Administration Office
503/645-6433

# Board of Directors Regular Meeting 

June 8, 2009

## 6:00 p.m. Executive Session; 7:00 p.m. Regular Meeting HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Meeting Room 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton

## AGENDA



[^0]
## MEMO

DATE: May 29, 2009
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { TO: } & \text { The Board of Directors } \\ \text { FROM: } & \text { Doug Menke, General Manager }\end{array}$
RE: Information Regarding the June 8, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting
Agenda Item \#4 - Presentations
A. Service to Beaverton Awards: Janet Allison \& Leslie Mundt

Attached please find a memo from myself reporting that Janet Allison and Leslie Mundt will be at your meeting to be recognized by the Board of Directors for receiving the City of Beaverton's Service to Beaverton Award.

## B. Tualatin Hills Park Foundation Project Report

Attached please find a memo from the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation reporting that members of the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation's Development Committee will be at your meeting to make a presentation regarding the Foundation's current project, an allaccessible, multi-use field for disabled children and adults.

Agenda Item \#5 - Public Hearing: Second Reading of Ordinance Regarding Park District Rules \& Regulations
Attached please find a memo from Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Development, providing an overview of the materials contained within the information packet. Mike Janin, Superintendent of Security Operations, and Tom Sponsler with Beery, Elsner \& Hammond, LLP, Park District legal counsel, will be at your meeting to answer any questions the Board may have.

Action Requested: Board of Directors approval of the following actions:

1. Conduct a public hearing and Second Reading of the Ordinance Regarding Park District Rules \& Regulations, and
2. Board adoption of Ordinance 2009-01, An Ordinance Adopting District Compiled Policies, Chapter 7, Related to Revised District General Regulations.

Agenda Item \#8 - Consent Agenda
Attached please find Consent Agenda items \#8A-K for your review and approval.
Action Requested: Approve Consent Agenda Items \#8A-K as submitted:
A. Approve: Minutes of May 4, 2009 Regular Meeting
B. Approve: Monthly Bills
C. Approve: Monthly Financial Statement
D. Appoint: Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center Advisory Committee Member
E. Approve: Resolution Regarding Vacation Accruals Adjustment
F. Approve: Performance Compensation Policy Adjustment/Reduction
G. Approve: Washington County Request for Public Utility Easement in Roxie's Place Park
H. Approve: Transfer of System Development Charge Credits from Sexton Crest Park to Timberland Development (Polygon NW)
I. Approve: Telecommunications Site Lease Amendment at Garden Home Recreation Center
J. Approve: General Manager's Employment Contract
K. Approve: Architectural \& Engineering Contracts for Cedar Hills Park, Schiffler Park, and Westside Trail Bond Projects

Agenda Item \#9 - Unfinished Business
A. 2008 Bond Measure

Attached please find a memo from Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, providing an update regarding recent activities centered around the 2008 Bond Measure. Hal will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board of Directors may have.

Action Requested: No action requested. Board information only.

## B. Family Assistance Program Revision

Attached please find a memo from Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Development, regarding revisions being requested to the Park District's Family Assistance Program.
Susan Bender Phelps, Development Coordinator, will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board of Directors may have.

Action Requested: Board of Directors acceptance of the staff recommendations for 1 and 2 as detailed within the memo. Implementation will commence July 1, 2009 and will apply to all new applicants and renewals. Staff will monitor the impact of these changes and will review overall program effectiveness after six months.

## C. District Compiled Policies

Attached please find a memo from myself reporting that Tom Sponsler with Beery, Elsner \& Hammond, LLP, Park District legal counsel, will be at your meeting to provide an overview of his memo and attachments pertaining to a reorganization of the Board of Directors' policies.

Action Requested: Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2009-10 - Approving District Compiled Policy Chapter Eight, as Revisions of Previously Adopted Board Policies.

## D. General Manager's Report

Attached please find the General Manager's Report for the June 8, 2009 Regular meeting.

