | Colf Construction, LLC |  | 117,678.43 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - Retainage Payable | \$ | 117,678.43 |
| 284873 | 12/01/2014 | Colf Construction, LLC |  | 3,651.36 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Bond - Trails/Linear Parks | \$ | 3,651.36 |
| 284898 | 12/05/2014 | Andy Medcalf Construction Company |  | 1,173.00 |
| 285040 | 12/15/2014 | Cedar Mill Construction Company |  | 16,164.05 |
| 285043 | 12/15/2014 | Pacific Furnishings NW |  | 11,315.41 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Building Improvements | \$ | 28,652.46 |
| 284872 | 12/01/2014 | Arizon Structures WorldWide, LLC |  | 28,340.67 |
| 284901 | 12/05/2014 | The Farley Group, Inc. |  | 4,040.54 |
| 285042 | 12/15/2014 | OPSIS Architecture, LLP |  | 17,069.56 |
| 285044 | 12/15/2014 | Speedy Septic Service |  | 21,950.00 |
| 285087 | 12/22/2014 | Cedartech, Inc. |  | 6,488.00 |
| 285095 | 12/22/2014 | Pro Blinds \& Shades |  | 1,890.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Building Replacements | \$ | 79,778.77 |
| 284906 | 12/05/2014 | Western Equipment Distributors, Inc. |  | 11,677.13 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Fleet Capital Replacement | \$ | 11,677.13 |
| 284920 | 12/05/2014 | Kronos Incorporated |  | 1,425.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Information Technology Improvement | \$ | 1,425.00 |
| 284903 | 12/05/2014 | Ross Recreation Equipment Company, Inc. |  | 3,001.00 |
| 285036 | 12/15/2014 | 3J Consulting, Inc. |  | 6,095.65 |
| 285036 | 12/15/2014 | 3J Consulting, Inc. |  | 3,318.15 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - Park \& Trail Replacements | \$ | 12,414.80 |
| 285036 | 12/15/2014 | 3J Consulting, Inc. |  | 1,488.22 |
| 285041 | 12/15/2014 | Green Thumb Landscape \& Maintenance, Inc. |  | 54,878.88 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay - SDC - Park Development/Improvement | \$ | 56,367.10 |


| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name | Check Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACH | 12/03/2014 | Ann M. Satterfield |  | 1,405.85 |
| ACH | 12/12/2014 | Rene Brucker |  | 1,169.60 |
|  |  | Conferences | \$ | 2,575.45 |
| 284895 | 12/05/2014 | PGE |  | 49,216.29 |
| 285005 | 12/15/2014 | PGE |  | 5,031.26 |
| 285139 | 12/26/2014 | PGE |  | 27,756.56 |
|  |  | Electricity | \$ | 82,004.11 |
| 284997 | 12/15/2014 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 202,935.05 |
| 284999 | 12/15/2014 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 18,897.00 |
| 285165 | 12/31/2014 | Kaiser Foundation Health Plan |  | 238,487.85 |
| 285166 | 12/31/2014 | Moda Health Plan, Inc. |  | 30,107.96 |
| 285170 | 12/31/2014 | Standard Insurance Co. |  | 13,304.10 |
| 285176 | 12/31/2014 | UNUM Life Insurance-LTC |  | 1,281.20 |
|  |  | Employee Benefits | \$ | 505,013.16 |
| 284996 | 12/15/2014 | PacificSource Administrators, Inc. |  | 7,933.31 |
| 284998 | 12/15/2014 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 33,360.19 |
| 285000 | 12/15/2014 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 2,093.32 |
| 285003 | 12/15/2014 | Voya Retirement Insurance \& Annuity Co. |  | 6,958.32 |
| 285168 | 12/31/2014 | PacificSource Administrators, Inc. |  | 9,004.31 |
| 285171 | 12/31/2014 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 35,667.10 |
| 285173 | 12/31/2014 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 2,093.32 |
| 285175 | 12/31/2014 | THPRD - Employee Assn. |  | 14,877.82 |
| 285178 | 12/31/2014 | Voya Retirement Insurance \& Annuity Co. |  | 6,958.32 |
|  |  | Employee Deductions | \$ | 118,946.01 |
| 284894 | 12/05/2014 | NW Natural |  | 33,769.63 |
| 285138 | 12/26/2014 | NW Natural |  | 26,938.87 |
|  |  | Heat | \$ | 60,708.50 |
| 285051 | 12/15/2014 | Beaverton Volleyball Officials Association |  | 1,672.00 |
| 285119 | 12/22/2014 | Universal Whistles, LLC |  | 5,370.50 |
|  |  | Instructional Services | \$ | 7,042.50 |
| 284910 | 12/05/2014 | Brown \& Brown Northwest |  | 32,934.00 |
|  |  | Insurance | \$ | 32,934.00 |
| 284918 | 12/05/2014 | Hughes Electrical Contractors |  | 3,070.12 |
| 9923 | 12/10/2014 | Schulz-Clearwater Sanitation, Inc. |  | 9,197.65 |
| 9924 | 12/10/2014 | Schulz-Clearwater Sanitation, Inc. |  | 8,309.56 |
| 9925 | 12/10/2014 | Schulz-Clearwater Sanitation, Inc. |  | 16,213.83 |
| 9950 | 12/10/2014 | Guaranteed Pest Control Service Co, Inc. |  | 1,512.00 |
| 10142 | 12/10/2014 | Arizon Structures WorldWide, LLC |  | 7,195.71 |
| 10268 | 12/10/2014 | SimplexGrinnell LP |  | 3,292.20 |
| 10623 | 12/10/2014 | SHAV-TRONICS |  | 1,623.10 |
| 285102 | 12/22/2014 | Northwest Control Company, Inc. |  | 1,505.00 |
| 285109 | 12/22/2014 | RMS Pump, Inc. |  | 1,176.50 |
|  |  | Maintenance Services | \$ | 53,095.67 |
| 10199 | 12/10/2014 | Platt Electric Supply, Inc. |  | 1,832.93 |
| 10318 | 12/10/2014 | Valley Athletics |  | 1,590.00 |
| 10353 | 12/10/2014 | Pioneer Manufacturing Co. |  | 2,067.00 |
| 10409 | 12/10/2014 | Airgas Nor Pac, Inc. |  | 6,296.87 |
| 10417 | 12/10/2014 | Coastwide Laboratories |  | 1,767.36 |
| 10612 | 12/10/2014 | Coastwide Laboratories |  | 3,044.18 |
| 10614 | 12/10/2014 | Coastwide Laboratories |  | 1,410.67 |
| 285026 | 12/15/2014 | ORCA Pacific, Inc. |  | 2,002.83 |
| 285103 | 12/22/2014 | ORCA Pacific, Inc. |  | 1,172.27 |
| 285126 | 12/22/2014 | Chown, Inc. |  | 1,020.48 |
|  |  | Maintenance Supplies | \$ | 22,204.59 |


| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name | Check Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 284922 | 12/05/2014 | Aloha Youth Football/Cheerleading |  | 1,574.50 |
|  |  | Miscellaneous Other Services | \$ | 1,574.50 |
| 9922 | 12/10/2014 | Ricoh Americas Corporation |  | 2,272.25 |
| 9926 | 12/10/2014 | OfficeMax Incorporated |  | 5,563.48 |
| 9927 | 12/10/2014 | OfficeMax Incorporated |  | 2,090.40 |
|  |  | Office Supplies | \$ | 9,926.13 |
| 285033 | 12/15/2014 | US Postal Service CMRS-PB |  | 3,000.00 |
|  |  | Postage | \$ | 3,000.00 |
| 285032 | 12/15/2014 | Signature Graphics |  | 17,848.00 |
|  |  | Printing \& Publication | \$ | 17,848.00 |
| 284891 | 12/03/2014 | Washington County DLUT |  | 3,000.00 |
| 284916 | 12/05/2014 | Frank's Garage LLC |  | 1,625.00 |
| 10124 | 12/10/2014 | MSDS Online |  | 1,999.00 |
| 10317 | 12/10/2014 | Providence Health \& Services |  | 1,650.00 |
| ACH | 12/15/2014 | Beery, Elsnor \& Hammond, LLP |  | 1,783.75 |
| 285110 | 12/22/2014 | Smith Dawson \& Andrews |  | 3,000.00 |
| 285113 | 12/22/2014 | Talbot, Korvola \& Warwick, LLP |  | 28,475.00 |
| 285130 | 12/22/2014 | Jonathan House |  | 1,430.00 |
| 285131 | 12/22/2014 | Jaime Valdez Photography |  | 1,430.00 |
| 285132 | 12/22/2014 | Lilien Systems |  | 8,400.00 |
|  |  | Professional Services | \$ | 52,792.75 |
| 9963 | 12/10/2014 | Kore Group |  | 2,808.45 |
| 10098 | 12/10/2014 | OfficeMax Incorporated |  | 1,167.23 |
| 10372 | 12/10/2014 | U.G. Cash \& Carry |  | 1,861.14 |
| 10735 | 12/10/2014 | Wilsons Lodge |  | 1,472.30 |
| 285027 | 12/15/2014 | Play-well TEKnologies |  | 5,850.00 |
| 285046 | 12/15/2014 | A \& E Imaging |  | 1,337.62 |
| 285124 | 12/22/2014 | Bubble Bump Soccer, LLC |  | 2,397.50 |
|  |  | Program Supplies | \$ | 16,894.24 |
| 9919 | 12/04/2014 | Waste Management of Oregon |  | 5,130.87 |
|  |  | Refuse Services | \$ | 5,130.87 |
| 9922 | 12/10/2014 | Ricoh Americas Corporation |  | $3,132.02$ |
|  |  | Rental Equipment | \$ | 3,132.02 |
| 284932 | 12/05/2014 | PixelSpoke |  | 6,000.00 |
| 284934 | 12/05/2014 | Public Affairs Counsel, Inc. |  | 4,975.00 |
| 10290 | 12/10/2014 | Northwest Tree Specialists |  | 1,791.50 |
| 285035 | 12/15/2014 | Washington County Health \& Human Services |  | 4,048.00 |
| 285054 | 12/15/2014 | Cook Security Group |  | 2,056.99 |
| 285056 | 12/15/2014 | Milton L. Fearn |  | 1,400.00 |
| 285127 | 12/22/2014 | Edwards Enterprises |  | 1,739.12 |
| 285129 | 12/22/2014 | GreenPlay, LLC |  | 3,500.00 |
| 285147 | 12/30/2014 | Beaverton Auto Parts |  | 1,025.00 |
|  |  | Technical Services | \$ | 26,535.61 |
| 284915 | 12/05/2014 | Executive Forum |  | 3,350.00 |
|  |  | Technical Training | \$ | 3,350.00 |
| 284893 | 12/05/2014 | Integra Telecom |  | 4,400.83 |
| 285137 | 12/26/2014 | Integra Telecom |  | 4,360.57 |
|  |  | Telecommunications | \$ | 8,761.40 |
| 10705 | 12/10/2014 | Terex Services |  | 5,975.00 |
|  |  | Vehicle \& Equipment Services | \$ | 5,975.00 |


| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name |  |  | Check Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 284926 | 12/05/2014 | Marc Nelson Oil Products, Inc. |  |  | 2,327.12 |
| 284941 | 12/05/2014 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  |  | 8,201.54 |
| 285021 | 12/15/2014 | Marc Nelson Oil Products, Inc. |  |  | 1,900.60 |
| 285117 | 12/22/2014 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  |  | 5,281.05 |
| 285123 | 12/22/2014 | Bretthauer Oil Co. |  |  | 2,389.63 |
|  |  | Vehicle Gas \& Oil |  | \$ | 20,099.94 |
| 9917 | 12/04/2014 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  |  | 10,082.35 |
| 9921 | 12/04/2014 | City of Beaverton |  |  | 8,405.93 |
| 284896 | 12/05/2014 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  |  | 9,956.07 |
| 285141 | 12/26/2014 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  |  | 1,449.44 |
|  |  | Water \& Sewer |  | \$ | 29,893.79 |
|  |  |  | Report Total: | \$ | 1,912,813.19 |

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District
General Fund Financial Summary
December 2014

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

## 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 | 35,139 | 71,534 | 139,532 | 51.3\% | 261,119 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administration | 159,731 | 985,301 | 1,009,143 | 97.6\% | 2,161,629 |
| Business \& Facilities | 1,143,837 | 8,966,031 | 9,126,039 | 98.2\% | 17,571,260 |
| Planning | 99,087 | 613,273 | 765,946 | 80.1\% | 1,523,286 |
| Capital Outlay | 125,051 | 1,077,279 | 2,670,145 | 40.3\% | 4,660,718 |
| Contingency | - | - | - | 0.0\% | 2,100,000 |
| Total Other Expenditures: | 1,562,845 | 11,713,418 | 13,710,804 | 85.4\% | 28,278,012 |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 2,644,478 | \$19,580,498 | \$22,174,493 | 88.3\% | \$44,388,743 |
| venues over (under) Expenditures | \$ (1,233,728) | \$11,331,584 | \$ 8,293,961 | 136.6\% | \$ $(5,277,860)$ |
| ginning Cash on Hand |  | \$ 6,445,779 | 5,277,860 | 122.1\% | 5,277,860 |
| ding Cash on Hand |  | \$17,777,363 | \$13,571,821 | 131.0\% | \$ |

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

## General Fund Financial Summary

December, 2014

## General Fund Resources



General Fund Expenditures


DATE: January 20, 2015
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Appointing Audit Committee Members

## Introduction

Staff requests board of directors' appointment of three audit committee members and approval of the attached resolution making the appointments.

## Background

The district audit committee was authorized by Resolution No. 2008-04 at the April 7, 2008 board of directors meeting and consists of three members of the public. The primary responsibilities of the audit committee include periodically forming a recommendation regarding the selection of the park district's independent auditors, review of the annual audit plan, monitoring progress and compliance, participating in an audit exit conference, presentation of the audit report to the board of directors, and post audit follow-up. Membership for the committee is drawn from the board of directors (1), the district's budget committee (1), and the general public (1).

Bob Scott, board secretary, currently fulfills the board position, but his term expired December 31,2014 . He has agreed to continue fulfilling the board's position on this committee and requests reappointment for a period of two years.

Shannon Kennedy, current budget committee member, has agreed to continue to fulfill the budget committee's position on this committee, but her term expired on December 31, 2014. She requests reappointment for a period of two years.

Kathleen Leader currently fulfills the public position on the committee, but her term also expired December 31, 2014. She has agreed to continue fulfilling the public position on this committee and requests reappointment for a period of one year. Please find her application attached.

## Proposal Request

Staff requests board of directors' appointment of the three above named individuals to the district's audit committee, per the attached resolution. The designated term length for an audit committee member is two years; however, in order to stagger the terms, it is proposed that two of the audit committee members' terms run through December 31, 2016 and one member's term runs through December 31, 2015 (assuming that the board and budget committee representatives remain on those committees as well through that time). District legal counsel has reviewed and approved of the attached resolution.

## Action Requested

Board of directors' approval of Resolution No. 2015-02, Appointing Audit Committee Members.

# RESOLUTION No. 2015-02 <br> Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon 

## A RESOLUTION APPOINTING AUDIT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

WHEREAS, one committee member shall be appointed for a term expiring on December 31, 2015 and two committee members shall be appointed by the board for terms expiring on December 31, 2016 and;

WHEREAS, the selected committee members have demonstrated their interest and knowledge in the committee's area of responsibility. Now, therefore

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

Section 1. The board of directors approves the appointment of Kathleen Leader for a one-year term expiring December 31, 2015, and Bob Scott and Shannon Kennedy for two-year terms expiring December 31, 2016, to the audit committee.

Section 2. This resolution is effective upon its passage on the adoption date listed below.

Duly passed by the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors this $2^{\text {nd }}$ day of February, 2015.

John Griffiths, President

Bob Scott, Secretary
ATTEST:

[^0]THPRD

## TUALATINHUSPARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVSORY COMMTIEE APPUCATION

| Name: Kathleen Leader |  | Date: $1 / 14 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | City: | Zip: |
| Home Phone: | Cell: | Work Phone: |
| Email: |  |  |

Please note you must reside within the Park District's boundaries and complete a background check in order to serve on the Audit Committee.

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

I believe that my career in financial management provides me with skills, knowledge and experience that would benefit the District.

I value the mission, services and recreation facilities provided by Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, and believe that my knowledge and experience will foster the continuation and growth of District services in the community.
2. How long have you lived in the community?

I have lived in Cedar Hills over 12 years.
3. Have you served on other volunteer committees? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were: I currently serve as a Board Member for Oregon Municipal Finance Officers Association (OMFOA), guiding the mission and planning conferences and events for the organization.

I am currently the Treasurer for Forest Hills Village Homeowners Association. I have held this position for over 11 years. I am responsible for billing and collection of annual assessments, payment of bills monthly, preparation of the annual budget and monthly/annual financial statements, preparation of annual tax statements, banking and investment functions. I participate as a member of the Board developing and enforcing bylaws, covenants and restrictions, and guidelines, responding to homeowner concerns, and addressing the needs of the Association.

I was a Board Member for Neighbor Health Clinics, a non-profit organization providing medical and dental services to indigent and uninsured individuals in North and South East Portland, from 1999 through 2002. I provided governance and direction for the operations and policies of the non-profit organization and assisted in fund raising opportunities
4. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities?

What: Pilates Class
When: Eight years ago
Where: Cedar Hills Recreation Center
I also jog at least twice a week through the Commonwealth Park and enjoy the lake, scenery and people. In early 1990 I volunteered as a swimming coach for the Special Olympics, and practices and events were held at the District's pool facility on Walker Road.
5. If employed, what is your occupation?

Finance Manager with Clean Water Services

## TUALATIN HLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVSORY COMMTIEE APPUCATION

6. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Audit Committee:
I have over 17 years in financial management and reporting experience, including 12 years in the local government sector.

My work experience as the Finance Manager with Clean Water Services and Finance Director for the City of Troutdale, City of Wood Village and Holgate Center includes:

- Develop and administer policies and procedures for accounting, financial management, financial information system administration, banking and investment services, purchasing, auditing, budget, utility billing, debt administration, financial reporting, internal controls and property/liability risk management.
- Ensure compliance with generally accepted accounting standards and federal, state and local laws and regulations affecting fiscal activities and related operations.
- Prepare and oversee preparation of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.
- Serve as primary liaison with the independent auditors in developing the audit scope and responding to auditor's findings and recommendations.
- Direct the development of strategic plans for financial activities and prepare financial forecasts and models for resource and expenditure issues to ensure that long term financial management objectives are met.
- Acting Budget Officer, direct development of the annual budget, establish and monitor budgetary controls, and ensure compliance with Local Budget Law.

DATE: January 20, 2015
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Jim McElhinny, Director of Park \& Recreation Services

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Reappointing Stuhr Center Advisory Committee Members

## Introduction

The Stuhr Center Advisory Committee requests board of directors' approval to reappoint five committee members.

## Background

At their January 12, 2015 meeting, the Stuhr Center Advisory Committee recommended that the board of directors reappoint Robert Cannon, Harold Eves, Edith Frahm, David Magee and Norman Vaillancourt to the committee for two-year terms.

Please note that the respective applicants' applications and the Stuhr Center Advisory Committee's current roster are attached.

## Action Requested

Board of directors' approval of Resolution 2015-03, reappointing Robert Cannon, Harold Eves, Edith Frahm, David Magee and Norman Vaillancourt to the Stuhr Center Advisory Committee.

## RESOLUTION 2015-03

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon

## A RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING

 STUHR CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSWHEREAS, the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors must appoint committee members by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the committee members shall be appointed by the board for a two-year term; and

WHEREAS, the committee members have demonstrated their interest and knowledge in the committee's area of responsibility

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

The board of directors approves the reappointment of Robert Cannon, Harold Eves, Edith Frahm, David Magee and Norman Vaillancourt to the Stuhr Center Advisory Committee.

Duly passed by the board of directors of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District this $2^{\text {nd }}$ day of February, 2015.

John Griffiths, Board President

Bob Scott, Board Secretary

## ATTEST:

Jessica Collins, Recording Secretary

## TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICATION

| Name: Robert Cannon | City: | Date: $1 / 12 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | Cell: | Zip: |
| Home Phone: | Work Phone: |  |
| Email: |  |  |

Advisory Committee you are applying for: (You must reside within the THPRD boundaries)
AquaticsHistoric FacilitiesNatural ResourcesParks
RecreationSports
区 Stuhr CenterTrails

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

I have served on the Advisory Committee for the past sixteen (16) years. In that time we have aquired a bus for tours, new exercise equipment, pool tables, pation furniture, an addition to social room, exercise room/remodeling.
2. How long have you lived in the community?