## Agenda Item \#10 - New Business

## A. Park District Auditor

Attached please find a memo from Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities, reporting on the District Audit Committee and Park District staff recent solicitation of audit services for the Park District. Keith will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and to answer any questions the Board may have.

> Action Requested: Board of Directors appointment of Talbot, Korvola and Warwick, LLP, to provide audit services to the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District and its component unit, the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation, and authorize staff to negotiate the contract for services commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009.

## Other Packet Enclosures

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


## MEMO

DATE: May 27, 2009
TO: The Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager
RE: $\quad$ Service to Beaverton Awards: Janet Allison \& Leslie Mundt
Former THPRD Board Member Janet Allison and long-time Park District employee Leslie Mundt were honored May 13 as co-winners of the City of Beaverton's Service to Beaverton Award in the individual category. The award recognizes extraordinary, sustained volunteer contributions to the local community.

Both individuals have long and notable lists of volunteer achievements to their credit. Among them, Janet has served on numerous THPRD boards and committees and is current chair of the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation. Leslie has been active with the Beaverton Celebration Parade Committee for 23 years, serving as chair for more than 15 of those.

Janet and Leslie will be present at your June 8, 2009 Regular Board meeting to be recognized by the Board of Directors for this prestigious award.

## Board of Trustees

Janet Allison
Chair/Associate Trustee
Pacific Western Machinery, Inc.
Kathy Christy
Vice Chair/Associate Trustee Realtor, Keller Williams

Frank Myers
Secretary/Associate Trustee Bank of the West

James O'Connor
Treasurer/Associate Trustee
Jenkins Estate Advisory
Committee
Howard M. Terpenning
Ex-Officio Member
Executive Committee
Associate Trustee
Pablo Anaya Associate Trustee NIKE, Inc.

Frank Angelo
Associate Trustee
Angelo Planning Group
Marvin E. Doty iate Trustee ican Altemative
Energy, LLC
Denny Doyle
Associate Trustee
Doyle \& Associates
Babette Horenstein
Associate Trustee
Marilyn Mays
Associate Trustee
Realtor, Keller-Williams
Larry Pelatt
Director Trustee
Westem Sales, Inc.
Donna Satterlee
Associate Trustee Satterlee Communications

Paul Waldram, CPA
Associate Trustee
Moss Adams, LLP
Honorary Board

[^1]DATE: May 28, 2009
TO:
The Board of Directors
FROM: Tualatin Hills Park Foundation
RE: $\quad$ Tualatin Hills Park Foundation Project Report
Members of the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation's Development Committee will be at your meeting to make a presentation regarding the Foundation's current project, an all-accessible, multi-use field for disabled children and adults.

The committee is composed of Chair Kathy Christy, Janet Allison, Pablo Anaya, Frank Angelo, Marv Doty, Marilyn Mays, Frank Myers, Larry Pelatt, Donna Satterlee, Howard Terpenning, and Development Coordinator Susan Bender Phelps.

The committee's charge was to:

- Develop a project for the Foundation that would benefit the community.
- Once the project had been chosen, continue with the following:
- Hold informational meetings with constituent groups to introduce the project.
- Develop materials that would inform and advertise the project.
- Distribute materials to the community including businesses, disabled groups and other donors.
- Seek out in-kind donations.
- Cross-promote this project with other THPRD events.

Chair Kathy Christy will summarize what our project is and why the Foundation chose it.

## MEMO

DATE: May 27, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Development
RE: $\quad$ Public Hearing - Second Reading of Ordinance Regarding Park District Rules \& Regulations

## Summary

The Board of Directors will conduct a second hearing at their June 8, 2009 Regular Meeting to gather public input about proposed updates to the Park District Rules \& Regulations.

## Background

THPRD's Rules and Regulations were originally developed in September 1997 and revised in 2002. As the Park District has grown along with the community and neighborhoods that we serve, individual behaviors or activities also have changed. In preparing to rewrite the Park District's Rules and Regulations, staff researched several park districts in the Pacific Northwest to determine if any of their rules may be applicable to THPRD. Staff also received suggested rule changes and additions from various Park District departments.