Since 1965
3. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities?YesNo If yes, please explain in what you or your family participated in and where, when:
Walking, exercising, tours, on-going, at Commonwealth Lake Park; Nature Park; Stuhr Center.
4. Have you served on other volunteer committees? - YesNo
If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were:
Over the years, I have served on many volunteer committees beginning with the Past Office Recreatoin Committee in the 1980's for about 10 years. About five years as the treasurer. Also as vice president in the local union. Several years in camping club- arranging campouts. Working in local food pantry.
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee: I have worked with people having different ideas and views, where they had to be resoved for the betterment of all. I feel I'm able to see the long term effects of plans.
6. Term of Office preferred (please check one):

区 2-year term or $\square$ 3-year term

## TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICATION

| Name: Harold Eves |  | Date: $1 / 12 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | City: | Zip: |
| Home Phone: | Cell: | Work Phone: |
| Email: |  |  |

Advisory Committee you are applying for: (You must reside within the THPRD boundaries)AquaticsHistoric FacilitiesNatural ResourcesParks
RecreationSports
区 Stuhr CenterTrails

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

Desire to promote health and wellness of senior citizens.
2. How long have you lived in the community?

45 years
3. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, please explain in what you or your family participated in and where, when:
Harvest Festival/Bazzaar; picnics, host Thursday social dance; present member of Advisory Committee; Humana, etc. Work at Stuhr Center 8 years (evenings) for Roxie and Linda Jo.
4. Have you served on other volunteer committees? $\boxtimes$ YesNo
If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were:
Harvest Bazaar, Health Fair
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee: Lisa Novak and Stuhr Center Staff, doing excellent job.
6. Term of Office preferred (please check one):2-year term or3-year term

## TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICATION

| Name: Edith Frahm |  | Date: $1 / 12 / 2015$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | Cell: | City: | Zip: |
| Home Phone: | Work Phone: |  |  |
| Email: |  |  |  |

Advisory Committee you are applying for: (You must reside within the THPRD boundaries)
AquaticsHistoric FacilitiesNatural ResourcesParks
RecreationSports
区 Stuhr CenterTrails

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

Having been on the committee awhile, I have come to appreciate the benefits and wonders of Elsie Stuhr Center and want to continue to contribute all I can to keep the center the strong institution that it is. The center is the strongest asset that we seniors have and as the baby boomers are reaching 55 and over, we need to be very strong to keep it going.
2. How long have you lived in the community?

11 1/2 years
3. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, please explain in what you or your family participated in and where, when:
work out room, dance class, dances, Harvest Bazaar, exercise, photography class - 2004 current at the Elsie Stuhr Center.
4. Have you served on other volunteer committees? $\boxtimes$ YesNo

If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were:
Harvest Bazaar-bag lady 2011 \& 2012; Fashion Show model; very active in two hospital auxiliaries (held all offices 1940's-1960's); Chairman of Dance Club-1950's \& 1960's; Street Light Chairman (collect street light money)
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee: I was involved in retail for years and learned a lot about human nature and how to win friends and influence people. All my life, I have continued to educate myself by reading and learning.
6. Term of Office preferred (please check one):

2 2-year term or $\square$ 3-year term

## TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICATION

| Name: David Magee |  | Date: $1 / 12 / 2015$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | Cell: | City: | Zip: |
| Home Phone: | Work Phone: |  |  |
| Email: |  |  |  |

Advisory Committee you are applying for: (You must reside within the THPRD boundaries)
AquaticsHistoric FacilitiesNatural ResourcesParks
RecreationSports
区 Stuhr CenterTrails

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

I wish to continue my commitment to the health and well-being of older members of our community.
2. How long have you lived in the community?

29 years
3. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities?
® YesNo If yes, please explain in what you or your family participated in and where, when: 1988-youth classes for daughter; 1995-youth classes for both daughters; 1995-2012-classes, gym use and rec sports for all family members; 1998-2013-family; David-2002-2013; Elsie Stuhr Center: classes, clubs and advisory committee at Cedar Hills RC, Garden Home RC, Tualatin Hills Center, and Elsie Stuhr Center.
4. Have you served on other volunteer committees? $\boxtimes$ YesNo If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were:
MS Society of Portland, Fall Festival at Stuhr Center, Advisory Committee meetings at Stuhr Center (4 years)
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee: Previous experience serving on the Advisory Committee at the Elsie Stuhr Center; and past 13 years involvement with variety of activities and classes at the Elsie Stuhr Center.
6. Term of Office preferred (please check one):

2 2-year term or $\square$ 3-year term

## TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT <br> ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPLICATION

| Name: Norman Vaillancourt |  | Date: $1 / 12 / 2015$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | Cell: | City: | Work Phone: |
| Home Phone: | Cmail: |  |  |

Advisory Committee you are applying for: (You must reside within the THPRD boundaries)
AquaticsHistoric FacilitiesNatural ResourcesParks
RecreationSports
区 Stuhr Center

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

As a current member of the Advisory Committee, informing about our bond issues and our expasion and other great things. Our future here and the many things ahead. To move on for the better of our future and of our center. Can't wait.
2. How long have you lived in the community?

12 years
3. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No If yes, please explain in what you or your family participated in and where, when:
Day care, tee-ball, soccer, playtime, truck show. Maureen, my wife, attends fitness room daily at the Stuhr Center. Grandkids about 6 years ago; Maureen present at Conestoga Recreation and Aquatic Center and Elsie Stuhr Center.
4. Have you served on other volunteer committees? $\boxtimes$ YesNo
If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were:
Advisory Board member of Elsie Stuhr Center (present); Public Advisory Committee (THPRD); Advisory Committee for 20 year plan; Special Task Force \& Advisory Committee for Change; Task Force on the SR Idol Show; Health Fair and coffee host; Farmers Market and Harvest Bazaar (baked goods); Thursday Social Dance; Hike and Bike (THPRD); T-Hills at the Park- Car Show (THPF)
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee: I come with 40 years of experience in park and recreation community servces from Southern California, City of Whitter; part time work in many areas and continue the work, working with our people and best for our center to support our staff.
6. Term of Office preferred (please check one):
$\boxtimes$ 2-year term or $\square$ 3-year term

## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District STUHRCENIER ADVSORY COMMTTEE ROSTER

Last Updated: 1/20/15

| Committee Member | Member Since | Term Expires |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| David Magee <br> Chair | February 2008 | February 2015 |
| Robert Cannon | February 2004 | February 2015 |
| Harold Eves | February 2006 | February 2015 |
| Edith Frahm | February 2008 | February 2015 |
| Helen Popa | October 2012 | October 2014 |
| Norman Vaillancourt | February 2004 | February 2015 |
| Laurel Reilly | April 2014 | April 2016 |
| Ex-Officio Member | Representing | Term Expires |
| Lisa Novak | Staff <br> THPRD <br> Staff <br> THPRD | N/A <br> Terri Cannon |

## MEMO

DATE: January 21,2015
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Aisha Willits, Director of Planning
RE: $\quad$ Bond Program Update

## 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.

## Capital Projects Construction Update

At the February board meeting, you will receive a PowerPoint presentation on the continuing and upcoming projects as part of the bond program update agenda item. A brief summary of the projects and their status is provided below.

| Project Name | Status |
| :--- | :--- |
| Roger Tilbury Park | Roger Tilbury Park reached substantial completion and opened to <br> the public in mid-December. The public has had full use of <br> accessible paved paths and crushed gravel trails that connect the <br> east and west neighborhoods. Both the traditional and natural play <br> areas appear well used. T Edge Construction will be completing <br> restoration pocket planting in February, while the Natural Resources <br> department continues on with full-site restoration over the next year. |
| Cedar Mill Park | Cedar Mill Park was deemed substantially complete and opened to <br> the public in mid-November. The district's contractor, Milroy Golf <br> Systems, has continued work to bring the project to final completion. <br> Patrons have full access to parking, picnicking and play areas, <br> which also include a paved pathway access to NW 107 |
| Both Avenue. |  |
| the natural grass is established. The fields will be reassessed in in |  |
| the natil |  |
| March to evaluate readiness for use. The tennis court will be |  |
| temporarily striped, as weather permits, followed by the application |  |
| of a permanent acrylic surface in June. |  |


| HMT ADA Parking <br> improvements | The HMT ADA parking improvements reached substantial <br> completion in mid-December. Remaining work to reach final <br> completion includes installation of additional landscaping, inspection <br> of the restored wetland and the replacement of a portion of the north <br> entry stairs. This work will be completed in spring and summer 2015 <br> as weather permits. <br> The artwork installation along the north stairs will likely be complete <br> by the end of January. The background wall painting is done and <br> installation is being coordinated with district Maintenance staff. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Southwest Quadrant <br> Community Park <br> Development | Since the approval of the master plan, the district closed on an <br> additional property along SW 170 Avenue. The addition of this <br> property will provide more street frontage and an improved access <br> point to the park. Staff has been coordinating efforts with local <br> agencies in preparation for filing a land use application in April. In a <br> meeting with ODOT and Washington County, the park district was <br> informed we will be required to install a sidewalk on Farmington <br> Road to meet the state's minimum improvement standards. <br> Additional design meetings have focused on the development of the <br> athletic fields and inclusive play elements. Geoff Roach, director of <br> Community Partnerships, is leading an effort to better understand <br> the needs of inclusive play through a series of meetings with <br> Providence Health \& Services. |
| Cedar Hills Community <br> Park Redevelopment | The project is currently on hold in the master planning phase. <br> Following the initial neighborhood meeting, staff received <br> substantial input from the public on transportation concerns, among <br> others. The transportation concerns required a broader discussion <br> with the Beaverton School District (BSD), Washington County and <br> the City of Beaverton. A meeting was held between all four parties <br> and THPRD and BSD agreed to consider both Cedar Hills Park and <br> the replacement of William Walker Elementary School as part of a <br> master planning effort. The scope to identify the cumulative effect of <br> the redevelopment of both sites was developed and that updated <br> transportation analysis is underway. |
| Somerset West <br> Neighborhood Park | The master planning process for Somerset West Park is currently <br> on hold. Initial cost estimates for the project came in substantially <br> higher than the established project budget. Together with our <br> consultants, staff is working to evaluate the remaining park design <br> to reduce the overall project costs. |

DATE: January 21, 2015
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Geoff Roach, Director of Community Partnerships

## RE: $\quad$ Resolution Amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 Sponsorships/Naming of District Property/Memorials

## Introduction

THPRD's 2013 Strategic Plan and Service and Financial Sustainability Plan were adopted by the board of directors in December 2013. The Strategic Plan sets forth overarching goals, objectives and action steps to guide the district's operations for the next 10 years. The Service and Financial Sustainability Plan establishes targets and strategies that advance the district by providing a resource allocation strategy and by establishing a new cost recovery philosophy.

A recommendation in the Service and Financial Sustainability Plan (SFSP) encourages the creation of a stronger partnership platform, a platform that allows the district to be even more attractive to nonprofit, other government, and private for-profit entities. A review of the district's sponsorship policy was highlighted as an important step. A review of the existing sponsorship policy also resulted in a review of the existing naming policy. This review also encouraged the development of a proposed new memorials and tributes policy. The three policies, when viewed together, define how brands and names of other entities (people, organizations and businesses) associate and appear alongside THPRD's name and brand at our owned and managed assets.

## Background

The sponsorship policy review was recommended to identify a "menu" of options that THPRD could offer as sponsorship opportunities to other entities. The general concept presented was that a sponsor could consider "adopting" a facility or a program, etc.

In the spirit of diversifying revenues and attracting key partnerships to help THPRD more efficiently implement our mission, the SFSP recommends these steps specifically:

- Theme 1: Policy Strategies; Goal 5 - Revise Current Sponsorship Policy
- Theme 5: Revenue Enhancement; Goal 21 - Explore the opportunities for and use of Sponsorships through naming rights.

As outlined at the September 22, 2014 regular board meeting, staff was charged with investigating and developing an approach to sponsorship that is relevant to THPRD operations. The following actions were taken in 2014:

- Staff reviewed the district's current policies and affairs related to naming, sponsorship and memorials \& tributes because the combined activity taken in these areas of our
operation result in nearly all the names and brands appearing at THPRD owned and operated facilities.
- Staff sampled existing policies from "like" jurisdictions, to include nonprofit organizations, other special district formats for parks, and city models for providing park and recreation services.
- Ideas and concepts concerning emerging policy changes were discussed at a joint advisory committee meeting on July 17, 2014. The meeting included members from the following:
o Stuhr Advisory Committee
o Natural Resources Advisory Committee
o Recreation Advisory Committee
o Trails Advisory Committee
o Aquatics Advisory Committee
o Parks Advisory Committee
- In addition, as real world needs have arisen in 2014, staff has been working to apply the proposed new polices informally. The new polices have been applied in the context of a new event sponsor for summer concerts and in numerous emerging requests for memorials or tributes.


## Recommendations Overview

Staff is recommending the following changes to currently existing policies:

1. Retain the existing naming policy with the following outcomes:
a. Retain a high level of decision making around the naming/renaming of THPRD assets. The act of naming/renaming should continue to be used sparingly and to recognize:
i. Historic events, people, and places
ii. Outstanding individuals
iii. Donors
b. In addition to an entire THPRD site being eligible for naming/renaming, allow the same for significant portions of an otherwise named park, such as a fountain, playfield, skate area, or playground.
c. Deepen the criteria for naming eligibility.
d. Afford the opportunity for naming/renaming of district assets after businesses and companies.
2. Replace the existing sponsorship policy with the proposed new policy language to enact the following outcomes:
a. Define sponsorship as a business arrangement between THPRD and an outside party and clearly separate sponsorship from permanent naming of district assets.
b. Clarify the categories available for sponsorship as: events, programs, projects, and sites.
c. Deepen the understanding of procedural aspects related to sponsorships.

Staff is recommending adding a new policy addressing memorials and tributes with the following outcomes:

1. Establish a policy for addressing memorials \& tributes at district assets.
2. Set criteria for use in evaluating memorial \& tribute requests.
3. Establish basic guidelines to aid in determining suitable and unsuitable location and design of memorials \& tributes at district assets.

## Proposal Request

Staff is requesting that the board of directors approve a resolution amending District Compiled Policies (DCP) Chapter 8 to reflect the proposed changes. Attached is a marked-up version of DCP Chapter 8, labeled as Exhibit A, which identify the proposed amendments. The resolution and proposed changes to DCP Chapter 8 have been reviewed by THPRD's legal counsel.

Also attached are the draft procedures for implementing the changes proposed for DCP 8. These procedures are still in development and may need additional refinement prior to implementation. They are provided for board information only and do not require board approval. The attachments are labeled as follows:

- Exhibit B - Naming of District Properties draft procedures (redline showing proposed edits to original procedures)
- Exhibit C - Private Sponsorships draft procedures (this document is not shown in redline due to the extent of the proposed changes)
- Exhibit D - Private Sponsorships procedures (proposed to be replaced by Exhibit C)
- Exhibit E - Memorials \& Tributes draft procedures


## Action Requested

Board of directors' approval of Resolution No. 2015-04, amending District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 - District Property.

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-04

## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon

## A RESOLUTION APPROVING DISTRICT COMPILED POLICIES CHAPTER EIGHT, AS AMENDED

a. The Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (District) board adopted District Compiled Policies (DCP) on June 8, 2009 and amended DCP Chapter 8 on March 7, 2011; and;
b. The District board desires to add new sections to DCP Chapter Eight concerning District Property; and
c. The amendments to Chapter 8 contain provisions regarding the naming or renaming of District property, private sponsorships as well as memorials and tributes.

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

Section 1. The DCP Chapter 8, as amended and attached as Exhibit A to this resolution is adopted. This new Chapter 8 replaces the Chapter previously adopted by the Board on June 8, 2009 and amended by the Board on March 7, 2011.

Section 2. This resolution takes effect on February 2, 2015.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVAL: February 2, 2015

John Griffiths, President

Bob Scott, Secretary

## ATTEST:

Jessica Collins, Recording Secretary

## District Compiled Policies

## CHAPTER 8 - DISTRICT PROPERTY

### 8.01 Easements on District Property

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for requesting and securing easements on District owned property to staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community.
(B) Policy. It is District policy to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of District property. In the spirit of cooperation with citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community, it may sometimes be acceptable to allow easements on District property for other than park and recreation purposes if the benefits to the District and community outweigh the negative impacts.
(C) Implementation Strategy.
(1) Upon request, the District will consider proposals for easements on District properties if it can be demonstrated that the negative impact of the intended function of such easements will not outweigh the community and District benefits or the District will be adequately compensated for such an impact. Examples of such easements include conservation, storm water / sanitary sewer / domestic water, construction access, emergency access, utility, road right-of-way or similar easements.
(2) Staff will evaluate each easement proposal case-by-case based on the District Operational Procedures adopted by the Manager. Depending on the type of easement request, decisions regarding an easement proposal will be made either by the Board or Manager.

### 8.02 Encroachments on District Property

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for resolving encroachments on District owned property to staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community.
(B) Policy. It is District policy to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of District property. Any encroachment on or modification to District property is considered trespassing when it comes to the attention of the District, regardless of when the property was initially encroached upon or by whom. Persons deemed responsible by the District will be notified in writing and directed to remove all encroachments. Examples of encroachments on District property include landscape installation, placement of physical structures, fence / wall installation and pathway / driveway construction.

## District Compiled Policies

## (C) Implementation Strategy.

(1) If an encroachment is not resolved within 90 days of the notice or other period specified by the District in the trespass notice, the District may take action to restore the property to its original condition. Persons deemed responsible by the District for the encroachments must pay the cost of such action.
(2) Staff will evaluate each contested encroachment case-by-case based on the District Operational Procedures adopted by the Manager. If the violator wishes to appeal a decision of the Manager, persons responsible for the encroachment may request a hearing before the Board.

### 8.03 Telecommunications Facilities on District Property

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for requesting and securing the installation and operation of telecommunication facilities on District owned property to staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community.
(B) Policy. It is District policy to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of District property. In the spirit of cooperation with citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community, it may sometimes be acceptable to allow the installation and operation of telecommunications facilities on District property for other than park and recreation purposes if the benefits to the District and community outweigh the negative impacts. Consideration may be given to the impact of telecommunication facilities on properties adjacent to District property.
(C) Implementation Strategy. Upon request, staff will evaluate each lease proposal case-by-case based on the District Operational Procedures adopted by the Manager. The Operational Procedures will provide that impacts to park users are considered and that a public meeting is held prior to final review of each application. The Manager will deny a telecommunications lease proposal or recommend it to the Board for approval. The Board may approve a lease and may hold further public hearings at its discretion. All decisions of the Board are final.

### 8.04 Wetland and Buffer Mitigation on District Property

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for requesting and securing the use of District owned property for wetland and buffer mitigation purposes to staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community.
(B) Policy. It is District policy to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of District property. In the spirit of cooperation with citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community, it may sometimes be
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acceptable to allow the use of District property for mitigation purposes for other than park and recreation purposes if the benefits to the District and community outweigh the adverse impacts. Due to the delicate nature of new mitigation sites and the significant staff work to respond to a proposal, the District will charge fees to offset staff time spent on these projects.
(C) Implementation Strategy.
(1) Upon request, staff will evaluate each mitigation proposal case-by-case based on the District Operational Procedures adopted by the Manager. Applicants may appeal a decision of the Manager that denies, sets conditions of approval or assesses fees to the Board by filing a written request.
(2) The Manager will periodically update the District Operational Procedures to reflect inflationary increases in staffing, materials and land costs. Updates will take into account local, regional and statewide planning and regulatory initiatives.

### 8.05 Naming of District Property

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for the naming of new District properties, as well as -the renaming of existing District properties, and the naming of features in otherwise named District properties.
(B) Policy. It is District policy to name or rename District properties and features in otherwise named District properties so as to best serve the interests of the District and its residents and ensure a worthy and enduring legacy for the District's park and recreation system. To this end, the District supports consideration of naming and renaming requests within the following broad categories.
(1) Historic Events, People, and Places: The history of a major event, place or person may play an important role in the naming or renaming of a District property as communities often wish to preserve and honor the history of the District and the communities it serves, historical figures, its Native American heritage, local landmarks and prominent geographical locations, and natural and geological features.
(2) Outstanding Individuals: The District has benefited, through its evolution, from the contributions made by many outstanding individuals. This category is designed to acknowledge the sustained contribution that has been made by such individuals to the District and the development and management of the District's park and recreation system.
(3) Donors: Over the years, the District has benefited from the financial contributions made by residents, businesses, and foundations. On
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occasion, the significance of such donations may warrant consideration being given to requests from either the donor or another party to acknowledge such a gift by naming District property for the donor, the donor's surname, a family member or friend of the donor, a donating business, or a person associated with a donating business-or a business that has donated. In no case shall a District property be permanently named for a business or corporation.
(C) Implementation Strategy. The Board of Directors must approve the naming/renaming of District properties. Upon receiving a naming/renaming request, the Manager will evaluate it to determine whether the proposal is consistent with Board policy. The Manager may deny a proposal not deemed by the manager to be consistent with existing Board policy. Any person(s) whose proposal to name/rename a District property is denied may seek review of the decision by filing a written request with the Board of Directors within ten (10) days of the Manager’s denial. All proposals deemed by the Manager as being consistent with Board policy will be referred to the Board for approval. All decisions of the Board are final.

### 8.06 Private Sponsorships

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for requesting and securing sponsorships for District events, facilities and services to staff, citizens, and the business community.
(B) Policy.
(1) It is District policy to actively seek sponsorships for its events, services, parks, and facilities programs, projects and sites from individuals, foundations, businesses, corporations,-nomprofit organizations, service elubs, _and other entities. The purpose of such sponsorships is to raise additional revenue in a proprietary manner in order to increase the District's ability to deliver services to the community and/or provide enhanced levels of service beyond the core levels funded from the District's general fund and the fees charged to users. Sponsorships are intended to be used as a method to strengthen community partnerships and are not intended to be a public forum or any other tool for businesses, corporations or other entities to engage in free speech activities.
(2) In appreciation of such financial and/or in kind support, it is District policy to provide sponsors with suitable and appropriate recognition such as acknowledgement of their contributionsspace on a temporary basis for their brands, logos, and names to appear at THPRD owned and managed assets and in our materials. However, such recognition shall adhere to the aesthetic values and purpose of the District's parks, facilities, and services. In addition, such recognition shall not detract from the visitor's experience
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or expectation, nor shall it impair the visual qualities of the site or be perceived as creating a proprietary interest.
(C) Implementation Strategy. Staff will evaluate each sponsorship request case-bycase based on the District Operational Procedures adopted by the Manager. All sponsorships which enable the District to further its mission will be encouraged. The Manager may approve sponsorships of up to $\$ 150,000$. Sponsorships over $\$ 150,000$ will be presented to the Board of Directors for their consideration.

### 8.07 Memorials and Tributes on District Property

(A) Purpose. To provide direction for requesting and securing memorial and tribute placement at District owned and managed properties.
(B) Policy.
(1) It is District practice to accommodate memorial and tribute requests on a case by case basis for placement at District owned and managed properties. This policy establishes a framework for use in decision making for memorial and tribute requests. Requests will have the best success when they are sensitive to:

- The park user experience;
- The design standards and master plans that guide District improvements;
- The long-term cost of maintenance and the allocation of maintenance resources;
- The District identified improvement needs within parks;
- The average life span of the memorial or tribute (THPRD commitments to memorial or tribute shall survive only until such time that replacement is necessary); and
- The District's commitment to cost recovery.
(2) The policy formalizes key procedures, including:
- Application procedure;
- Review and approval procedure; and
- Catalogue of memorial and tribute amenities - District preferred options.
(C) Implementation Strategy. Staff will evaluate each memorial and tribute request case-by-case based on the District Operational Procedures adopted by the Manager.
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## PURPOSE

To create procedures in order to carryout District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 as adopted by the Board of Directors.

## POLICY

Operating procedures will be enacted to ensure compliance with Board of Directors policies.

## PROCEDURE

## General Guidelines for Naming or Renaming District Properties

A. All naming and renaming of District properties and features in otherwise named District properties should adhere to the definitions of classifications of District properties established in the Comprehensive Plan.
B. In considering proposals for the naming or renaming of a District property and features in otherwise named District properties, the following general principles should be taken into account either collectively or individually:

- Engender a strong positive image.
- Be appropriate having regard to the District property's location and/or history.
- Have historical, cultural or social significance for future generations.
- Commemorate places, people or events that are of continued importance to the District, region, state, and/or nation.
- Have symbolic value that transcends its ordinary meaning or use and enhances the character and identity of the District property.
- Have broad public support.
C. If a renaming is proposed, existing names that have become widely accepted by the community should not be abandoned unless there are compelling reasons for doing so. Historical or commonly used place names should be preserved wherever possible.


## Guidelines for Naming or Renaming District Properties for Historic Events, People, and Places

A. In considering the naming/renaming of a District Property and features in otherwise named District properties after a person, priority should be given to those who made a sustained and lasting contribution to:

- The District;
- The City of Beaverton;
- Washington County;
- The State of Oregon; or
- The Nation
B. The naming/renaming of a District property and features in otherwise named District properties after people who may have lost their lives due to war or a tragic event may not be considered until after the impact of the event has lessened within the community.
C. When a District property is associated with or located near events, people, and places of historic, cultural or social significance, consideration should be given to naming/renaming that District property after such events, people, and places. In considering such proposals, the relationship of the event, person or place to the District property should be demonstrated through research and documentation.
D. Naming or renaming a District property and features in otherwise named District properties for an outstanding individual is encouraged where that person's significance and good reputation have been accepted in the District's history- and when such individual has been deceased for at least three years. The deceased clause can be waived at the Board's directive. The District reserves the right to rename any District property if the person for whom it is named turns out to be disreputable or subsequently acts in a disreputable way.
E. Priority for Naming/Renaming should be given to those who have provided ten or more years of volunteer service to the community.


## Guidelines for Naming or Renaming District Properties for Donors

A. From time to time, a significant donation may be made to the District that will add considerable value to the District's park and recreation system. On such occasions, recognition of this donation by naming a District property or features in otherwise named District properties in honor of or at the request of the donor can be considered.
B. As a guideline, the threshold for considering the naming or renaming of a District property or features in otherwise named District properties should include one or more of the following:

- Land for the majority of the park was deeded to the District.
- Contribution of a minimum of $60 \%$ of the capital construction costs associated with developing the District property.
- Provision of a minimum 20-year endowment for the continued maintenance and/or programming of the District property.
C. Donors seeking naming rights for major donations with respect to an individual should be encouraged to follow the guidelines that apply to naming a District property for historic events, people, and places, as noted above. Exceptions to this will be considered on their own merits. The District reserves the right to rename any District property if the person or entity for whom it is named turns out to be disreputable or subsequently acts in a disreputable way. In no-case shall a District property be permanently named for a business or corporation.


## Other Considerations

A. To minimize confusion, parks should not be subdivided for the purpose of naming unless there
are readily identifiable physical divisions such as roads or waterways. However, naming of specific major facilities within District sites can be permitted; under these circumstances such names should be different from the site name to avoid user confusion. The District may name significant portions of an otherwise named park, such as a fountain, playfield, skate area or playground.
B. All signs that indicate the name of a District property should comply with the District's Signage Master Plan. Specialized naming signage should not be permitted.

## Managing Requests for Naming/Renaming of Parks and/or Facilities

A. The Board of Directors must approve the naming/renaming of District properties and features in otherwise named District properties.
B. All requests for the naming or renaming of a District property or features in otherwise named District properties shall be made in writing to the General Manager of the District. The General Manager, or designee, may also initiate a request to the Board of Directors for the naming or renaming of a District property and features in otherwise named District properties.
C. Requests should contain the following minimum information:

- The proposed name.
- A written justification for the proposed name addressing the Board of Directors policy and District Operational Procedures for the naming of District property.
- A depiction/map showing the location and boundaries of the District property. If proposing to name a facility within a District property, include a depiction/map showing the location of the facility.
- If proposing to rename a District property, include justification for changing an established name.
D. Upon receipt of a naming/renaming request by the District, the General Manager will render an initial verdict-decision regarding whether the request is consistent with Board policy. Any person whose request to name/rename a District property is denied by the General Manager may appeal to the Board of Directors.
E. Naming/renaming requests will adhere to a Level II public notice, consistent with the District's Community Outreach Procedure, which shall be provided in advance of consideration of the proposed naming/renaming by the Board of Directors.
F. The Board of Directors will make the final decision regarding the naming/renaming request-via resolution.
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## PURPOSE

To create procedures in order to carryout District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 as adopted by the Board of Directors.

## POLICY

Operating procedures will be enacted to ensure compliance with Board of Directors policies.

## INTENT

THPRD and its citizens pride themselves on their extensive park and recreation system. This pride is evidenced in many ways, including the decades of generous support shown by the business community in this region. Today, financial and in-kind support is critical as the demands to sustain and expand park and recreation offerings increase while the district strives to maintain appropriate tax and fee structures. Therefore, THPRD pursues partnerships with the for-profit sector through sponsorship of district events, programs, projects and site-related amenities. The purpose of such sponsorships is to raise additional revenue in a proprietary manner in order to increase the District's ability to deliver services to the community and/or provide enhanced levels of service beyond the core levels funded from the District's general fund and the fees charged to users.

The benefits inherent in these sponsorships are intended to be balanced and to accrue to all participants entering a sponsorship agreement. Sponsorships are intended to afford the district the opportunity to build and sustain programs and park amenities while sponsors receive access to important marketing venues and the opportunity to align their branding with the district's public mission. Sponsorships are intended to be used as a method to strengthen community partnerships and are not intended to be a public forum or any other tool for businesses, corporations or other entities to engage in free speech activities. This policy and its guidelines and procedures are intended to guide district management, decision-makers, and staff, or any allied organization pursuing sponsorship agreements. It is also intended to help potential sponsors understand the opportunities and the constraints of park and recreation sponsorship.

The district welcomes a relationship with sponsors as an opportunity to enhance its services provided sponsorships are consistent with district policies, respect the physical beauty of public spaces and district properties, promote the district's mission and core services, and are compatible with district image and brand. A sponsor's products, services and marketing objectives are expected to be compatible with the district's mission, values, and policies. Forprofit entities seeking sponsorship opportunities with the district are generally ineligible if their primary products or services are substantially dependent upon the sale of:

- alcohol, other than beer and wine,
- prescription drugs,
- tobacco,
- gambling,
- firearms,
- sexually explicit material, or
- junk food.


## DEFINITIONS

All sponsorships must adhere to the definitions of classifications of district properties established in the Comprehensive Plan. The following definitions apply specifically to this sponsorship policy and related procedures.

Sponsorship is financial or in-kind support from an outside entity, the sponsor, for specific events, programs, projects or sites in exchange for the sponsor receiving tangible and intangible marketing and tax benefits from the district. Sponsorship is a negotiated agreement between the sponsor and the district. The sponsor can expect this agreement to include but not be limited to:
A) recognition opportunities (product promotion and temporary recognition) on district property and in district materials,
B) authorization by the district for the sponsor to promote its investment with the district and with district programs, and
C) name association, particularly with respect to events, programs, and projects; and name association to a limited extent with respect to sites.

Recognition benefits are opportunities, conveyed from the district to the sponsor, that allow a sponsor's branding, products, name, and logo to be temporarily visible on district property and materials. Details relating to the opportunity are described in a sponsorship agreement and must comply with district policies.

Recognition is the signage paid for and often created by the sponsor that is usually placed in designated, purchased spaces for a temporary period of time to promote a product/service. Recognition is allowed in the district's printed materials and publications. Temporary recognition is the display of corporate logos, branding, or copy at a district event or on collateral materials associated with an event, program, project or site. Permanent recognition generally is not allowed at outdoor sites such as designated parks, facilities, trail ways, natural areas, and outside other district buildings.

Sponsorship agreement is the legal instrument that sets forth the terms and conditions the parties agree upon.

Events are one-time activities for the public organized by the district, held on district property and generally last less than a week, e.g. a sports clinic at a recreation center, a dance competition, or a volunteer activity. These events may re-occur routinely, e.g., an annually held concert or series of concerts.

Programs are ongoing district approved and organized activities led by district staff and/or by district paid instructors for the public, e.g., district run youth sports leagues, after school classes, yoga instruction, summer internship or volunteer program, etc. Programs generally involve the district providing staff supervision.

Projects are one-time district efforts, often with a product as an end-result. The product is generally intended for the public, e.g., a facility map, trails map or a park master plan.

Sites are specific places, varying in scale from individual features or areas, e.g., an off-leash pet
area or interactive water feature, or a ball field to an entire park or facility; or to an entire system of places, e.g., district-wide flower beds.

## CATEGORIES OF SPONSORSHIP

Sponsorship is encouraged in four general categories of District activity:

- Events
- Programs
- Projects
- Sites: This category of district activity is available, but is intended to be used sparingly.

Pricing offered by the district, as expressed in levels of sponsorship, is to incorporate the district's Service and Financial Sustainability Plan.

This policy may impact a number of district-related associations and partnerships with other organizations:
A) Community sports groups are teams and leagues that often solicit their own sponsorships and enter private agreements independent of the district. District sponsorship policies will not apply to these groups, however, written approval from the district must be obtained by the community sports group prior to a display benefiting one of their sponsors appearing within district parks, trail ways, facilities, natural areas and related district properties. A general exception is made for team uniforms.
B) Nonprofit organizations and other public institutions are those educational, cultural, environmental, and services organizations and agencies that may be located in or adjacent to designated parks, e.g., co-location with Tualatin Valley Water District or with Clean Water Services in or adjacent to THPRD parks or natural areas. Many organizations and agencies will have sponsorship programs independent of the district. Any organization or agency providing marketing benefits for sponsors outside their physical boundary but within a district property boundary must obtain district approval prior to display.
C) Concessionaires from time to time operate district properties. As private entities, concessionaires are permitted to obtain sponsors as they relate to their operations. However, any marketing benefit displayed beyond the physical boundary of the Concession site, but within a district property boundary, must be approved by the district.
D) Associated conservancies, foundations, and friends' groups include those park organizations that have formed in order to enhance and advocate for specific district parks, programs, and services. Individual agreements determine the level of management the group and the district are committing resources toward. Most of these groups will implement their own sponsorship, gift, and naming policies. When these groups operate on district properties and offer material benefit to sponsors displayed on district property then this district policy applies.

## RECOGNITION BENEFITS FOR SPONSORS

The district's willingness to provide recognition benefits for sponsors shall not be construed in any way to be an endorsement of the sponsor's goods or services by the district, or any proprietary interest of the sponsor in the district.

Recognition benefits for the sponsor are negotiated and detailed in a specific sponsorship agreement.

## TERMINATING SPONSORSHIPS

The district reserves the right to terminate any sponsorship should conditions arise during the life of that sponsorship that results in the sponsorship conflicting with this policy or the sponsorship is no longer in the best interests of the district. Decisions to terminate a sponsorship shall be made by the General Manager, or designee, and will not include the return or reimbursement of funds or asset improvements.

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Sponsorships are an important way in which the district can obtain additional resources to support the pursuit of its mission. However, sponsorships may come with unintended consequences and, as such, all sponsorship offers need to receive careful consideration. On occasion the district may need to reject a sponsorship offer. Circumstances under which this may occur include, but are not limited to:

- The potential sponsor seeks to impose conditions that are inconsistent with the district's mission, values, policies, and/or planning documents.
- Acceptance of the sponsorship creates a conflict of interest or policy, e.g., a sponsorship from a tobacco company.
- The sponsor and the district are in litigation.

The decision to reject a sponsorship, or to recommend rejection to the Board of Directors, shall be at the sole discretion of the General Manager or his or her designee.

## PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF SPONSORSHIP

## CATEGORIES OF SPONSORSHIP

Sponsorship is encouraged in four general categories of district activity:
A) Event sponsorship affords marketing benefits to sponsors vis-à-vis anything relating to the lead-up and the occurrence of an event. Specific sponsorship agreements may allow for the sponsor's name to be directly associated with the event, e.g., the marquee sponsor. The sponsor may have a variety of temporary recognition and marketing opportunities related to the event. District staff will maintain and periodically update a listing of sponsorship levels tied to events.
B) Program sponsorship affords recognition benefits throughout a program's duration, and may provide benefit beyond the specific program depending upon the details of the sponsorship agreement. Based on the agreement a sponsor's name may be associated with the program, e.g., TFO's Introduction to Fly Fishing at THPRD, and other benefit opportunities may be available. District staff will maintain and periodically update a listing of sponsorship levels tied to programs.
C) Project sponsorship affords recognition benefits attached directly to the product(s) that result from the collaboration between the district and the sponsor. District staff will develop project sponsorship levels on a case-by-case basis.
D) Site sponsorship recognition benefits are negotiated and established through the sponsorship agreement and are addressed on a case-by-case basis. This category of district activity is available, but is intended to be used sparingly. An example of site sponsorship may be: a sign for twelve months at the park highlighting Toro for providing a year's worth of park maintenance at Vista Brook Park.

Pricing offered by the district, as expressed in levels of sponsorship, is to incorporate the district's Service and Financial Sustainability Plan.

## SPONSORSHIP PROPOSAL

A) The sponsor's proposal shall enhance current priorities, programs, and core services of the district.
B) The sponsor's proposal, particularly with respect to recognition benefits and temporary recognition, must align with the district's design standards, visual integrity, and commitment to user experiences at district facilities.
C) The sponsor's proposal acknowledges and complies with the district's cost recovery and financial sustainability model.
D) The sponsor's proposal will not commit the district to additional operating and maintenance responsibilities and costs.
E) The tangible and intangible marketing benefits of the sponsor's proposal are appropriately balanced between sponsor and the district.
F) The sponsor has established or seeks to establish a strong track record of community involvement with the district or related public service providers.

Sponsorships generally originate through one of two procedures:
A) Self-initiated by an interested prospective sponsor, or
B) Initiated by the district through a formal or informal Request for Sponsors process.

Self-initiated procedure: Interested prospective sponsors may contact the district at any time to discuss prospective sponsorship interests and will submit a one page written Corporate Sponsorship Inquiry. The district procedure is:
A) A meeting or phone call is held between prospective sponsor and assigned district staff to review the Corporate Sponsorship Inquiry. The district determines during this step whether or not to invest further time in the sponsorship concept.
B) If further time is warranted, the district will draft a sponsorship agreement to include:
a. name of sponsor,
b. purpose of sponsorship,
c. sponsorship levels available and the specific level selected by the sponsor identified,
d. benefit to the district stated,
e. recognition benefit to the sponsor stated (display, type, location, size, design, content, and duration),
f. articulation of how the sponsorship is intended to operate (what the parties will do, how long the agreement is in effect, conditions that shall terminate the agreement, statement on exclusivity if applicable).
C) The sponsorship agreement is approved by the General Manger, or designee. The approval tier inside THPRD will be: less than \$10k - programmers; less than \$50k management team; less than \$150k - General Manager; \$150k and over - Board of Directors.
D) The sponsorship agreement is executed in writing by the district and the sponsor. The district's signing authority is consistent with the district's approval authority.

District-initiated procedure: The district will from time to time announce sponsorship needs and opportunities. This may be done informally through relationships district staff and programmers maintain with the broader community. It may also take the form of a more formal request solicited through district communication channels, including website, social media, publications, direct mail, and targeted inquiry. At the district's election, a meeting between the prospective sponsor that has responded to district inquiry and district assigned staff will be held and:
A) If further time is warranted, the district will draft a sponsorship agreement to include:
a. name of sponsor,
b. purpose of sponsorship,
c. sponsorship levels available and the specific level selected by the sponsor identified,
d. benefit to the district stated,
e. recognition benefit to the sponsor stated (display, type, location, size, design, content, and duration),
f. articulation of how the sponsorship is intended to operate (what the parties will do, how long the agreement is in effect, conditions that shall terminate the agreement, statement on exclusivity if applicable).
B) The sponsorship agreement is approved by the General Manger, or designee. The approval tier inside THPRD will be: less than $\$ 10 \mathrm{k}$ - programmers; less than $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ management team; less than \$150k - General Manager; \$150k and over - Board of Directors.
C) The sponsorship agreement is executed in writing by the district and the sponsor. The district's signing authority is consistent with the district's approval authority.