The Board of Directors conducted a first reading of the Ordinance Regarding Park District Rules and Regulations at their May 4, 2009 Regular Board meeting. Please find attached the proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations as requested during the hearing (Attachment 1), as well as a memo from Tom Sponsler of Beery, Elsner \& Hammond, LLP, the Park District's Legal Counsel and an ordinance to adopt the updated Rules and Regulations as Chapter 7 of the District Compiled Policies.

## Proposal Request

Staff requests the Board of Directors conduct a second hearing to gather public input regarding the proposed updates to the Park District Rules \& Regulations. Mike and Tom will be in attendance at the June 8, 2009 meeting to answer any questions the Board may have.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the following actions:

1. Conduct a public hearing and Second Reading of the Ordinance Regarding Park District Rules \& Regulations, and
2. Board adoption of Ordinance 2009-01, An Ordinance Adopting District Compiled Policies, Chapter 7, Related to Revised District General Regulations.

## Beery Elsner

\& Hammond lıp

## MEMORANDUM

| TO: | THPRD Board of Directors |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Thomas Sponsler <br> Office of General Counsel |
| SUBIECT: | District Compiled Policies - Second Approval and Enactment of Chapter 7 <br> District Regulations |

DATE: June 8, 2009

## Introduction

We have reviewed the 26 board policies adopted between 1975 and 2008. At the February 2, 2009 Board meeting we proposed a new organization and comprehensive format for the policies. We presented chapters one through six for approval at the April 6, 2009 Board meeting. At the May 4, 2009 Board meeting we proposed and the Board approved for the first time the ordinance to adopt Chapter 7, District Regulations.

## Chapter 7

The attached Chapter 7 ordinance is submitted for second approval and enactment by the Board. As presented last month, this chapter continues an edited version of previous policy 20 with some new provisions. New material proposed by Mike Janin and others and prepared in conjunction with our office was crafted to address additional enforcement issues. ORS 198.510 - 198.600 authorizes the district to adopt regulations by ordinance and requires compliance with a specific statutory process. Future amendments to this ordinance must also be adopted by ordinance. The version includes some edits discussed at the last Board meeting.

## Conclusion

The memo and attachment presents the Board with the amended version of the new DCP Chapter 7 approved for the first time after a public hearing at the May 4, 2009 Board meeting. You are asked to approval for the second and enact the Chapter 7 ordinance.

TS/sg
Enclosures

## CHAPTER 7 - DISTRICT REGULATIONS

### 7.01 General Regulations

No person shall violate any provision of the Oregon Criminal Code.

### 7.02 General Use of District Property

No person shall:
(A) Use abusive, threatening, or obscene language and gestures. Persons must conduct themselves in a manner that will not distract or disturb others in the peaceable enjoyment of any District property;
(B) Remove, destroy, or damage ${ }_{2}$ alter or obstruct any vegetation, land, equipment materials or supplies on District property;
(C) Engage in any activity in a District park or property managed by the District that is intended to be done in a restroom facility;
(D) Walk, stand, sit, or climb on any monument, vase, kiosk, awning, tent, tree, statue, fountain, railing, fence or other equipment/structure not intended for that purpose on District property;
(E) Apply graffiti to District property or possess graffiti implements with the intent of applying graffiti;
(F) Dump or leave any rubbish, yard debris or refuse of any type on any District property. Refuse or litter resulting from use of such areas must be deposited in refuse receptacles provided for such purposes, if available, or transported away from the property;
(G) Pollute any stream or waterway on or running through District property;
(H) Wash any clothing, equipment or other material, clean any fish, introduce or place any polluting substance, or waste or litter in any body of water on District property;
(I) Enter, wade, dive into or swim in any body of water on District property unless in specifically designated areas;
(J) Excavate, erect, install, place or perform any action related to the placement of any temporary or permanent structure on District property except for approved temporary placement of personal accessories;
(K) Stay overnight in any vehicle on District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to District property without prior approval of the Manager;
(L) Hit golf balls on or into District property; or
(M) Disobey any reasonable direction or request of a District Employee or peace officer based on the DCP or during an emergency situation.