## RECOGNITION BENEFITS FOR SPONSORS

The district's willingness to provide recognition benefits for sponsors shall not be construed in any way to be an endorsement of the sponsor's goods or services by the district, or any proprietary interest of the sponsor in the district.

Recognition benefits for the sponsor are negotiated and detailed in a specific sponsorship agreement. The district generally will offer a choice of sponsorship levels, with appropriate recognition benefits tied to each level. General guidelines include:
A) All sponsor recognition materials, including but not limited to banners, signs, brochures, cards, posters, newsletters and labels on products such as t-shirts must be approved by the district.
B) The district will provide established areas for temporary recognition at outdoor park facilities when relevant, e.g., fenced ball field area, skate park, play area; and at indoor recreation centers.
C) An unlimited number of corporate recognition and logos printed on "walk-away" products, e.g., t-shirts, water bottles, note pads, is acceptable. Visual impact will need to be approved by the district when THPRD logo is also present.

The district's marketing department must approve the use of the district's logo by the sponsor if the district logo is proposed by a sponsor for use in the sponsor's business publications and/or marketing materials. All district logo use must be associated only with the specific area of district operations the sponsor is supporting.

## SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENTS

All sponsorship offers shall be the subject of a sponsorship agreement.

## PRIVATE SPONSORSHIPS
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Date: March 7, 2011
Adopted by: Doug Menke
General Manager
Signature: $\qquad$
Date:

Supersedes Policy: Not applicable<br>Implemented by: Bob Wayt<br>Director of Communications \& Outreach

Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

## PURPOSE

To create procedures in order to carry out District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 as adopted by the Board of Directors.

## POLICY

Operating procedures will be enacted to ensure compliance with Board of Directors policies.

## DEFINITIONS

All sponsorships must adhere to the definitions of classifications of District properties established in the Comprehensive Plan.

The following definitions apply specifically to this sponsorship procedure:

- ADVERTISING, the activity of attracting the public's attention to a particular product or service.
- CORPORATE SLOGAN, a word or phrase that may be attached to a corporate name or logo.
- DONATIONS, the provision of in-kind goods and/or money for which no benefits are sought.
- INTERPRETIVE SIGN, a sign within a park or building that interprets natural, historic, and/or cultural features.
- LOGO, a symbol or name that is used to brand an organization.
- PLAQUE, a flat memorial plate containing information that is either engraved or in bold relief.
- RECOGNITION BENEFITS, opportunities given to the sponsor to have its name/logo appear on park property or materials for a specified period of time.
- SIGN, a structure that is used to identify a specific park, to convey directions to park users, and/or to inform them of the relevant regulations and other pertinent information.
- SPONSORSHIP, financial or in-kind support from an individual or corporation for a specific service, program, facility, park or event in return for certain benefits.
- SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT, the legal instrument that sets out the terms and conditions the parties have agreed to.


## SPONSORSHIP PROPOSALS

A. A proposed sponsorship should generally relate (where possible) to the intent of the facility or subject park and its master plan.
B. Sponsorships cannot be made conditional on Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District's performance.
C. The mission of a sponsorship organization should not conflict with the mission of Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District.
D. Sponsorships should provide a positive and desirable image to the community.
E. Sponsorship benefits offered should be commensurate with the relative value of the sponsorship.
F. Operating costs associated with the sponsor's proposal should not exceed $10 \%$ of the value of the proposal.
G. Individual sponsors should not limit Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District's ability to seek other sponsors.
H. Recognition benefits to be offered will not compromise the design standards and visual integrity of the park or facility.
I. An evaluation of the potential sponsor will include, but not limited to:

- Products/services offered.
- Company's record of involvement in environmental stewardship and social responsibility.
- Principles of the company.
- Sponsor's rationale for its interest in Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District.
- Sponsor's expectations.
- Sponsor's timeliness and/or readiness to enter into an agreement.
J. All sponsorship proposals that exceed $\$ 150,000$ must be approved by the District's Board of Directors.


## RECOGNITION OF SPONSORS

A. Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District appreciates all sponsorships that enable it to further its mission.
B. In recognition of a sponsor's contribution, preference will be given to providing a form of recognition that is not displayed within parks.
C. Recognition of a sponsorship shall not suggest in any way the endorsement of the sponsor's goods or services by Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, or any proprietary interest of the sponsor in THPRD.
D. Any physical form of on-site recognition shall not interfere with visitor use or routine facility/park operations.
E. The form of any on-site recognition shall be of an appropriate size and color and shall not detract from the facility/park surroundings or any interpretive message.
F. All sponsorship agreements will be for a defined period of time having regard to the value of the sponsorship and the life of the asset being sponsored.
G. Naming of events and/or facilities within a park or center in recognition of a sponsor is permitted providing such names are subordinate to the name of the park or the center.

- In no case shall a District property or building be permanently named for a business or corporation.
- Facility naming requests will require a Level II public notice consistent with the District's Community Outreach Procedure.


## SPONSORSHIP CATEGORIES

A. Events: Financial or in-kind support for an event organized by Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District on THPRD property.
B. Park/Facility Development: Financial or in-kind support associated with the design and construction of a particular park and recreational facility. Projects within this category will typically be of a one-time nature.
C. Program Delivery: Financial or in-kind support that facilitates the ongoing delivery of a particular District-wide or site-specific program.

## TYPES OF RECOGNITION

A. Sponsors will be provided with a level of recognition that is commensurate with their contribution. In acknowledging a sponsor, preference will be given to an off-site form of recognition that may include one or more of the following:

- A thank you letter.
- The contribution publicized through Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District's website, newsletters, activities guide, and/or media releases, and through the sponsor's corporate newsletter, annual report, and/or website.
- Events such as a press conference, photo opportunity, ground breaking or ribbon cutting ceremony.
- Permanent plaque or sign (permanency is limited to the life of the asset).
- Naming of a particular amenity within a facility or park where the sponsorship covers the majority (>60\%) of the cost of the particular amenity, subject to the terms noted within the District's Naming Policy.
B. Determining Types of Recognition: Decisions as to the type of recognition to be provided to a sponsor shall be the decision of the General Manager, or designee.
C. Determining Design Standards for Various Types of Recognition:
- Design and Location of Temporary Signs and Plaques: Recognition of a sponsor shall be permitted on either a temporary sign or a sign that is of a directional, informative or interpretive nature. In such circumstances the sponsor's name and/or logo shall be designed so that it does not dominate the sign in terms of scale or color. The General Manager, or designee, shall determine approval of a sponsor's name and/or logo on signs, as well as the design and content of plaques.
- The siting and term of temporary signs and plaques shall be determined by the General Manager, or designee.
- Design and Location of Sponsorship Boards: In developing a suitable design, a format should be considered that allows for the recognition of sponsors using small nameplates; plaques or tiles so sponsor details can be added or removed easily.
- The General Manager, or designee, shall determine the location of sponsorship boards within facilities.
- Design and Information Requirements for Website: The General Manager, or designee, shall determine the design and information to be posted on the District's website as it relates to sponsor recognition.


## SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENTS

All sponsorship offers shall be the subject of a sponsorship agreement.

## PRIVATE SPONSORSHIPS

## TERMINATING SPONSORSHIPS

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District reserves the right to terminate any sponsorship should conditions arise during the life of that sponsorship that results in the sponsorship conflicting with this policy or the sponsorship is no longer in the best interests of Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District. Decisions to terminate a sponsorship shall be made by the General Manager, or designee, and will not include the return or reimbursement of funds or asset improvements.

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Sponsorships are an important way in which Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District can obtain additional resources to support the pursuit of its mission. However, sponsorships may come with unintended consequences and, as such, all sponsorship offers need to receive careful consideration. On occasion Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District may need to reject a sponsorship offer. Circumstances under which this may occur include, but are not limited to:

- The potential sponsor seeks to impose conditions that are inconsistent with Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District's mission, values, policies, and/or planning documents.
- Acceptance of a potential sponsorship would create a conflict of interest or policy, e.g., a sponsorship from a tobacco company.
- The potential sponsor is in litigation with the District.
- The decision to reject a sponsorship, or to recommend rejection to the Board of Directors, shall be at the sole discretion of the General Manager or his designee.


## Memorials and Tributes on District Property

## X.XX.XX

Date:
Adopted by: Doug Menke
General Manager
Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

Supersedes Policy:<br>Implemented by: Geoff Roach<br>Director of Community Partnerships

Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

## PURPOSE

To create procedures in order to carryout District Compiled Policies Chapter 8 as adopted by the Board of Directors.

## POLICY

Operating procedures will be enacted to ensure compliance with Board of Directors policies.

## INTENT

The Greater Beaverton area is enriched by the beauty and function of THPRD's properties. While memorials and tributes may augment the experience offered, THPRD's properties remain a very precious commodity. It is THPRD's primary responsibility to preserve the quality of experience for all users when attending to applicant requests for appropriate memorials and tributes. Therefore, memorials and tributes will be approved only when to THPRD's satisfaction it has been determined that the addition of the memorial or tribute does not overly burden the user experience or the district's ability to serve the park and recreation system.

## DEFINITIONS

All memorials and tributes must adhere to the definitions of classifications of district properties established in the Comprehensive Plan. The following definitions apply specifically to this memorial and tributes policy and related procedures.

Memorials: Constitute items or objects placed within district properties with the intent to preserve the memory of a deceased person(s). Since memorial related to military service takes place exclusively at Memorial Park, people interested in memorializing a loved one's military contribution should contact the Beaverton American Legion Post \#124.

Tributes: Constitute items or objects placed within district properties with the intent to acknowledge the contributions to THPRD made by living people who have had a demonstrated ten year or longer history of positive impact for THPRD.

Applicant: The originator of a memorial or tribute request who has filed an application for review and approval with the THPRD General Manager's Office.

## CRITERIA

This policy is provided to encourage appropriate memorials and tributes that:

- Recover costs in a manner consistent with THPRD's Comprehensive Plan and Service and Financial Sustainability Analysis.
- Are sensitive to all park users.
- Are sensitive to design standards and master plans that guide THPRD's parks improvements.
- Are sensitive to the long-term cost of maintenance and the allocation of maintenance
resources; e.g. funds, people, and expertise.
- Are sensitive to district-identified improvement needs of district properties.
- Are sensitive to timeframe. THPRD commitments to memorial or tribute will survive until such time that replacement is necessary. Replacement will only be considered if applicant reapplies by submitting a new application to the General Manager's Office, and then it is not guaranteed.

Memorials and Tributes deemed most acceptable under this policy will be those that are readily considered traditional park amenities contributing to THPRD's system of parks and recreation. A catalogue of such amenities is provided.

The district reserves the right to remove, at the district's expense, a memorial or tribute if the person(s) for whom the memorial or tribute was erected turns out to be disreputable or subsequently acts in a disreputable way. Furthermore, at any time should THPRD determine that a memorial or tribute is no longer suitable or suitably located, THPRD at its discretion may elect to relocate a memorial or tribute or permanently remove it from district property. No refund will be made to the applicant.

## GUIDELINES

Memorial and tribute opportunities derive from THPRD priorities:

- THPRD will maintain a list of district properties that are available and most suitable for memorials and tributes.
- THPRD will maintain a list of district properties that are closed to further memorials and tributes.
- THPRD will maintain a catalogue of traditional park amenities most suitable to the intent of this policy on memorials and tributes. A request that THPRD considers a park improvement may be treated as "a significant portion of an otherwise named park". The request may support naming rights and will therefore be addressed in the policy regarding Naming of District Property.
- THPRD will maintain a memorials and tributes application form. The form will be made available on line or by requesting a physical form at THPRD Administrative Offices, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, Oregon 97006. 503-645-6433.


## PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF MEMORIALS AND TRIBUTES

- Applicants will complete an application and submit the application to the General Manager's Office.
- The General Manager's office will review.
- The General Manager will either:
o call to engage applicant and clarify matters on the application request, or
o will designate an appropriate THPRD employee to engage an initial review with applicant.
- The General Manager, or designee, will meet with the applicant and review the proposed location and design elements for the memorial or tribute.
- The General Manager, or designee, will convene THPRD's Memorial and Tribute Internal Review Team. The team convenes twice annually to review applications that meet the criteria. Therefore, applicants may wait up to six months for the review to initiate.
o THPRD's Memorial and Tribute Internal Review Team includes, but is not limited to, key staff representing:
- Maintenance
- Parks programming
- Planning and design
- Finance
- THPRD's Memorial and Tribute Internal Review Team will recommend approval, denial, or modification of the application to the General Manager.
- The General Manager will make the final decision (and can halt the review and decision making process at any time by denying the application).
- The General Manager's office will notify the applicant in writing regarding his/her decision. Approving or denying any memorial or tribute is wholly within the discretion of THPRD and no individual or organization has any right to make any improvement or place any item(s) on district properties without written approval.

Once a memorial or tribute is approved.

- In the event a design professional is engaged by either applicant or THPRD, the cost is born by the applicant. THPRD is to be involved in creating the scope of work and in approving all design phases of the memorial or tribute.
- Memorials or tributes requiring permits and approvals from additional jurisdictions are discouraged and will generally result in early General Manager denial.
- All installation of tributes and memorials on district properties will be performed by THPRD employees or THPRD designated contractors. The cost of installation, and all that attends installation, is born by the applicant.
- All improvements made to a public space on district properties become the property of THPRD and are subject to the laws, policies, and procedures that govern the THPRD system of parks and recreation.


## Memorials and Tributes on District Property

## Memorial \& Tribute Application

Please contact the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Administrative Offices at 503-6456433 and 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, Oregon 97006 if you are interested in establishing a memorial or tribute. THPRD maintains a policy on memorials and tributes, a list of sites within the district where memorials and tributes are available, and a list where they are not, and a catalogue of preferred park amenities that are most welcome by the district when considering memorials and tributes. Occasionally families may not be sure who to contact or may forget to provide notice when establishing these gifts. This can cause confusion for your donors and our staff. If you have an interest in establishing a memorial or tribute please provide the information requested below. We are happy to accommodate requests to meet your needs but such requests require prior approval by THPRD.

Date:
Honoree's Name: $\qquad$
Family Contact or Memorial Organizer's Name: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
City, State, Zip Code: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$
Email: $\qquad$
Type of Tribute or Memorial To Be Established:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Special Notes or Instructions:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Catalogue of THPRD preferred park amenities for memorials and tributes with pricing.

## Park Amenities



Memorial Tree Plantings $\$ 1,500$ (this needs to be tied to THPRD cost recovery)


Memorial Plaques \$250-\$1,000 (this needs to be tied to THPRD cost recovery )

## MEMO

DATE: January 26, 2015
TO: $\quad$ The Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager

## RE: $\quad$ General Manager's Report for February 2, 2015

## State Legislative Minimum Wage Increase Proposal

There are currently two bills in the legislature to increase minimum wage. One bill proposes an increase to $\$ 12.20$ by 2017 and the other proposes an increase to $\$ 15.00$ by 2018. District staff has calculated the financial impact of the proposed minimum wage increases for both bills under two different methods. The first method is simply raising all of the positions that are below the proposed minimum wage levels to the new minimum. The impact based on this calculation is over $\$ 500,000$ for a $\$ 12.20$ wage and $\$ 1.6$ million for a $\$ 15.00$ wage. The second method attempts to preserve some wage equity by increasing wages across the part-time rate ranges. The top part-time wage is kept constant, but the bottom is brought up to the new minimum and the whole chart is compressed (smaller step increases and differences between grades). The impact based on this calculation is approximately $\$ 1.5$ million for a $\$ 12.20$ wage and $\$ 2.7$ million for a $\$ 15.00$ wage. We have provided the potential impacts by each department to the superintendents and they have compiled lists of service level impacts or fee increases that would be necessary to absorb the cost increases. We will continue to monitor these bills to determine their potential impact in their final form (whatever that may be) and will keep the board appraised of their status.

## Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

The following dates are proposed for the board of directors and budget committee's meeting schedule over the next few months:

- Mid-Year Budget Review Meeting - Monday, February 23
- March Regular Board Meeting - Monday, March 2
- April Regular Board Meeting - Monday, April 13
- Budget Committee Work Session - Monday, April 20
- May Regular Board Meeting - Monday, May 4
- Budget Committee Meeting - Monday, May 18
- June Regular Board Meeting - Monday, June 8
- June Budget Adoption Meeting - Monday, June 22


# Management Report to the Board February 2, 2015 

Communications \& Outreach

Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Outreach

1. A cross-functional team of THPRD employees developed a marketing plan to promote sales of the district's new Deluxe Pass, which was rolled out to the public on January 1. The plan offered the pass for a three-month trial period at the discounted rate of $\$ 99$ (more than $30 \%$ off the regular $\$ 145$ fee). THPRD staff used email blasts, social media advertising and other means to interest patrons in the offer. As of mid-January, more than 500 passes had been sold at the discounted rate.
2. Registration for spring programs starts March 7. As usual, the district will use a variety of communications tools to market THPRD programs to the public, including direct mail, website, social media, e-newsletter and ads. Meanwhile, staff are working to produce the summer activities guide, which is due out in late March.

Community Partnerships<br>Geoff Roach, Director of Community Partnerships

1. Campaign developments:
a. Foundations
i. In January, staff updated Oregon Community Foundation and a Californiabased family foundation on campaign progress. Decisions from each are anticipated in the coming few weeks.
ii. Application submittal schedule for emerging foundations is understood.
2. Working with a targeted list of emerging foundations now.
b. Individual donor prospects
i. Calls and meetings with donor prospects continue.
ii. Donors with gift pledges due in 2014 were invoiced in early December. Nearly all pledges were received on time. The remaining few outstanding pledges are being addressed now.
c. A design charrette was held in early January and targeted input from front-line health providers serving people with disabilities and injuries. Information from the meeting was provided to the planning and design team for SW Quadrant Community Park.

## Aquatics

Sharon Hoffmeister, Superintendent of Aquatic Program Services

1. New Year's resolutioners are continuing with their fitness goals as fitness class attendance remains strong. Response to the new Deluxe Pass has been favorable. Deluxe Pass sales in January 2015 exceeded the former Aquatics Fitness pass sales from January 2014. We will continue to check in with our customers to get their feedback on the new pass and the flexibility they now have with the variety of services available to them in one pass.

Maintenance<br>Jon Campbell, Superintendent of Maintenance Operations

1. Playground equipment upgrades are complete at Valley Park East. Maintenance staff recently replaced two 50-year-old metal climber pieces and the playground chips with repurposed play equipment and new chips. During previous playground upgrades over the years, staff salvaged and upgraded a tire-swing from Carolwood Park and a slide from Wonderland Park to replace the climbers. Hardware and some parts were replaced on both pieces to ensure several years of safe play and value life for each of the new pieces.
2. Planned maintenance projects at several facilities are complete. The Cedar Hills Recreation Center, Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center, Garden Home Recreation Center, Nature Center, Beaverton Swim Center and Harman Swim Center were all recently impacted with either a temporary partial or full closure so that planned capital replacement projects and preventative maintenance services could be performed.
3. The Parks Maintenance department realigned several parks in the southeast and southwest work zones. In an effort to provide more efficient service delivery, primary goals of reducing fuel use and miles traveled continue to be a priority. Department supervisors will review fuel and mileage reports each quarter with their staff.

## Natural Resources \& Trails Management

Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources \& Trails Management

1. Natural Resources Functional Plan. With the recent board adoption of the plan, staff has been incorporating its goals into 2015/16 fiscal year planning. Staff will also be giving a presentation about the plan at the annual Portland Urban Ecology Symposium in February.
2. Nature Center Maintenance. The facility was spruced up in mid-January. Floors in the lobby and Beaver Den were refinished, the concrete floors in both interior restrooms were resealed, and portions of the interior were painted.
3. Roger Tilbury Memorial Park. The nature play area opened and has been popular with Nature Center programs as well as local children busy exploring and building stick forts.

Planning \& Development
Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning \& Development

1. Trails Functional Plan: Staff continues to be fully engaged with the Trails Advisory Committee on the Trails Functional Plan (TFP). The committee has held two extra work sessions in addition to their monthly regular meetings to work on the TFP. Staff has also met with the Maintenance department, internal staff team, and contacted local agencies to discuss concepts and coordinate planning efforts. Staff is anticipating a neighborhood meeting in the spring to gather community input which will be incorporated into the plan.
2. SDC Methodology \& Administrative Procedures Guide Update: Staff had previously worked on updating sections of the SDC Administrative Procedures Guide. There is also a need to update the SDC Methodology, which was last updated in 2007. With the need for both to be updated, staff has begun contacting consultants to find a firm that can update both SDC elements at the same time. Since the consultant's work will be related to SDCs, staff will include a line item in the FY 2015/16 budget. The funding source for this line item will be taken from the SDC undesignated projects fund in the SDC budget.

## Programs \& Special Activities

Lisa Novak, Superintendent of Programs \& Special Activities

1. The Request for Proposal for an ADA Access Audit of Facilities and Property and Accompanying Transition Plan was advertised with the Daily Journal of Commerce on January 12, 2015.
2. Volunteer Services and Special Events staff is contacting artists to book for the Summer Concert Series.

## Recreation

Eric Owens, Superintendent of Recreation

1. As of January 20, the new Deluxe Pass sales at all three recreation centers have exceeded fitness revenue from pass sales compared to fall 2014 fitness class revenue. Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center's group fitness classes (including aquatic fitness) have seen an increase of 15 to $50 \%$ due to the new Deluxe Pass. Fitness staff is reporting favorable comments from most participants who enjoy the flexibility and are trying new classes.
2. The Garden Home Recreation Center gymnastics program has over 250 kids registered for winter term classes, a 50\% increase in registrations from fall 2014.

## Security Operations

## Mike Janin, Superintendent of Security Operations

1. Our partnership with local law enforcement agencies continues to be very successful. Below is an example of our involvement in the last three months of 2014.

- Beaverton Police: Superintendent of Security Operations spoke at new officer recruit academy on Park Patrol as resource for calls in parks.
- Washington County Dispatch: spoke at annual dispatcher training - four sessions using Park Patrol for service calls on district property.
- Hillsboro Police: gave permission to use abandoned houses on district property for $\mathrm{K}-9$ training.


## Sports

Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports

1. Fields: 2015 tournaments have been scheduled and assigned field use, communicated with the requestors, and any adjustments are in progress. There is a slight increase in requests for events this year. Allocation meetings for Spring 2015 field use are in process.
2. Tennis: The single-payer rate plan has been in place since January 1. Both tennis air structures are fully operational, some minor repairs remain to be completed in the summer.
3. Program development: A programming summit will be held February 4 at Providence Park. Staff will engage with a wide range of area service and program providers to develop a comprehensive program for people with disabilities.

## Business Services

Cathy Brucker, Finance Manager
Nancy Hartman Noye, Human Resources Manager
Mark Hokkanen, Risk \& Contract Manager
Seth Reeser, Operations Analysis Manager
Phil Young, Information Services Manager

1. The Risk \& Contract department is working with the other departments in providing an online training system to our employees. SafePersonnel is a leading online training and compliance management system that delivers and documents training of every staff member. With over 50 compliance training courses written by the nation's leading experts available, this system allows for unlimited customized trainings specific to THPRD to be added. We are confident this will provide an increased safety environment for both employees and patrons.
2. The Leadership Academy remains popular. Participants in Tier III, session III, completed their case study work in support of THPRD goals and presented their final projects and implementation plans to the management team on January 14. Tier IV, a consultant-led attribute development program, is also underway. Participants met with their executive coach, reviewed the results of their 360-degree assessments, and created individual development plans during the month of January. Enrollment for Tier II, session IV, began in January and is expected to reach the class maximum; course work will begin in April. The next Tier I enrollment will take place in August.
3. The Information Services department has completed initial setup of the virtual desktop infrastructure project budgeted for in the IS capital improvement budget. The department has started to build out the private cloud environment; the full implementation of this project is scheduled to take three years.
4. The first round of Business Plan submissions has been completed. Twenty-three business plans impacting the FY 2015/16 goal outcomes have been submitted through our Business Plan Teams (Programs, Maintenance, Natural Resources and Trails, Sustainability and Communications). Business Plans will be finalized and approved by the end of February for inclusion in the FY 2015/16 proposed budget.
5. THPRD's Wellness Committee is kicking off the New Year with a great incentive to "get lean in 15." The committee is hosting THPRD's third "Biggest Loser" contest for employees, which began January 20 and will continue for three months. Entry is free and completely voluntary. Prizes will be awarded to the six participants who lose the largest percentage of their body weight during the duration of the contest. Thirty-two full-time and regular parttime employees are participating.

Quarterly Grant Report
FY 2013/14 \& FY 2014/15

| Potential <br> Funding <br> Source | Coordinator | Amount <br> Requested | Purpose | Date <br> Submitted | Due Date | Decision Date | Outcome | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OPRD Recreation <br> Trails Program | Brad <br> Hauschild | \$109,200 | Waterhouse Trail Improvements at John Marty Park | 7/25/2014 | 6/4/2014 | January, 2015 | Denied |  |
| Oregon Parks \& Rec <br> Dept Local <br> Government Grant | Brad <br> Hauschild | \$40,000 | Terra Linda Park picnic pavilion | 4/4/2014 | 4/4/2014 | September, $2014$ | Denied |  |
| Oregon Parks \& Rec <br> Dept Local <br> Government Grant | Brad <br> Hauschild | \$212,500 | Roger Tilbury Memorial Park Phase 2 | 4/4/2014 | 4/4/2014 | September, $2014$ | Denied |  |
| Oregon Parks \& Rec Dept Land \& Water Conservation Fund | Brad Hauschild | \$50,000 | Raleigh Park picnic pavilion | 3/28/2014 | 3/28/2014 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { September, } \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | Denied |  |
| Metro Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Grant | Nancy <br> Chase/Aisha <br> Willits | \$136,435 | Assistance in property acquisition to expand Lilly K. Johnson Woods Natural Area | 1/24/2014 | 1/24/2014 | June, 2014 | Awarded | Would add to a previous grant awarded for the same purpose |
| ArtPlace America | Bruce <br> Barbarasch | \$198,000 | Art \& artist workshops for Nature Revealed Project | 12/13/2013 | 12/13/2013 | 2/14/2014 | Denied |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODOT } \\ & \text { ConnectOregon V } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Brad Hauschild | \$600,000 | Waterhouse Trail \#4 construction | 11/22/2013 | 11/25/2013 | August, 2014 | Denied |  |
| WCVA Tourism Grant | Bruce <br> Barbarasch | \$45,000 | Discovering Nature through Art | 8/26/2013 |  | Spring, 2014 |  | Asked to revise, will wait to resubmit |

[^1]
## February



## March



## April



## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

Through 12/31/2014

| rough 12/31/2 | 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 Complete 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) |  |  |

## GENERAL FUND

## IVISION

QAY House Rend PROJECTS Challenge Grant Compeetitive Fund Signage Master Plan
Fanno Creek Trail Man
Pedestrian Pathways (7 sites)
Concrete Sidewalks ( 6 sites $)$
Stuhr Parking Lot Crack
ADA Wonderland Park Playstructure cmp
Playstructure - Wonderland Park
FC Greenway Erosion Solution
Aqua Climb
Aquatic Center Dive Tower Louvers
Jenkins Lead Abatement (Main House) G-Max Testing Unit
HMT Tennis Center Ro
Info System Workstations \& Notebooks Jenkins Estate Irigation FCSC Remodel
Energy Savings Performance Contract Phase 2
ATHLETIC FACILITY REPLACEMENT Synthetic Turf - Aloha High
Carolwood Park-Bracking \& Crack Repair
Somerset Park Hitting Wall
TOTAL ATHLETIC FACILITY REPLACEMENT
ATHLETIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENT
Summercrest Park Tennis Baak
ASC Power Door Operator
GH ADA Sidewalk Addition
McMillan Park ADA Components
TOTAL ATHLETIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENT
PARK AND TRAIL REPLACEMENTS
Play Equipment (2 sites)
Irrigation \& Drainage System Repairs
Trash Cans in Parks
Dog Bag Dispensers
Canopies
Burnsidge
Burnsidge Park Picnic Table
Portable Toilet Enclosures (5)
Asphalt Path Replacement \& Repairs (6 sites)
Concrete Sidewalks (4 sites) \& Curbing (2 sites)
Signage (various sites)
PARK AND TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS
Memorial Benches
ODOT Grant-Westside Trail\#18 easement
Opinionator - Patron Feedback
Raleigh Park Shelter- LWCF Gran
Terra Linda Park Shelter-LGGP Gran
Roger Tillury Phase 2 -LGGP Grant

| 100,000 | 1,800 | - | 100,000 | 1,800 | 87,371 | - | 1,800 | Budget | 89,171 | 1,800 | 10,829 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45,000 | 45,000 |  | 45,000 | 45,000 |  |  | 45,000 | Budget | 45,000 | 45,000 |  |  |
| 75,000 | 53,000 | - | 75,000 | 53,000 | 70,108 | 30,913 | 18,322 | Award | 119,343 | 49,235 | (44,343) | 3,765 |
| 62,000 | 20,400 | - | 62,000 | 20,400 | 39,409 | 2,638 | 17,762 | Budget | 59,809 | 20,400 | 2,191 |  |
| 88,414 | 88,414 | - | 88,414 | 88,414 | 67,063 |  | - | Complete | 67,063 |  | 21,351 | 88,414 |
| 50,200 | 50,200 |  | 50,200 | 50,200 | 27,875 | 8,000 | - | Complete | 35,875 | 8,000 | 14,325 | 42,200 |
| 26,666 | 16,166 | - | 26,666 | 16,166 | 10,500 | 16,166 | - | Complete | 26,666 | 16,166 | - |  |
| 13,200 | 13,200 |  | 13,200 | 13,200 | 13,200 |  |  | Complete | 13,200 |  |  | 13,200 |
| 113,000 | 113,000 | - | 113,000 | 113,000 | 98,806 | 5,584 | - | Complete | 104,390 | 5,584 | 8,610 | 107,416 |
| 75,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 135,000 | 120,000 | 41,972 | 53,944 |  | Complete | 95,916 | 53,944 | 39,084 | 66,056 |
| 9,180 | 9,180 |  | 9,180 | 9,180 |  |  | 9,180 | Budget | 9,180 | 9,180 |  |  |
| 9,500 | 9,500 | - | 9,500 | 9,500 | - |  | 9,500 | Budget | 9,500 | 9,500 |  | - |
| 9,000 | 9,000 | - | 9,000 | 9,000 | - | - | 9,000 | Budget | 9,000 | 9,000 |  |  |
| 14,000 | 14,000 | - | 14,000 | 14,000 |  |  |  | Canceled |  |  | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| 868,000 | 868,000 | - | 868,000 | 868,000 | 1,723 | 2,055 | 864,222 | Budget | 868,000 | 866,277 |  | 1,723 |
| 67,000 | 35,000 | - | 67,000 | 35,000 | 32,213 |  | 35,000 | Budget | 67,213 | 35,000 | (213) |  |
|  |  | - |  |  | 1,778 | 2,275 |  | Complete | 4,053 | 2,275 | $(4,053)$ | $(2,275)$ |
| 132,000 | - | - | 132,000 | - | 94,235 | 20,143 | 2,670 | Award | 117,048 | 22,813 | 14,952 | (22,813) |
| 674,736 |  | - | 674,736 | - | 416,486 |  | 40,300 | Award | 456,786 | 40,300 | 217,950 | $(40,300)$ |
| 2,431,896 | 1,405,860 | 60,000 | 2,491,896 | 1,465,860 | 1,002,738 | 141,718 | 1,052,756 |  | 2,197,212 | 1,194,474 | 294,684 | 271,386 |
|  |  | 160,000 | 160,000 | 160,000 |  | 156,310 | - | Complete | 156,310 | 156,310 | 3,690 | 3,690 |
|  |  | 91,000 | 91,000 | 91,000 |  | 86,926 | 4,240 | Award | 91,166 | 91,166 | (166) | (166) |
|  |  | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 |  |  | 19,106 | Award | 19,106 | 19,106 | $(3,106)$ | $(3,106)$ |
|  |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | 7,450 |  | Complete | 7,450 | 7,450 | 2,550 | 2,550 |
|  |  | 277,000 | 277,000 | 277,000 | - | 250,686 | 23,346 |  | 274,032 | 274,032 | 2,968 | 2,968 |
|  |  | 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 | - | - | 6,500 | Budget | 6,500 | 6,500 | - | - |
|  |  | 2,183 | 2,183 | 2,183 | - | - | 2,183 | Budget | 2,183 | 2,183 | - | - |
|  |  | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 |  | 9,000 |  | Complete | 9,000 | 9,000 |  |  |
|  |  | 20,300 | 20,300 | 20,300 | - |  | 20,300 | Budget | 20,300 | 20,300 | - |  |
|  |  | 37,983 | 37,983 | 37,983 | - | 9,000 | 28,983 | Budget | 37,983 | 37,983 | - |  |
|  |  | 87,468 | 87,468 | 87,468 | - | 22,579 | 64,889 | Budget | 87,468 | 87,468 | - |  |
|  |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | 14,832 | 10,168 | Budget | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | - |
|  |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | - |  | 5,000 | Budget | 5,000 | 5,000 | - |  |
|  |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,128 |  | Complete | 10,128 | 10,128 | (128) | (128) |
|  |  | 2,860 | 2,860 | 2,860 |  | 2,600 | - | Complete | 2,600 | 2,600 | 260 | 260 |
|  |  | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |  | 2,500 | - | Complete | 2,500 | 2,500 |  |  |
|  |  | 4,500 | 4,500 | 4,500 |  | 2,815 | - | Complete | 2,815 | 2,815 | 1,685 | 1,685 |
|  |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | - |  | 5,000 | Budget | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  |
|  |  | 172,707 | 172,707 | 172,707 |  | 175,107 | 24,662 | Award | 199,769 | 199,769 | $(27,062)$ | $(27,062)$ |
|  |  | 38,117 | 38,117 | 38,117 | - | 36,499 |  | Complete | 36,499 | 36,499 | 1,618 | 1,618 |
|  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - | 22,589 | 15,887 | Award | 38,476 | 38,476 | 1,524 | 1,524 |
|  |  | $\xrightarrow{26,400}$ | 26,400 | 26,400 | - | 984 | 25,416 | Budget | 26,400 | 26,400 | - |  |
|  |  | 419,552 | 419,552 | 419,552 | - | 290,633 | 151,022 |  | 441,655 | 441,655 | (22,103) | (22,103) |
|  |  | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | 2,374 | 5,626 | Budget | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | - |
|  |  | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | - | 2,246 | 147,754 | Budget | 150,000 | 150,000 | - | - |
|  |  | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | 1,360 | 1,140 | Budget | 2,500 | 2,500 |  | - |
|  |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | - |
|  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
|  |  | 212,500 | 212,500 | 212,500 | - | - | 212,500 | Budget | 212,500 | 212,500 | - | - |

# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District 

Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

Through 12/31/2014

| Description | Project Budget |  |  |  |  | Project Expenditures |  | Estimated Total Costs |  |  |  | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 | Basis of Estimate | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Project } \\ \text { Cumulative }\end{array}$ | Current Year | Project Cumulative | Current Year |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (1+3) | (2+3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (4+5+6) | (5+6) |  |  |
| CHALLENGE GRANTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Program Faciility Challenge Grants |  |  | 97,500 | 97,500 | 97,500 |  | 14,726 | 82,774 | Budget | 97,500 | 97,500 |  |  |
| total challenge grants |  |  | 97,500 | 97,500 | 97,500 |  | 14,726 | 82,774 |  | 97,500 | 97,500 |  |  |
| BUILDING REPLACEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cardio/Weight Room Equipment Replacement |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
| Aquatic Center Roof |  |  | 800,000 | 800,000 | 800,000 |  | 18,774 | 781,226 | Budget | 800,000 | 800,000 |  |  |
| Aquatic Center Pool Deck |  |  | 267,250 | 267,250 | 267,250 |  |  | 267,250 | Budget | 267,250 | 267,250 |  |  |
| Aquatic Center Resurface Pool \& Tile Repair |  |  | 241,803 | 241,803 | 241,803 |  | 1,920 | 239,883 | Budget | 241,803 | 241,803 |  |  |
| Aquatic Center Electronic HVAC Controls |  |  | 115,485 | 115,485 | 115,485 |  | 6,658 | 108,827 | Budget | 115,485 | 115,485 |  |  |
| Aloha Main Circulation Pump Platform |  |  | 7,450 | 7,450 | 7,450 |  |  | 7,450 | Budget | 7,450 | 7,450 |  |  |
| Replacement Pump/Motor (2) |  |  | 24,600 | 24,600 | 24,600 |  | 2,400 | 22,200 | Budget | 24,600 | 24,600 |  |  |
| Diatomaceous Earth Fltr Cvrs-2 |  |  | 5,775 | 5,775 | 5,775 |  | 7,059 |  | Complete | 7,059 | 7,059 | $(1,284)$ | $(1,284)$ |
| Beaverton Pool Gutter-line |  |  | 5,600 | 5,600 | 5,600 |  | 6,090 |  | Complete | 6,090 | 6,090 | (490) | (490) |
| Aquatic Center Gutters, Chm Cntrir, Drain Covers |  |  | 18,236 | 18,236 | 18,236 |  | 7,513 | 10,723 | Budget | 18,236 | 18,236 |  |  |
| Aquatic Center 16' Dive Board |  |  | 8,613 | 8,613 | 8,613 |  | 8,241 |  | Complete | 8,241 | 8,241 | 372 | 372 |
| Aloha Splash Water Slide |  |  | 5,471 | 5,471 | 5,471 |  |  | 3,935 | Award | 3,935 | 3,935 | 1,536 | 1,536 |
| Harman Lane Anchors |  |  | 6,290 | 6,290 | 6,290 |  | 6,290 |  | Complete | 6,290 | 6,290 |  |  |
| Lookout Platform Chair |  |  | 7,132 | 7,132 | 7,132 |  | 5,615 |  | Complete | 5,615 | 5,615 | 1,517 | 1,517 |
| Aloha Portable Slide |  |  | 5,470 | 5,470 | 5,470 |  |  | 5,470 | Budget | 5,470 | 5,470 |  |  |
| AC Track Drinking Fountain |  |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |  | 645 |  | Complete | 645 | 645 | 355 | 355 |
| Schlotmann Hot Water Heater |  |  | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 |  | 514 |  | Complete | 514 | 514 | 586 | 586 |
| Cedar Hills Boiler Room Drains |  |  | 2,760 | 2,760 | 2,760 |  | 2,760 |  | Complete | 2,760 | 2,760 |  |  |
| CRAC Weld Boiler Heat Exchanger Pipes |  |  | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |  | 87 | 1,913 | Budget | 2,000 | 2,000 |  |  |
| AC Shower Mixers \& Parts |  |  | 1,600 | 1,600 | 1,600 |  | 1,575 |  | Complete | 1,575 | 1,575 | 25 | 25 |
| NPIC Interior Restroom Sinks \& Parts |  |  | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 |  |  | 1,100 | Budget | 1,100 | 1,100 |  |  |
| SSC Asbestos Abatement \& Recover Piping |  |  | 9,200 | 9,200 | 9,200 |  |  | 9,200 | Budget | 9,200 | 9,200 |  |  |
| Carpet (2 sites) |  |  | 5,210 | 5,210 | 5,210 |  | 960 | 4,250 | Budget | 5,210 | 5,210 |  |  |
| Interior Paint (2 sites) |  |  | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |  | 171 | 1,829 5 | Budget | 2,000 5 | 2,000 5 |  |  |
| NPIC Reseal Ceramic Tile Flooring |  |  | 6,000 17400 | 6,000 17400 | $\begin{array}{r}6,000 \\ 17400 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 6.537 | 5,320 11,182 1,08 | Award Award | 5,320 17719 | 5,320 17719 | 680 (319) | 680 (319) |
| GH Tile Floor Replacement |  |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |  |  | 1,000 | Budget | 1,000 | 1,000 | (3) |  |
| AC Gym Wood Floors Screening/Resurfacing |  |  | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 |  | 10,160 |  | Complete | 10,160 | 10,160 | 340 | 340 |
| NPIC Interior Restrooms Flooring |  |  | 4,500 | 4,500 | 4,500 |  |  | 4,319 | Award | 4,319 | 4,319 | 182 | 182 |
| Stuhr Ctr ice Machine |  |  | 2,050 | 2,050 | 2,050 |  | 899 |  | Complete | 899 | 899 | 1,151 | 1,151 |
| AC Socket Plates, Relamp \& Blinds |  |  | 10,674 | 10,674 | 10,674 |  | ${ }^{8,356}$ |  | Complete | ${ }_{8}^{8,356}$ | ${ }_{8}^{8,356}$ | 2,318 | 2,318 |
| TC Relamp / Washer\& Dryer |  |  | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |  | 5,213 | 2,887 | Budget | 7,500 | 7,500 |  |  |
| Harman Window Shades |  |  | 1,611 | 1,611 | 1,611 |  | 1,890 |  | Complete | 1,890 | 1,890 | (279) | (279) |
| Furnace (2 sites) |  |  | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |  |  | 7,500 | Budget | 7,500 | 7,500 |  |  |
| Adm Office Rooftio Unit \& Duct Heater |  |  | 13,648 | 13,648 | 13,648 |  |  | 13,648 | Budget | 13,648 | 13,648 |  |  |
| AC HVAC Electrical Repairs |  |  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |  |  | 4,000 | Budget | 4,000 | 4,000 |  |  |
| NPIC Exterior Restrooms HVAC Fans |  |  | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |  | 1,934 |  | Complete | 1,934 | 1,934 | 566 | 566 |
| Camp Riv Upper Pavilion Exterior Painting |  |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |  |  | 1,000 | Budget | 1,000 | 1,000 |  |  |
| CH Downspouts Replacement |  |  | 2,510 | 2,510 | 2,510 |  | 2,510 |  | Complete | 2,510 2 | 2,510 2,500 |  |  |
| Fanno Farmhouse Picket Fence |  |  | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |  | 482 | 2,018 | Budget | 2,500 | 2,500 |  |  |
| Gutters (2 s sites) |  |  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |  |  | 4,000 | Budget | 4,000 | 4,000 |  |  |
| Greenway Park - Paint Structure \& Replace Gutters |  |  | 3,100 | 3,100 | 3,100 |  | 3,479 |  | Complete | 3,479 | 3,479 | ${ }^{(379)}$ | ${ }^{(379)}$ |
| JEN Roof \& Veranda Repairs |  |  | 5,200 | 5,200 | 5,200 |  | ${ }^{6,488}$ | 1,000 | Budget | 7,488 | 7,488 | $(2,288)$ |  |
| Tallac Terrace Park Play Pad Roof Repair |  |  | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |  | 1,710 |  | Complete | 1,710 | 1,710 | 290 | 290 |
| ASC Exterior Painting |  |  | 14,889 | 14,889 | 14,889 |  |  | 14,889 | Budget | 14,889 | 14,889 |  |  |
| NPIC Entrance Light Replacement \& Interior Relamp Fanno Farmhouse ADA Ramp |  |  | 1,500 19,000 | 1,500 19,000 | 1,500 19,000 |  |  | 1,500 19,000 | Budget Budget | 1,500 19,000 | 1,500 19,000 |  |  |
| FCSC Roof Repairs \& Consultation |  |  | 18,096 | 18,096 | 18,096 |  | - | 18,096 | Budget | 18,096 | 18,096 | - |  |
| AC Alcove Roof |  |  | 11,500 | 11,500 | 11,500 |  | 12,412 |  | Complete | 12,412 | 12,412 | (912) | (912) |
| JEN Stable Septic Tank |  |  | 19,000 | 19,000 | 19,000 |  | 21,950 | - | Complete | 21,950 | 21,950 | $(2,950)$ | $(2,950)$ |
| AC Compressor Replacement @ Stuhr Ctr |  |  |  |  |  | - | 5,449 | - | Complete | 5,449 | 5,449 | $(5,449)$ | (5,449) |