### 7.03 District Property Hours

Hours of operation are posted on District property that is open to the public and controlled by gates or other devices. The hours of operation for all other District property that is open to the public is from dawn to dusk unless otherwise posted.

### 7.04 Fires

(A) Fires are prohibited on all District property except in areas designed and set aside for such purposes.
(B) Fires on District property shall be confined to barbecue stands, pits, or fireplaces provided for that purpose and portable stove use confined to established picnic areas where fires are allowed.
(C) No fire on District property may be left unattended and every fire must be extinguished by the user before leaving District property.
(D) The Manager may restrict or prohibit fires further than provided in this section when fire hazard conditions are high.

### 7.05 Music / Amplification Systems

No person shall produce amplified sound or use a public address system at sound levels that offend other District property users or extend beyond the boundaries of District property unless by District permission.

### 7.06 Model Devices

(A) No person shall operate motorized model cars, rockets, aircraft, boats or similar devices on District property except by District approval in areas specifically designated for that purpose.
(B) No person shall operate such devices that emit loud noises, foul odors and visible emissions.

### 7.07 Alcohol and Controlled Substances

No person shall:
(A) Display, possess or consume any alcoholic beverages while on District property except by District permit issued by the Manager. A District permit may contain conditions the Manager believes promote the peaceful use of District property by patrons; or
(B) Sell, buy, use or have in possession any drug or narcotic prohibited by state law while on District property.

### 7.08 Vehicles and Watercraft

(A) Bicycles, skateboards, scooters, in-line and roller skates, and other similar devices powered exclusively by humans:
(1) Are permitted on District property except in areas that are posted to exclude such activities;
(2) Shall not move at a speed that endangers other persons or District property;
(3) Shall not be used on any brickwork, ornamental surface, picnic table, tennis court, fountain area, railing, stairwell, doorway access, planter, sculpture, or surfaces not intended for their use on District property; and
(4) Shall not be left so as to obstruct pedestrian traffic on a path, trail, disabled access ramp, or building entrance on District property.
(B) No person shall:
(1) Operate a motorized vehicle or watercraft on District property except:
(a) On roadways and parking areas specifically designated for motor vehicles;
(b) On bodies of water specifically designated for watercrafts;
(c) District maintenance or law enforcement vehicles; or
(d) Wheel chairs or mobility scooters for the use of a disabled person.
(2) Operate a motorized vehicle or watercraft carelessly or in a manner that endangers the rights or safety of others;
(3) Park a motorized vehicle or trailers on District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to and managed by the District for extended periods, while not using District property or with the intent to market, sell, wash or repair the vehicle at any time;
(4) Park motorized vehicles or trailers in parking lots or other areas on District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to District property while not using District property. Any violations are subject to tow and the owner is responsible for costs of impoundment; or
(5) Temporarily stop motorized vehicles or trailers in parking lots or other areas of District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to District property in violation of posted rules designating special use, including fire lanes, temporary drop off areas or handicap parking spaces.

### 7.09 Firearms and Explosives

Except when authorized by the Manager, no person shall:
(A) Possess, discharge or cause to be discharged on or into any District property any fireworks, explosive or other dangerous substance or similar device;
(B) Possess, discharge or cause to be discharged across, on or into any District property a firearm, bow and arrow, or any other weapon or device harmful to the life or safety of persons, property, wildlife or their habitat; or
(C) Possess, discharge or cause to be discharged any device capable of launching a projectile by means of compressed gas, air or electricity or have in one's possession a replica firearm on or into any District property.

### 7.10 Animals

(A) No person shall release animals, domestic, exotic or native, onto District property.
(B) No person shall feed any waterfowl or other wildlife on District property.
(C) Except as authorized by the Manager, no person shall pursue, hunt, trap or capture any wild bird or other animal on District property, or fish in waters within the District, except in areas specifically designated for such purposes.
(D) No person shall mistreat, torment or molest domestic or wild animals on District property.
(E) No person shall allow an animal to injure or intimidate another animal or person while on District property.
(F) No person shall allow an animal to cause damage to any District or other person's property while on District property.
(G) No person shall allow any non-domesticated animal, horse or livestock to enter District property, unless it is specially posted to allow such use.
(H) Dogs are prohibited on District property areas designated as no dog areas, except guide dogs under state law.
(I) Dogs on District property shall be on a leash not more than eight feet in length or confined in a vehicle and must be kept under control at all times.
(J) Dog owners are responsible for the immediate removal of all solid waste from their dog that is deposited on District property.
(K) The District may exclude, by temporary posting, domestic animals from designated District property sites during special events where it is determined that the overcrowding of persons or activities may limit the enjoyment or safety of others.
(L) No person shall allow any domestic animal, horse or livestock to enter any recreational facility, equipment or amenity on District property unless it is a working guide animal.
(M) No person shall ride, lead or keep a horse or livestock on District property.
(N) No person shall tie any animal to any tree or other structure on District property not designated for that purpose.

### 7.11 Solicitation / Signs

(A) Except in specifically designated areas, no person shall erect signs, markers, or inscriptions of any type on District property.
(B) No person shall distribute any notice, pamphlet, handbill, or printed information of any kind, except to a person willing to accept it and if it is distributed without charge and in a location approved by the District.
(C) No person shall solicit money, goods, or services or perform or engage in any act with the intent or expectation of receiving payment from another person on District property.

### 7.12 Vendors / Concessions

No person shall operate a fixed or mobile concession; solicit, sell, offer for sale, peddle, hawk or provide any goods or services; or advertise any goods or services on District property without District approval.

### 7.13 Assemblies / Meetings

No person shall organize and hold any religious or political meeting or other assembly on District property without District approval upon request. Such use may be conditioned as to the time and place of holding such meeting or assembly so as not to unreasonably interfere with other activities. Such conditions may be appealed to the Manager if the applicant feels such conditions are unreasonable.

### 7.14 Enforcement of Regulations

(A) Peace officers and District employees are delegated authority to enforce these regulations. This authority includes the issuance of citations as provided by Oregon law to any person who violates any provision of these regulations, to refuse entrance and to exclude persons from District property.
(B) No person shall interfere with any authorized person enforcing these regulations.
(C) No person shall refuse to leave District property after being directed to leave by a peace officer or District employee.
(D) Violation of these regulations is punishable by exclusion or misdemeanor. ORS 266.450.
(E) If any regulation is found unenforceable by any court, the remaining regulations remain valid, binding and enforceable.