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budge

## Through 12/31/2014

|  | Project Budget |  |  |  |  | Project Expenditures |  | Estimated Total Costs |  |  |  | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Prior Year Budget Amount | Budget Carryover to Current Year | New Funds <br> Budgeted in Current Year | Cumulative Project Budget | Current Year Budget Amount | $\underset{\text { Years }}{\text { Expended Prior }}$ | 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) |  |  |
| Fanno Farmhouse Sewer Line |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{3,873}$ |  | Complete | ${ }^{3,873}$ | ${ }^{3,873}$ | $(3,873)$ | $(3,873)$ |
| 50 Mtr Pool Circulation Pump |  |  | - |  |  |  | 7,453 | - | Complete | 7,453 | 7,453 | $(7,453)$ | $(7,453)$ |
| Tennis Air Structures Reconst. |  |  | - |  |  |  | 34,684 | $(33,684)$ | Award | 1,000 | 1,000 | $(1,000)$ | $(1,000)$ |
| CRA Boiler Valve Replacement |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,845 |  | Complete | 3,845 | 3,845 | $(3,845)$ | $(3,845)$ |
| total building replacements |  |  | 1,778,323 | 1,778,323 | 1,778,323 |  | 216,596 | 1,582,330 |  | 1,795,082 | 1,795,082 | $(16,759)$ | $(16,759)$ |
| BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FCSC Safety Shower for HAZMAT Locker |  |  | 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 |  |  | 6,325 | Award | 6,325 | 6,325 | 175 | 175 |
| HMT Comm \& Dev - Front Office Improvement |  |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  | 5,000 | Budget | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  |
| Administration Office Reconfiguration |  |  | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 |  | 147,940 | 16,660 | Award | 164,600 | 164,600 | (54,600) | $(54,600)$ |
| TOTAL BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS |  |  | 121,500 | 121,500 | 121,500 | - | 147,940 | 27,985 |  | 175,925 | 175,925 | (54,425) | (54,425) |
| TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY DIVIIION | 2,431,896 | 1,405,860 | 3,254,858 | 5,686,754 | 4,660,718 | 1,002,738 | 1,077,279 | 3,406,217 |  | 5,482,389 | 4,479,651 | 204,365 | $\stackrel{\text { 181,067 }}{ }$ |

## information services department

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENTS

Server Replacements
LAN/WAN Replacement
PrintersNNetwork Printers
TOTAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENTS
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS
Misc. Application Software
Workstation and Phone
Kronos Upgrade
Virtual Desktop Infrastructure
FCSC Server Rack/UPS
FCSC Server Room Security
TOTAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT total information systems department

| 8,500 | 8,500 | 8,50 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| 55000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 5,000 | 5,000 | $5,0,5$ |
|  | 53,500 | 53,500 |


| 8,500 | - | 987 | 7,513 | Budget | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 55,000 | - | 30,836 | - | 10,488 | Award | 41,325 |
| 5,000 | - | 5,000 | Burget | 51,325 |  |  |
| 5,000 | - | 5,000 | Budget | 5,000 | 500 |  |


| $(6,325)$ |
| :---: |
| - |
| - |

MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

## FLEET REPLACEMENTS

## $72 "$ Mowers (3) Tire Balancer

Electric Utility Vehicle
$52^{\prime \prime}$ Mowers (2)
$52^{\text {" Mower \& } 2 \text { 2 }}$ Trailers
Large Rotary Mowe
4x4 SUV Hybrid
Chipper
total fleet replacements
BUILDING MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENTS CHRC Vacuums \& Battery Packs
Conestoga Floor Scrubber
Suhr Center Wet Dry Vacuu
TC Sweeper Batteries \& Parts
NPIC Pressure Washer \& Wand
TOTAL BLDG MAINT EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENTS
BUILDING MAINTENANCE IMPROVEMENT
Preventive Drain Emergency Response
Data Collection Tablets
TOTAL BULLDING MAINT IMPROVEMENTS
total maintenance department
grand total general fund

| 11,340 | 11,340 | 11,340 | - |  | 11,340 | Budget | 11,340 | 11,340 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,200 | 1,200 | 1,200 | - | 985 | - | Complete | 985 | 985 | 215 | 215 |
| 12,540 | 12,540 | 12,540 |  | 985 | 11,340 |  | 12,325 | 12,325 | 215 | 215 |
| 264,240 | 264,240 | 264,240 | - | 156,294 | 103,380 |  | 259,674 | 259,674 | 4,566 | 4,566 |
| 3,720,898 | 6,152,794 | 5,126,758 | 1,002,738 | 1,370,876 | 3,580,277 |  | 5,950,046 | 4,947,307 | 202,748 | 179,451 |

# Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District 

Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

## Through 12/31/2014



## SDC FUND

LAND ACQUISITION

| Land Acquisition (FY 14) | 790,000 | 790,000 | - ${ }^{-}$ | 790,000 | 790,000 | - | 3,361 | 786,639 | Budget | 790,000 | 790,000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Acquisition - North Bethany |  | - | 1,670,168 | 1,670,168 | 1,670,168 | - |  | 1,670, 168 | Budget | 1,670,168 | 1,670, 168 | - |  |
| Summer Falls Property Acquisition |  |  | 329,832 | 329,832 | 329,832 |  | 329,832 |  | Complete | 329,832 | 329,832 |  |  |
| TOTAL LAND ACQUIIITİN | 790,000 | 790,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,790,000 | 2,790,000 | - | 333,193 | 2,456,807 |  | 2,790,000 | 2,790,000 | - |  |
| DEVELOPMENTIMPROVEMENT PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fanno Creek Trail / Scholls Greenwood Inn | 2,011,950 | 60,000 | - | 2,011,950 | 60,000 | 1,946,487 | 7,965 | 52,035 | Budget | 2,006,487 | 60,000 | 5,463 |  |
| Bonny Slope / BSD Trail Development | 175,000 | 175,000 | 325,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 |  |  | 500,000 | Budget | 500,000 | 500,000 |  |  |
| MTIP Grant Match - Westside Trail \#18 | 82,205 | 19,275 | 201,125 | 283,330 | 220,400 | 73,266 | 12,177 | 208,223 | Budget | 293,666 | 220,400 | $(10,336)$ |  |
| Graf Meadows Park - Trail Connection | 600,000 | 447,500 |  | 600,000 | 447,500 | 143,244 | 323,610 | 123,890 | Budget | 590,744 | 447,500 | 9,256 |  |
| Future Dog Park Construction - Site to be determined | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  |
| Fanno Creek Trail - Hall Blvd Crossing | 384,250 | 35,500 | 50,000 | 434,250 | 85,500 | 176,753 | 292 | 85,208 | Budget | 262,253 | 85,500 | 171,997 |  |
| Timberland Park - Project Management | 34,000 | 17,750 |  | 34,000 | 17,750 |  | 15,034 | 2,716 | Budget | 17,750 | 17,750 | 16,250 |  |
| Jackie Husen Park Expansion - Planning |  | - | 83,500 | 83,500 | 83,500 |  | 31,456 | 52,044 | Budget | 83,500 | 83,500 | - |  |
| Connect OR Grant / Waterhouse Trail Segment 4 |  |  | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |  |  | 200,000 | Budget | 200,000 | 200,000 |  |  |
| LWCF Grant / Raleigh Park Shelter |  | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | - |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 | - |  |
| LGGP Grant / Terra Linda Park Selter |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
| LGGP Grant / Roger Tilbury Park Phase 2 |  |  | 212,500 | 212,500 | 212,500 |  |  | 212,500 | Budget | 212,500 | 212,500 |  |  |
| Bethany Creek Falls 1 \& 2 - Project Management |  |  | 120,500 | 120,500 | 120,500 |  | 7,451 | 113,049 | Budget | 120,500 | 120,500 | - |  |
| Bethany Terrace Trail \#11 - Project Management |  |  | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 |  |  | 10,500 | Budget | 10,500 | 10,500 |  |  |
| New Neighborhood Park Master Plans (2) |  |  | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |  |  | 150,000 | Budget | 150,000 | 150,000 | - |  |
| New Neighborhood Park Development |  |  | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |  |  | 1,500,000 | Budget | 1,50,000 | 1,500,000 |  |  |
| SW Quadrant Community Center - Site Feasability |  |  | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 |  |  | 60,000 | Budget | 60,000 | 60,000 |  |  |
| Natural Area Master Plan |  | - | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |  |  | 100,000 | Budget | 100,000 | 100,000 | - |  |
| Undesignated Projects |  | - | 2,742,793 | 2,742,793 | 2,742,793 |  |  | 2,742,793 | Budget | 2,742,793 | 2,742,793 | - |  |
| TOTAL DEVELOPMENT/IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS | 3,337,405 | 805,025 | 5,845,918 | 9,183,323 | 6,650,943 | 2,339,750 | 397,985 | 6,252,958 |  | 8,990,693 | 6,650,943 | 192,630 |  |
| GRAND TOTAL SDC FUND | 4,127,405 | 1,595,025 | 7,845,918 | 11,973,323 | 9,440,943 | 2,339,750 | 731,178 | 8,709,765 |  | 11,780,693 | 9,440,943 | 192,630 |  |

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { KEY } & & \\ \text { Budget } & \text { Estimate based on original budget - not started and/or no basis for change } \\ \text { Deferred } & \text { Some or all of Project has been eliminated to reduce overall capital costs for year. }\end{array}$
Award Estimate based on Contract Award amount or quote price estimate

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

## Through 12/31/2014

|  |  |  | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  | Variance |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Quad- } \\ \text { rant } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Project } \\ & \text { code } \end{aligned}$ | Description | Initial Project Budget | Adjustments | Current Total Project Budget FY 14/15 | Expended Prior Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Total Expended to Date | Estimated Cost to Complete | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basis of } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \text { (Completed } \\ \text { Phase) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { Cumulative Cost } \end{gathered}$ | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { Expended to } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { Expended } \\ \text { to Total Cost } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (1+2)=(3) | (4) | (5) | $(4+5)=(6)$ | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | $(3-9)=(10)$ | (6) / 3 ) | (6)/(9) |

BOND CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND

| SE | 91-901 | $\frac{\text { New Neighborhood Parks Development }}{\text { AM Kennedy Park \& Athletic Field }}$ | 1285250 |  | 1335720 | 886.530 |  | $1,686.530$ |  | moter | 886 | (350,810) | 126.3\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sw | 91-902 | Barsotti Park \& Athletic Field | ${ }_{1}^{1,285,250}$ | 27,134 | 1,312,384 | 1,258,105 |  | 1,258,105 |  | Complete | 1,258,105 | 54,279 | 95.9\% | $100.0 \%$ $100.0 \%$ |
| NW | 91-903 | Hansen Ridge Park (formerly Kaiser Ridge) | 771,150 | 16,035 | 787,185 | 753,743 |  | 753,743 |  | Complete | 753,743 | 33,442 | 95.8\% | 100.0\% |
| sw | 91-904 | Roy Dancer Park | 771,150 | 16,308 | 787,458 | 651,272 |  | 651,272 |  | Complete | 651,272 | 136,186 | 82.7\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 91-905 | Roger Tilibury Park | 771,150 | 19,335 | 790,485 | 291,348 | 527,990 | 819,338 | 100,042 | Bid Award | 919,380 | (128,895) | 103.7\% | 89.1\% |
|  |  | Total New Neighborhood Parks Development | 4,883,950 | 129,282 | 5,013,232 | 4,640,998 | 527,990 | 5,168,988 | 100,042 |  | 5,269,030 | (255,798) | 103.1\% | 98.1\% |
|  |  | Authorized Use of Savings from Bond Issuance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | Administration Category | - | 255,798 | 255,798 | - |  |  |  | N/A |  | 255,798 | n/a |  |
|  |  | Total New Neighborhood Parks Development | 4,883,950 | 385,080 | 5,269,030 | 4,640,998 | 527,990 | 5,168,988 | 100,042 |  | 5,269,030 |  | 98.1\% | 98.1\% |
|  |  | Renovate \& Redevelop Neighborhood Parks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE | 91-906 | Cedar Mill Park, Trail \& Athletic Fields | 1,125,879 | 29,166 | 1,155,045 | 304,437 | 599,154 | 903,591 | 138,255 | Bid Award | 1,041,846 | 113,199 | 78.2\% | 86.7\% |
| SE | 91-907 | Camille Park | 514,100 | 28,634 | 542,734 | 585,471 |  | 585,471 |  | Complete | 585,471 | $(42,737)$ | 107.9\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 91-908 | Somerset West Park | 1,028,200 | 27,247 | 1,055,447 | 154,298 | 5,393 | 159,691 | 2,290,304 | A ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 2,449,995 | $(1,394,548)$ | 15.1\% | 6.5\% |
| NW | 91-999 | Pioneer Park and Bridge Replacement | 544,934 | 21,059 | 565,993 | 533,358 |  | 533,358 |  | Complete | 533,358 | 32,635 | 94.2\% | 100.0\% |
| SE | 91-910 | Vista Brook Park | 514,100 | 20,452 | 534,552 | 733,500 |  | 733,500 |  | Complete | 733,500 | (198,948) | 137.2\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Total Renovate \& Redevelop Neighborhood Parks | 3,727,213 | 126,558 | 3,853,771 | 2,311,064 | 604,547 | 2,915,611 | 2,428,559 |  | 5,344,170 | $(1,490,399)$ | 75.7\% | 54.6\% |
|  |  | New Neighborhood Parks Land Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NW | 98-880-a | New Neighborhood Park - NW Quadrant (Biles) | 1,500,000 | 28,467 | 1,528,467 | 1,041,404 |  | 1,041,404 | - | Complete | 1,041,404 | 487,063 | 8.1\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 98-880-b | New Neighborhood Park - NW Quadrant (Living Hope) |  |  |  | 1,060,935 | 6,789 | 1,067,724 |  | Complete | 1,067,724 | (1,067,724) | n/a | 100.0\% |
| NW | 98-880-c | New Neighborhood Park - NW Quadrant (Mitchell) |  |  |  | 36,849 | 686,989 | 723,838 |  | Complete | 723,838 | (723,838) | n/a | 100.0\% |
| NW | 98-880-d | New Neighborhood Park - NW Quadrant (PGE) |  |  |  | 62,712 |  | 62,712 |  | Complete | 62,712 | (62,712) | n/a | 100.0\% |
| NE | 98-745-a | New Neighborhood Park - NE Quadrant (Wilson) | 1,500,000 | 27,735 | 1,527,735 | 525,108 | 2,965 | 528,073 |  | Complete | 528,073 | 999,662 | 34.6\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | New Neighborhood Park - NE Quadrant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE | 98-745-b | (Lehman - formerly undesignated) | 1,500,000 | 31,870 | 1,531,870 | 2,094,725 | - | 2,094,725 |  | Complete | 2,094,725 | $(562,855)$ | 136.7\% | 100.0 |
|  |  | New Neighborhood Park - SW Quadrant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sw | 98-746-a | (Sterling Savings) | 1,500,000 | 24,453 | 1,524,453 | 1,058,925 |  | 1,058,925 |  | Complete | 1,058,925 | 465,528 | 69.5\% | $100.0 \%$ $100.0 \%$ |
| SW | 98-746-b | New Neighborhood Park - SW Quadrant (Altishin) |  |  |  | 546,751 |  | 546,751 |  | Complete | 546,751 | (546,751) | n/a |  |
| sw | 98-746-c | New Neighborhood Park - SW Quadrant (Hung easement for Roy Dancer Park) |  |  |  | 60,006 |  | 60,006 |  | Complete | 60,006 | $(60,006)$ | n/a | 100.0\% |
| SE | 98-747 | New Neighborhood Park - SE Quadrant (Cobb) | 1,500,000 | 15,547 | 1,515,547 | 2,559,230 | 148 | 2,559,378 |  | Complete | 2,559,378 | $(1,043,831)$ | 168.9\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 98-748 | New Neighborhood Park (North Bethany) (McGettigan) | 1,500,000 | 23,667 | 1,523,667 | 1,629,690 |  | 1,629,690 |  | Complete | 1,629,690 | $(106,023)$ | 107.0\% | 100.0\% |
| UND | 98-749 | New Neighborhood Park - Undesignated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reallocated |  |  | n/a | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Sub-total New Neighborhood Parks | 9,000,000 | 151,739 | 9,151,739 | 10,676,335 | 696,891 | 11,373,226 | - |  | 11,373,226 | (2,221,487) | 124.3\% | 100.0\% |
| UND |  | Authorized Use of Savings from New Community Park Land Acquisition Category | - | 1,655,677 | 1,655,677 | . | . | . | - | N/A | - | 1,655,677 | n/a |  |
|  |  | Authorized Use of Savings from Community Center / Community |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | Park Land Acquisition Category | - | 65,81 | 565,810 | - |  |  |  | N/A |  | 565,810 | n/a |  |
|  |  | Total New Neighborhood Parks | 9,000,000 | 2,373,226 | 11,373,226 | 10,676,335 | 696,891 | 11,373,226 | - |  | 11,373,226 |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | New Community Park Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sw | 92-915 | SW Community Park \& Athletic Field | 7,711,500 | 209,033 | 7,920,533 | 167,374 | 144,358 | 311,732 | 11,343,537 | Master Plan | 11,655,269 | $(3,734,736)$ | 3.9\% | 2.7\% |
|  |  | Sub-total New Community Park Development Outside Funding from Washington County / Metro | 7,711,500 | 209,033 | 7,920,533 | 167,374 | 144,358 | 311,732 | 11,343,537 |  | 11,655,269 | (3,734,736) | 3.9\% |  |
| UND |  | Transferred from Community Center Land Acquisition | - | 384,251 | 384,251 | - |  | - | - | N/A | - | 384,251 | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Total New Community Park Development | 7,711,500 | 593,284 | 8,304,784 | 167,374 | 144,358 | 311,732 | 11,343,537 |  | 11,655,269 | (3,350,485) | 3.8\% | 2.7 |
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|  |  |  | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  | Variance |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Quad- } \\ \text { rant } \end{array}$ | Project <br> Code | Description | Initial Project Budget | Adjustments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Current Total } \\ & \text { Project Budget } \\ & \text { FY 14/15 } \end{aligned}$ | Expended Prior Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Total Expended to Date | Estimated Cost to Complete | Basis of Estimate (Completed Phase) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { Cumulative Cost } \end{gathered}$ | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { Expended to } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { Expended } \\ \text { to Total Cost } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | Community Park Land Acausition | (1) | (2) | (1+2)=(3) | (4) | (5) | $(4+5)=(6)$ | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | $(3-9)=(10)$ | (6) / 3 ) | (6)/(9) |
| NE | 98-881-a | $\frac{\text { New Community Park Land Acquisition }}{\text { New Community Park - NE Quadrant (Teufel) }}$ | 10,000,000 | 132,657 | 10,132,657 | 8,103,899 | - | 8,103,899 | - | Complete | 8,103,899 | 2,028,758 | 80.0\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 98-881-b | Community Park Expansion - NE Quad (BSD/William Walker) |  |  |  | 372,655 | 426 | 373,081 |  | Complete | 373,081 | (373,081) | n/a | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Sub-total New Community Park | 10,000,000 | 132,657 | 10,132,657 | 8,476,554 | 426 | 8,476,980 |  |  | 8,476,980 | 1,655,677 | 83.7\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Authorized Use of Savings for New Neighborhood Parks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | Land Acquisition Category |  | $(1,655,677)$ | $(1,655,677)$ |  |  |  | - | N/A |  | $(1,655,677)$ | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Total New Community Park | 10,000,000 | (1,523,020) | 8,476,980 | 8,476,554 | 426 | 8,476,980 | - |  | 8,476,980 |  | 100.0\% | 00.0\% |
|  |  | Renovate and Redevelop Community Parks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE | 92-916 | Cedar Hills Park \& Athletic Field | 6,194,905 | 166,269 | 6,361,174 | 173,955 | 28,803 | 202,758 | 7,845,471 | AsE | 8,048,229 | $(1,687,055)$ | 3.2\% | 2.5\% |
| SE | 92-917 | Schiffler Park | 3,598,700 | 72,672 | 3,671,372 | 2,647,176 |  | 2,647,176 |  | Complete | 2,647,176 | 1,024,196 | 72.1\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Total Renovate and Redevelop Community Parks | 9,793,605 | 238,941 | 10,032,546 | 2,821,131 | 28,803 | 2,849,934 | 7,845,471 |  | 10,695,405 | $(662,859)$ | 28.4\% | 26.6\% |
|  |  | Natural Area Preservation-Restoration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE | 97-963 | Roger Tilbury Memorial Park | 30,846 | 828 | 31,674 | 1,310 | 34 | 1,344 | 30,330 | Planning | 31,674 |  | 4.2\% | 4.2\% |
| NE | 97-964 | Cedar Mill Park | 30,846 | 835 | 31,681 | 193 | 3 | 196 | 29,960 | Planning | 30,156 | 1,525 | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| NE | 97-965 | Jordan/Jackie Husen Park | 308,460 | 8,275 | 316,735 | 24,317 | 1,789 | 26,106 | 31,294 | Preparation | 57,400 | 259,335 | 8.2\% | 45.5\% |
| NW | 97-966 | NE/Bethany Meadows Trail Habitat Connection | 246,768 | 6,693 | 253,461 |  |  |  | 253,461 | On Hold | 253,461 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-967 | Hansen Ridge Park (formerly Kaiser Ridge) | 10,282 | 243 | 10,525 | 8,186 |  | 8,186 | 4,814 | Planning | 13,000 | $(2,475)$ | 77.8\% | 63.0\% |
| NW | 97-968 | Allenbach Acres Park | 41,128 | 1,094 | 42,222 | 3,514 | 1,000 | 4,514 | 37,076 | Planning | 41,590 | 632 | 10.7\% | 10.9\% |
| NW | 97-969 | Crystal Creek Park | 205,640 | 5,530 | 211,170 | 5,374 | 14 | 5,388 | 107,160 | Preparation | 112,548 | 98,622 | 2.6\% | 4.8\% |
| NE | 97-970 | Foothills Park | 61,692 | 1,143 | 62,835 | 46,178 |  | 46,178 |  | Complete | 46,178 | 16,657 | 73.5\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 97-971 | Commonwealth Lake Park | 41,128 | 759 | 41,887 | 30,809 |  | 30,809 |  | Complete | 30,809 | 11,078 | 73.6\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 97-972 | Tualatin Hills Nature Park | 90,800 | 2,278 | 93,078 | 27,696 |  | 27,696 | 12,716 | Planting | 40,412 | 52,666 | 29.8\% | 68.5\% |
| NE | 97-973 | Pioneer Park | 10,282 | 233 | 10,515 | 7,490 | 5 | 7,495 | 2,952 | Planning | 10,447 | 68 | 71.3\% | 71.7\% |
| NW | 97-974 | Whispering Woods Park | 51,410 | 897 | 52,307 | 48,871 |  | 48,871 | 6,748 | Planting | 55,619 | $(3,312)$ | 93.4\% | 87.9\% |
| NW | 97-975 | Willow Creek Nature Park | 20,564 | 383 | 20,947 | 21,877 |  | 21,877 |  | Complete | 21,877 | (930) | 104.4\% | 100.0\% |
| SE | 97-976 | AM Kennedy Park | 30,846 | 667 | 31,513 | 24,695 | 703 | 25,398 | 7,302 | Planting | 32,700 | $(1,187)$ | 80.6\% | 77.7\% |
| SE | 97-977 | Camille Park | 77,115 | 1,648 | 78,763 | 59,248 | 1,751 | 60,999 | 11,354 | Planting | 72,353 | 6,410 | 77.4\% | 84.3\% |
| SE | 97-978 | Vista Brook Park | 20,564 | 548 | 21,112 | 3,044 |  | 3,044 | 17,456 | Planting | 20,500 | 612 | 14.4\% | 14.8\% |
| SE | 97-979 | Greenway Park/Koll Center | 61,692 | 1,576 | 63,268 | 30,704 | 5,030 | 35,734 | 27,266 | Planning | 63,000 | 268 | 56.5\% | 56.7\% |
| SE | 97-980 | Bauman Park | 82,256 | 1,984 | 84,240 | 30,134 | 19 | 30,153 | 53,179 | Planting | 83,332 | 908 | 35.8\% | 36.2\% |
| SE | 97-981 | Fanno Creek Park | 162,456 | 4,368 | 166,824 | 5,022 | 90 | 5,112 | 160,818 | Planning | 165,930 | 894 | 3.1\% | 3.1\% |
| SE | 97-982 | Hideaway Park | 41,128 | 976 | 42,104 | 30,949 | 2,271 | 33,220 | 8,737 | Planting | 41,957 | 147 | 78.9\% | 79.2\% |
| sw | 97-983 | Murrayhill Park | 61,692 | 1,014 | 62,706 | 65,706 | 6 | 65,712 |  | Complete | 65,712 | $(3,006)$ | 104.8\% | 100.0\% |
| SE | 97-984 | Hyland Forest Park | 71,974 | 1,316 | 73,290 | 58,821 | 3,300 | 62,121 | 8,879 | Planting | 71,000 | 2,290 | 84.8\% | 87.5\% |
| sw | 97-985 | Cooper Mountain | 205,640 | 5,577 | 211,217 | 14 |  | 14 | 211,203 | On Hold | 211,217 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| sw | 97-986 | Winkelman Park | 10,282 | 237 | 10,519 | 5,894 |  | 5,894 |  | Complete | 5,894 | 4,625 | 56.0\% | 100.0\% |
| sw | 97-987 | Lowami Hart Woods | 287,896 | 7,680 | 295,576 | 36,144 | 4,460 | 40,604 | 124,396 | Planning | 165,000 | 130,576 | 13.7\% | 24.6\% |
| sw | 97-988 | Rosa/Hazeldale Parks | 28,790 | 708 | 29,498 | 11,563 | 1,191 | 12,754 | 16,496 | Planting | 29,250 | 248 | 43.2\% | 43.6\% |
| SW | 97-989 | Mt Williams Park | 102,820 | 2,787 | 105,607 | 244 |  | 244 | 105,363 | Planning | 105,607 |  | 0.2\% | 0.2\% |
| SW | 97-990 | Jenkins Estate | 154,230 | 3,309 | 157,539 | 128,915 | 3,786 | 132,701 | 10,876 | Planting | 143,577 | 13,962 | 84.2\% | 92.4\% |
| sw | 97-992 | Morrison Woods | 61,692 | 1.672 | 63,364 | 7,987 |  | 7,987 | 63,364 | On Hold | 63,364 | 2,483 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% 0.0\% |
| UND | 97-993 | Interpretive Sign Network | 339,306 | 8,697 | 348,003 | 159,784 | 107,117 | 266,901 | 72,399 | Sign Fabrication | 339,300 | 8,703 | 76.7\% | 78.7\% |
| NW | 97-994 | Beaverton Creek Trail | 61,692 | 1,673 | 63,365 |  |  |  | 63,365 | On Hold | 63,365 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-995 | Bethany Wetlands/Bronson Creek | 41,128 | 1,116 | 42,244 |  |  |  | 42,244 15841 | On Hold | 42,244 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| NW | 97-996 | Bluegrass Downs Park Crystal Creek | 15,423 | 418 | 15,841 |  |  |  | 15,841 | On Hold | 15,841 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| UND | ${ }_{97-914}$ | Crystal Creek Restoration of new properties to be acquired | 41,128 643,023 | 1,116 17440 | 42,244 660,463 | 598 |  | 598 | 42,244 659,865 | On Hold On Hold | 42,244 660,463 |  | 0.0\% | - $0.1 \%$ |
|  |  | Total Natural Area Restoration | 3,762,901 | 95,906 | 3,858,807 | 885,281 | 132,569 | 1,017,850 | 2,239,158 |  | 3,257,008 | 601,799 | 26.4\% | 31.3\% |
|  |  | Natural Area Preservation - Land Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND | 98-882 | Natural Area Acquisisions | 8,400,000 | 202,355 | 8,602,355 | 3,962,232 | 356,577 | 4,318,809 | 4,283,546 | Budget | 8,602,355 |  | 50.2\% | 50.2\% |
|  |  | Total Natural Area Preservation - Land Acquisition | 8,400,000 | 202,355 | 8,602,355 | 3,962,232 | 356,577 | 4,318,809 | 4,283,546 |  | 8,602,355 |  | 50.2\% |  | Total Natural Area Preserv

New Linear Park and Trail Development
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|  |  |  | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  | Estimated Cost to Complete | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basis of } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \text { (Completed } \\ \text { Phase) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { Cumulative Cost } \end{gathered}$ | Variance <br> Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { Expended to } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { Expended } \\ \text { to Total Cost } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quad- } \\ & \text { rent } \end{aligned}$ | Project Code | Description | Initial <br> Project Budget | Adjustments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Current Total } \\ & \text { Project Budget } \\ & \text { FY 14/15 } \end{aligned}$ | Expended Prior Years | Expended Year-to-Date | Total Expended to Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | $(1+2)=(3)$ | (4) | (5) | $(4+5)=(6)$ | (7) |  | $(6+7)=(9)$ | $(3-9)=(10)$ | (6) / (3) | (6)/(9) |
| SE | 95-944 | Structural Upgrades at Raleigh Swim Center | 4,481 | 6 | 4,487 | 5,703 |  | 5,703 |  | Complete | 5,703 | $(1,216)$ | 127.1\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-945 | Structural Upgrades at Somerset Swim Center | 8,962 | 12 | 8,974 | 9,333 |  | 9,333 |  | Complete | 9,333 | (359) | 104.0\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-950 | Sunset Swim Center Structural Upgrades | 1,028,200 | 16,245 | 1,044,445 | 626,419 |  | 626,419 |  | Complete | 626,419 | 418,026 | 60.0\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-951 | Sunset Swim Center Pool Tank | 514,100 | 275 | 514,375 | 308,574 |  | 308,574 |  | Complete | 308,574 | 205,801 | 60.0\% | 100.0\% |
| UND | 95-962 | Auto Gas Meter Shut Off Valves at All Facilities |  |  |  |  | 118 | 118 | 14,882 | Budget | 15,000 | $(15,000)$ | 0.0\% | 0.8\% |
|  |  | Total Facility Rehabilitation | 6,227,732 | 116,508 | 6,344,240 | 3,300,630 | 45,741 | 3,346,371 | 1,168,696 |  | 4,515,067 | 1,829,173 | 52.7\% | 74.1\% |
|  |  | Facility Expansion and Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE | 95-952 | Elsie Sturr Center Expansion \& Structural Improvements | 1,997,868 | 30,311 | 2,028,179 | 2,039,367 |  | 2,039,367 |  | Complete | 2,039,367 | $(11,188)$ | 100.6\% | 100.0\% |
| sw | 95-953 | Conestoga Rec/Aquatic Expansion \& Splash Pad | 5,449,460 | 83,658 | 5,533,118 | 5,435,930 | - | 5,435,930 |  | Complete | 5,435,930 | 97,188 | 98.2\% | 100.0\% |
| sw | 95-954 | Aloha ADA Dressing Rooms | 123,384 | 158 | 123,542 | 178,764 | - | 178,764 |  | Complete | 178,764 | $(5,222)$ | 144.7\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-955 | Aquatics Center ADA Dressing Rooms | 133,666 | 1,083 | 134,749 | 180,540 | - | 180,540 |  | Complete | 180,540 | $(45,791)$ | 134.0\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-956 | Athetic Center HVAC Upgrades | 514,100 | 654 | 514,754 | 321,821 | - | 321,821 |  | Complete | 321,821 | 192,933 | 62.5\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Sub-total Facility Expansion and Improvements | 8,218,478 | 115,864 | 8,334,342 | 8,156,422 | - | 8,156,422 |  |  | 8,156,422 | 177,920 | 97.9\% | 100.0\% |
| UND |  | Authorized Use of Savings for Deferred Park Maintenance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Replacements Category |  | $(177,920)$ | (177,920) |  |  |  |  | N/A |  | $(177,920)$ | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Total Facility Expansion and Improvements | 8,218,478 | $(62,056)$ | 8,156,422 | 8,156,422 |  | 8,156,422 |  |  | 8,156,422 |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | ADA/Access improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NW | 95-957 | HMT ADA Parking \& other site improvement | 735,163 | 19,029 | 754,192 | 165,254 | 687,633 | 852,887 | 158,565 | Bid Award | 1,011,452 | (257,260) | 113.1\% | 84.3\% |
| UND | 95-958 | ADA Improvements - undesignated funds | 116,184 | 2,663 | 118,847 | 72,245 |  | 72,245 |  | Complete | 72,245 | 46,602 | 60.8\% | 100.0\% |
| sw | 95-730 | ADA Improvements - Barrows Park | 8,227 | 104 | 8,331 | 6,825 | - | 6,825 |  | Complete | 6,825 | 1,506 | 81.9\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-731 | ADA Improvements - Bethany Lake Park | 20,564 | 194 | 20,758 | 25,566 | - | 25,566 |  | Complete | 25,566 | $(4,808)$ | 123.2\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-732 | ADA Improvements - Cedar Hills Recreation Center | 8,226 | 130 | 8,356 | 8,255 | - | 8,255 |  | Complete | 8,255 | 101 | 98.8\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-733 | ADA Improvements - Forest Hills Park | 12,338 | 197 | 12,535 | 23,416 |  | 23,416 |  | Complete | 23,416 | $(10,881)$ | 186.8\% | 100.0\% |
| SE | 95-734 | ADA Improvements - Greenway Park | 15,423 | 196 | 15,619 |  |  |  |  | Cancelled |  | 15,619 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| sw | 95-735 | ADA Improvements - Jenkins Estate | 16,450 | 262 | 16,712 | 11,550 |  | 11,550 |  | Complete | 11,550 | 5,162 | 69.1\% | 100.0\% |
| sw | 95-736 | ADA Improvements - Lawndale Park | 30,846 | 40 | 30,886 | 16,626 |  | 16,626 |  | Complete | 16,626 | 14,260 | 53.8\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-737 | ADA Improvements - Lost Park | 15,423 | 245 | 15,668 | 15,000 |  | 15,000 |  | Complete | 15,000 | 668 | 95.7\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-738 | ADA Improvements - Rock Crk Pwrine Prk (Soccer Fld) | 20,564 | 327 | 20,891 | 17,799 | - | 17,799 |  | Complete | 17,799 | 3,092 | 85.2\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-739 | ADA Improvements - Skyview Park | 5,140 | 82 | 5,222 | 7,075 | - | 7,075 |  | Complete | 7,075 | $(1,853)$ | 135.5\% | 100.0\% |
| NW | 95-740 | ADA Improvements - Waterhouse Powerine Park | 8,226 | 176 | 8,402 | 8,402 | - | 8,402 |  | Complete | 8,402 |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| NE | 95-741 | ADA Improvements - West Sylvan Park | 5,140 | 82 | 5,222 | 5,102 | - | 5,102 |  | Complete | 5,102 | 120 | 97.7\% | 100.0\% |
| SE | 95-742 | ADA Improvements - Wonderland Park | 10,282 | 163 | 10,445 | 4,915 | - | 4,915 |  | Complete | 4,915 | 5,530 | 47.1\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Total ADA/Access Improvements | 1,028,196 | 23,890 | 1,052,086 | 388,030 | 687,633 | 1,075,663 | 158,565 |  | 1,234,228 | $(182,141)$ | 102.2\% | 87.2\% |
| UND |  | Authorized Use of Savings from Bond Issuance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Administration Category |  | 182,141 | 182,141 | - | - |  |  | N/A |  | 182,141 | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Total ADA/Access Improvements | 1,028,196 | 206,031 | 1,234,227 | 388,030 | 687,633 | 1,075,663 | 158,565 |  | 1,234,228 |  | 87.2\% | 87.2\% |
|  |  | Community Center Land Acquisition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | Community Center / Community Park (SW Quadrant) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 98-884-a | (Hulse/BSD/Engel) | 5,000,000 | 103,517 | 5,103,517 | 853,224 | 523,726 | 1,376,950 | - | Complete | 1,376,950 | 3,726,567 | 27.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Community Center / Community Park (SW Quadrant) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND | 98-884-b | (Wenzel/Wall) |  |  |  | 2,322,745 | 29,032 | 2,351,776 | - | Complete | 2,351,776 | $(2,351,776)$ | n/a | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Sub-total Community Center Land Acquisition | 5,000,000 | 103,517 | 5,103,517 | 3,175,969 | 552,758 | 3,728,726 | - |  | 3,728,726 | 1,374,791 | 73.1\% | 100.0\% |
| UND |  | Outside Funding from Washington County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Transferred to New Community Park Development | - | $(176,000)$ | $(176,000)$ | - | - | - | - | N/A | - | $(176,000)$ | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Outside Funding from Metro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | Transferred to New Community Park Development | - | $(208,251)$ | (208,251) | - | - | - | - | N/A | - | $(208,251)$ | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Authorized Use of Savings for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UND |  | New Neighborhood Parks Land Acquisition Category |  | $(565,810)$ | $(565,810)$ |  |  |  |  | N/A |  | (565,810) | n/a | n/a |
|  |  | Total Community Center Land Acquisition | 5,000,000 | $(846,544)$ | 4,153,456 | 3,175,969 | 552,758 | 3,728,726 |  |  | 3,728,726 | 424,730 | 89.8\% | 100.0\% |

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

## Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budge

## Through 12/31/2014



## THPRD Bond Capital Program

## Funds Reprogramming Analysis - Based on Category Transfer Eligibility <br> As of 12/31/2014

Category (Over) Under Budget

Limited Reprogramming
Land: New Neighborhood Park
New Community Park
New Linear Park
New Community Center

Nat Res: Restoration
Acquisition

| 424,730 |
| ---: |
| 424,730 |

601,799

$$
601,799
$$

All Other
New Neighborhood Park Dev
Neighborhood Park Renov
$(1,490,399)$
New Community Park Dev
$(3,350,485)$
Community Park Renov
New Linear Parks and Trails
$(662,859)$

Athletic Field Development
Deferred Park Maint Replace
Facility Rehabilitation
ADA
Facility Expansion
Bond Admin Costs
97,853
(4,042,130)

Grand Total
$(3,015,601)$

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 14, 2015
To: Board of Directors
From: Keith Hobson, Director of Business and Facilities

Re: $\quad$ System Development Charge Report for November 2014
The Board of Directors approved a resolution implementing the System Development Charge program on November 17, 1998. Below please find the various categories for SDC's, i.e., Single Family, Multiple Family 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 November 2014.

| Type of Dwelling Unit | Current SDC per Type of Dwelling Unit |
| :--- | ---: |
| Single Family | $\$ 5,524.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 5,435.62$ |
| Multi-Family | $\$ 4,131.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 4,064.90$ |
| Non-residential | $\$ 143.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 140.71$ |


| City of Beaverton Collection of SDCs |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 2,783 | Single Family Units |
| 15 | Single Family Units at $\$ 489.09$ |
| 1,582 | Multi-family Units |
| 0 | Less Multi-family credits |
| 239 | Non-residential |
| $\mathbf{4 , 6 1 9}$ |  |


| Receipts | Collection Fee | Total Revenue |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 7,970,513.83$ | $\$ 217,760.53$ |  | $\$ 8,188,274.36$ |
| $\$ 7,336.35$ | $\$ 221.45$ | $\$ 7,557.80$ |  |
| $\$ 3,359,442.57$ | $\$ 93,831.20$ | $\$ 3,453,273.77$ |  |
| $(\$ 7,957.55)$ | $(\$ 229.36)$ | $(\$ 8,186.91)$ |  |
| $\$ 556,120.37$ | $\$ 16,296.11$ | $\$ 572,416.48$ |  |
| $\$ 11,885,455.57$ | $\$ 327,879.93$ | $\$ 12,213,335.50$ |  |


| Washington County Collection of SDC |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 7,418 | Single Family Units |
| -300 | Less Credits |
| 2,667 | Multi-family Units |
| -24 | Less Credits |
| 130 | Non-residential |
| $\mathbf{9 , 8 9 1}$ |  |


| Receipts |  | Collection Fee | Total Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 23,175,617.82$ | $\$ 587,225.25$ |  | $\$ 23,762,843.07$ |
| $(\$ 623,548.98)$ | $(\$ 19,285.02)$ | $(\$ 642,834.00)$ |  |
| $\$ 7,071,102.57$ | $\$ 176,369.84$ | $\$ 7,247,472.41$ |  |
| $(\$ 47,323.24)$ | $(\$ 1,463.61)$ | $(\$ 48,786.85)$ |  |
| $\$ 607,235.28$ | $\$ 15,206.38$ | $\$ 622,441.66$ |  |
| $\$ 30,183,083.45$ | $\$ 758,052.84$ | $\$ 30,941,136.29$ |  |


| Receipts | Collection Fee | Total Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$11,885,455.57 | \$327,879.93 | \$12,213,335.50 |
| \$30,183,083.45 | \$758,052.84 | \$30,941,136.29 |
| \$42,068,539.02 | \$1,085,932.77 | \$43,154,471.79 |


| Recap by Dwelling | Single Family | Multi-Family | Non-Resident | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Beaverton | 2,798 | 1,582 | 239 | 4,619 |
| Washington County | 7,118 | 2,643 | 130 | 9,891 |
|  | $\underline{\underline{9,916}}$ | $\underline{\underline{4,225}}$ | $\underline{\underline{369}}$ | $\underline{\underline{14,510}}$ |
| Total Receipts to Date |  |  | \$42,068,539.02 |  |
| Total Payments to Date |  |  |  |  |
| Refunds |  | (\$2,066,073.93) |  |  |
| Administrative Costs |  | (\$18.65) |  |  |
| Project Costs -- Developme |  | (\$22,152,090.98) |  |  |
| Project Costs -- Land Acquisition |  | (\$9,938,187.93) | (\$34,156,371.49) |  |
|  |  |  | \$7,912,167.53 |  |
| Recap by Month, FY 2014/15 | Receipts | Expenditures | Interest | SDC Fund Total |
| through June 2014 | \$39,401,807.67 | (\$33,486,508.43) | \$2,080,328.32 | \$7,995,627.56 |
| July | \$362,365.38 | (\$20,803.83) | \$3,301.39 | \$344,862.94 |
| August | \$987,171.47 | (\$393,225.74) | \$3,456.91 | \$597,402.64 |
| September | \$249,346.55 | (\$17,712.96) | \$3,674.53 | \$235,308.12 |
| October | \$873,400.03 | $(\$ 68,315.30)$ | \$4,075.89 | \$809,160.62 |
| November | \$194,447.92 | (\$169,805.23) | \$3,793.85 | \$28,436.54 |
| December | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| January | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| February | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| March | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| April | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| May | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| June | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
|  | \$42,068,539.02 | (\$34,156,371.49) | \$2,098,630.89 | \$10,010,798.42 |
| Recap by Month, by Unit | Single Family | Multi-Family | Non-Residential | Total Units |
| through June 2014 | 9,738 | 3,809 | 359 | 13,906 |
| July | 47 | 24 | 5 | 76 |
| August | 18 | 217 | 2 | 237 |
| September | 27 | 27 | 2 | 56 |
| October | 52 | 146 | 0 | 198 |
| November | 35 | 1 | 1 | 37 |
| December | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| January | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| February | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| March | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| April | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| May | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 9,917 | 4,224 | 369 | 14,510 |

Projected SDC balance as of June 30, 2014 per the budget was $\$ 6,458,262$. Actual balance was $\$ 7,635,896$. This fiscal year's projected total receipts per the budget are $\$ 2,982,681$.

## Events... Just for Seniors!

## @EIsie Sturh Center <br> Call and register today! 503.629.6342. <br> Photography Gallery Exhibit Over 65 stunning photos all taken by students from our photography class. Display is exhibited down the main corridors the month of January of the Elsie

Sample of art dry-brushed method-by instructor Kumi Pickford

## Stuhr Center.

Ever wanted to learn photography or expand your skills? Consider taking this great class. New term begins 1/14/15 9-10:30a.
Try something this new this New Year!

## Art Class-Oil Portraits

 Have fun learning this dry-brushing method of painting. The technique was developed by Russian artist in the Soviet Union era. Class begins 1/15/15.
## Active Aging Week

Monday-Saturday, 1/5-1/10
FREE!
Discover new places and people. This year's theme - Let the Adventure Begin - encourages par-
ticipants to explore life's many possibilities. Whether it's tai chi, dancing, brain games, or picking up a new hobby. This week you will be able to try a new fitness class for free. Check our front desk for a complete listing of activities, dates and times. Make sure to pick-up your free pass at front desk.



Active Aging class offered the Elsie Sturh Center

## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District: connecting people, parks and nature

> Jan. 1 changes will benefit fitness buffs, other THPRD users

Effective Jan. 1, 2015, THPRD is implementing changes that will benefit many fitness enthusiasts, military families, and participants who live outside district boundaries.
The district is taking a new approach to its group fitness programming, dropping the preregistration requirement for more than 200 weekly group classes, including yoga, Pilates, Zumba, BodyPump and aqua fitness classes. (Elsie Stuhr Center and Tualatin Hills Nature Center patrons may still preregister for some group fiteess programs.) The district's new Deluxe Pass allows patrons to participate in group fitness classes at any
facility whenever space permits. It provides up to two hours of free childcare at participating facilities, and also includes access to pools, weight rooms, cardio equipment and other drop-in benefits included with the Gencral Pass (formerly Frequent User Pass).
"We wanted to introduce a more user-friendly model to give guests better access to all of our facilities," said Sharon Hoffmeister, superintendent of Aquatics. "The more you use it, the lower your cost per visit, and there's nothing lost when you don'i go."
The Deluxe Pass for an adult (ages 18-57) can be purchased monthly for $\$ 51.50$ or at a discounted rate for periods of three, six or 12 months. Daily admission to a fitness class, without the childcare benefit, is $\$ 10$ for in-district adults.
To encourage more participation by out-of-district residents, THPRD is introducing an option


THPRD's new Deluxe Pass enables patrons to participate in group fitness classes without preregistration.
that lets them choose to pay a $25 \%$ premium for each class taken, instead of the required assessment ( $\mathbf{\$ 8 0}$ quarterly or $\$ 320$ annually). This option will apply to all classes as well as General Passes, Deluxe Passes, and drop-in activities.

THPRD also now allows out-of-district residents to begin registering two days after indistrict residents. Previously, the waiting period was six days. THPRD is also introducing a $10 \%$ discount for military personnel (including veterans) and
dependent family members. "The idea of a discount for military personnel is one that has been discussed here at THPRD for a long time," said Director of Planning Aisha Willits. "We are pleased to finally make it happen and honor them and their families for their service to our nation." In addition, the district will begin implementing a five-year schedule to standardize, at $10 \%$, larger discounts currently provided to seniors, youth, and patrons with special needs. Reduction of current discounts will be carried out over a multiyear period.


## Get in Touch with Nature

Beaverton boasts two premier nature parks, perfect for a rainy day or brisk, cool-weather walk. The Tualatin Hills Nature Center ( 15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton) has 1.5 miles of paved paths and 3.5 miles of soft-surface trails, and is easy to access via the MAX light rail.

In southern Beaverton, Cooper


Mountain Nature Park (18892 SW Kemmer Road, Beaverton) has majestic views of the valley and 3.5 miles of trails that traverse through different habitats, from woodlands and forests to prairies.

## Park, school districts

 agree on synthetic field

By ERIC APALATEGUI
The Times
The Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation and Beaverton School districts reached a third agreement that will continue to increase the number of synthetic grass athletic fields, which can hold up to wet season games when cleats turn natural fields to muck.

Just before winter break, the agencies signed off on construction of the artificial grass field at Conestoga Middle School, 12250 S.W. Conestoga Drive, in the southern end of the school district.

Construction will occur during summer 2016 at an estimated cost of $\$ 2$ million. The park district will pay for the project with bond funds voters approved in 2008.

The middle school will use the field during regular hours, and the park district will have access after school and on weekends.

The first 12 years of the 25 -year agreement are guaranteed, but school officials can move the field at their own expense after that time if they need space for school expansion. School officials consider that option unlikely, said park district spokesman Bob Wayt.

Intergovernmental agreements between the districts

## THPRD purchases land for parks

The Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District in December bought two parcels to use for future parks.

The first site is 0.89 acres that will increase the size of an already planned 20 -acre community park next to Mountain View Middle School. That parcel, at a cost of $\$ 509,000$, will provide more frontage and better access from Southwest 170th Avenue when construction begins in 2016, according to Aisha Willits, the district's planning director.

The district also bought three parcels totaling 2.56 acres northwest of the intersection of Southwest Tualatin Valley Highway and 185th Avenue. That acreage, bought for $\$ 700,000$, will be developed into a community park that will include Oregon's first "Champions Too" sports field designed specifically for people with special needs.

That project is not yet scheduled, Willits said.

Both purchases were funded with the district's 2008 bond measure, which is roughly two-thirds spent.
stretch back 50 years to 1964 . Joint projects also will bring synthetic turf fields to Mountain View Middle School in Aloha and William Walker Elementary School in Cedar Hills during the next couple years.
"Our community benefits greatly when we work together to create enhanced spaces for athletic activities," Beaverton School District Superintendent Jeff Rose said in a news release.

Combined, the park district's patrons already have at least part-time use of 10 artificial grass athletic fields, including two each at the Howard M. Terpenning Recreation Complex and Portland Community College's Rock Creek Campus and one at the Fanno Creek Service Center. During non-school hours, similar facilities are available at the school district's five largest high schools.
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## NEWS

## THPRD puts down $\$ 1.2$ million on land for Aloha park development

## By Nuran Altelr

nalteiregorgonian_com
Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District has closed two separate deals on Aloha properties that collectively cost more than $\$ 1$ million.
One site, purchased for $\$ 509,000$, is located next to Mountain View Middle School. The .89 -acre lot will become pat of a 20 -acre community parkthat will offer sports fields, olay equipment, a perimeter rail, picnic faclities and, if pri-
vate funding can be secured, The district also purchased Oregon's first "Champions Too" three parcels of land totaling sports field for special needs 2.56 acres northwest of 185th athletes, according to a press and the Tualatin Valley Highrelease,

THPRD is scheduled to begin "This is a flat, partially work on the park, currently wooded site that will one day known as Southwest Quadrant be developed as a neighborCommunity Park, in 2016. The hood park, "THPRD director of THPRD board unanimously approved the preferred master plan for this park at its Nov. 3 meeting. The $\$ 7.5$-million budgeted project is expected to be completed Fall 2017.

Funding for these parcels of and was provided by THPRD's 2008 voter-approved $\$ 100-\mathrm{mil}$ lion bond.



# City wants to speak language of its residents 

## By Nuran Alteir <br> Beaverton Leader

A Beaverton city staff that reflects the people it represents has been six years in the making.
It's not something that happens overnight, said Guadalupe Guajardo, senior consultant at the Nonprofit Association of Oregon, which helped the city with one of its first reports on setting priorities for cultural inclusion.

That report was completed in 2012, and was followed by a similar report by the Center for Public Service the following year. Among a list of recommendations, both highlighted one key issue: language access.
"People have a right to access resources because they are a member of our community, despite barriers such as language," said Alexis Ball, the city's equity outreach coordinator.
Beaverton's demographics have been changing for years.

Since 1990, it's estimated the percentage of white residents living in Beaverton has decreased 24 percent, according to U.S. Census Bureau data for 2013, while every minority group has grown.

The face of Beaverton city staff, however, has changed slightly. As of Jan. 5, Beaverton's human resources department reported 10.47 percent of city staff were a person of color, a 2.17 percent gain from 2007.
"There's been interest and will; I don't think there's been a lot of capacity to put in place a plan. We can't just wish that we get more diverse staff," Ball said. "We have to plan for it."

A concrete plan for cultural inclusion has been talked about since 2009, when the Diversity Task Force was created to advise the mayor's office on diversity and equity.
"The history has been really important in getting us

See Language, A3

## Language

Continued from A1
to where we are today; I don't think we're starting over," Ball said, referring to the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan, which the City Council unanimously passed on Jan. 13

The plan will serve as a road map for strategies such as "adopting and implanting a language access policy" or "creating a centralized city budget live for contracting professional translation and interpretation services."
These objectives, outlined in the first section of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan, are important for breaking down barriers for people who speak limited English, Ball said.

Almost 1 in 4 Beaverton residents were born outside of the U.S., according toa report called Examining Racial Disparities in Beaverton, which Ball wrote while doing her Master's at Portland State University; 1 in 3 people living in the city identify as a person of color.

Looking at language, 28 percent of Beaverton residents speak a language other than English. " 12.5 percent were reported to speak English less than 'very well,' " according to the report. More than 80 percent of those people speak Spanish or an Asian Pacific Islander language, making up a little more than 10 percent of the overall population.
"Compare how communities of color are doing versus the dominant white community in Beaverton ... and there's a huge difference. That's heartbreaking, and it's unjust," Ball said.

The report, published June

2014, lists some of those disparities, such as families of color having 3.5 times the rate of poverty as white families or students of color being 2.5 times more likely to drop out of high school.
"We need to actively break down institutional barriers to people being successful. ... We can't ignore it, and there's no way to explain it away," Ball said.

Currently, most language access programs have focused on the Latino population, which made up about 16.3 percent of Beaverton residents in 2010, according to the 2000 and 2010 Census Profile. Pay incentives at the city, for example, are only offered to people who use Spanish on the job.
Ball said that's because of usage: Data shows that "of limited-English speakers, 46 percent speak Spanish. ... It's a much greater number than any of the other languages; it doesn't mean there isn't a need for other languages."

Currently, 18 city employees at the library, police department and city hall receive translator pay, according to city spokesman Bill LaMarche. City staff also volunteer on occasion to help out with translating Arabic, Chinese and Portuguese, among 10 languages other than Spanish.

Regional organizations like Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District also have been working on policy changes to make every demographic feel more included. That means diversifying staff and giving them the tools needed to help people with limited English proficiency.
A Diversity \& Inclusion Vision Statement is expected to go before THPRD board of directors in March.

# Welcome to Beaver Town 

## THPRD learns to live with flooding and tree damage as beavers make a comeback

## By ERIC APALATEGUI

The Times
Big rodents are doing their best to transform Beaverton into Beaver Town.

As the famously industrious animals continue their comeback in the city, their dam-building enterprises have forced the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District to change the way it does business.

While many homeowners occasionally lose precious trees to the toothy mammals, THPRD is besieged with beaver activity because it manages many of the parks and greenspaces bordering creeks that the beavers call home.

Last month, for example, THPRD closed off access to a loop trail in Greenway Park a few hundred yards south of Southwest Hall Boulevard after beavers built a new dam site on Fanno Creek, which in turn caused flooding in the low-lying park, which is located entirely in the creek's floodplain.
"We have some neighbors who are really
See BEAVERS / Page 7


## From page 1

excited to see beavers in the park and others who say, 'Why don't you get rid of those critters?" said Bruce Barbarasch, the district's superintendent of natural resources and trail management.

When Barbarasch first started working for the district about 15 years ago, he only saw occasional signs of beaver activity. Low beaver populations at the time were the result of fur trappers and farmers killing them off for many decades, Barbarasch said. As those practices faded along with the rural landscape, beavers have found plenty of habitat to their liking in the heart of suburbia.

Years ago, the district tried to minimize the damage by trapping out problem beavers, but public outcry and lack of effectiveness caused THPRD to change its approach to one of peaceful, though not perfect, coexistence, Barbarasch said.
"Like some things in life .. you just have to adapt to what you've got," he said. "There are so many beavers, if you were to take one out and move it somewhere else, you would find another one would replace it."

To be sure, beaver activity has many positive effects. Their ponds provide prime habitat for a variety of birds, fish, turtles and amphibians, and the slower stream flows they engineer help filter out sediments, replenish aquifers and reduce erosion.

Plus, the busy beavers offer district patrons a glimpse of nature at work in their neighborhoods. "It hasn't been bad from an educational perspective at all," Barbarasch said.
But those benefits come with a price tag, from the relatively moderate cost of replacing or protecting trees, to the potentially six-figure expense of building bridges and boardwalks over flood-prone areas.
In Greenway Park, for example, park officials haven't yet decided whether to take the costly step of lifting the loop trail above the flooding or simply abandon that part of the path. The larger path on the park's west side is unaffected by beaver activity.
THPRD administrators have faced similar decisions in the past.

Up in the Rock Creek Greenway, for example, the district built an elevated trail to get above a beaver-flooded area. It was costly up front, Barbarasch said, but maintenance costs have gone down since its construction and wildlife habitat has improved.

In the wetlands along Messenger Creek off Southwest Center Street, rather than using a costly fix, the district abandoned a stretch of low-lying path flooded by beaver activity in that area. People still have access to a bridge they can use as a vantage point for watching wildlife, Barbarasch said.

In the Bannister Creek Greenway, beaver activity has been a mixed blessing. On one hand,
flooding has posed access problems along the creek. But on the other hand, beaver dams have slowed the streamflow to provide a natural cure to erosion problems that would have been costly to fix with human solutions.

So far, beavers have defeated most human efforts to outengineer them at dam sites. The nocturnal beavers make short work of replacing dams that people remove. And efforts such as inserting pipes into dams to keep ponds from flooding adjacent ground, or building barriers to discourage dam construction in the first place, are usually undone by determined beavers, Barbarasch said.


[^0]:    Jessica Collins, Recording Secretary

[^1]:    * New information is highlighted.