### 7.15 Exclusion

(A) In addition to other measures provided for violations of these regulations or state laws, any peace officer or District employee may exclude from all or a part of the District property any person who violates any regulation or any state law while on District property. The exclusion period shall not be less than 30 days nor more than 180 days for each effenseoccurrence.
(B) A person excluded under this section shall not enter or remain upon District property during the period of exclusion. An excluded person who enters or remains upon District property during the exclusion period is a trespasser and may be arrested and prosecuted for the crime of criminal trespass in the second degree. ORS 164.245.
(C) Written notice signed by the issuing party must be given to a person excluded from District property. The notice will specify the reason for the exclusion, the places and duration of the exclusion, and the consequences for the failure to comply with the notice. The exclusion commences immediately upon delivery of the notice to the excluded person.
(D) Variance.
(1) A person excluded may petition in writing to the Manager at any time during the exclusion period for a temporary waiver of the exclusion.
(2) Petitions must be addressed or delivered to: Exclusion Hearings Officer, Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, OR 97006.
(3) The circumstances and reason for the exclusion, and the places and duration of the exclusion may be reviewed by the Manager in considering approval of a variance.
(E) Appeal Procedures.
(1) Not later than 10 days after receiving the notice of exclusion, an excluded person may appeal in writing to the Manager for review of the exclusion. Appeals must be addressed or delivered to: Exclusion Hearings Officer, Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, OR 97006. A person may petition the Manager to rescind the exclusion, alter the places of exclusion or reduce the duration of the exclusion. An appeal must contain a copy of the exclusion notice, a request for a hearing or request for written review without a hearing, a statement setting forth the reasons that the exclusion is invalid or otherwise improper, and a current address and telephone number. The Manager will make a decision within 10 days after receipt of the appeal, unless a hearing is requested.
(2) If, as a part of a written appeal, a hearing is requested, a public hearing will be conducted by the Manager within 21 days after receipt of the appeal and make a decision within 21 days after the hearing.
(3) At any time during the exclusion, a person may petition in writing to the Manager for a temporary waiver of the exclusion.
(4) Unless the presence of the issuing person at the appeal hearing is requested, the Manager may use the issuing person's affidavit as evidence at the hearing.
(5) No peace officer or District employee has the authority to grant an excluded person permission to be in or on District property other than the Manager through the appeal process.

## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon

## AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING DISTRICT COMPILED POLICIES, CHAPTER 7, RELATED TO REVISED DISTRICT GENERAL REGULATIONS

a. The Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (District) board first adopted 26 policies on October 28, 1975 and last amended them on February 4, 2008.
b. The District is now reorganizing its policies into District Compiled Policies (DCP) for a more organized and comprehensive format. The District general regulations were previously adopted as Policy 20. That policy is now revised as DCP Chapter 7.
c. The District maintains about 300 parks and recreation facility sites totaling more than 2,000 acres. This includes neighborhood and community parks as well as natural areas, stream corridors and off-street pathways. The District has a responsibility to maintain these areas in a safe manner. Patrons have a responsibility to conduct themselves in a manner that does not interfere with the enjoyment of others.
d. The District and the General Counsel have prepared amendments to DCP Chapter 7 to make the District general regulations consistent with state law and to conform with the rest of the DCP.
e. The District and the General Counsel have prepared a revised and updated DCP Chapter 7 to allow enforcement responsive to situations encountered on District property.
f. ORS 266.450 requires that the District adopt its general regulations by ordinance in accordance with the provisions of ORS 198.510 to 198.600.

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

Section 1. The new DCP Chapter 7 attached as Exhibit A to this ordinance is enacted.
Section 2. This ordinance takes effect on July 8, 2009.

FIRST BOARD APPROVAL: May 4, 2009
SECOND BOARD APPROVAL AND ENACTMENT: June 8, 2009

Larry Pelatt, Board President
Adoption and date attested by:

Jessica Collins, Board Clerk

## CHAPTER 7 - DISTRICT REGULATIONS

### 7.01 General Regulations

No person shall violate any provision of the Oregon Criminal Code.

### 7.02 General Use of District Property

No person shall:
(A) Use abusive, threatening, or obscene language and gestures. Persons must conduct themselves in a manner that will not distract or disturb others in the peaceable enjoyment of any District property;
(B) Remove, destroy, damage, alter or obstruct any vegetation, land, equipment materials or supplies on District property;
(C) Engage in any activity in a District park or property managed by the District that is intended to be done in a restroom facility;
(D) Walk, stand, sit, or climb on any monument, vase, kiosk, awning, tent, tree, statue, fountain, railing, fence or other equipment/structure not intended for that purpose on District property;
(E) Apply graffiti to District property or possess graffiti implements with the intent of applying graffiti;
(F) Dump or leave any rubbish, yard debris or refuse of any type on any District property. Refuse or litter resulting from use of such areas must be deposited in refuse receptacles provided for such purposes, if available, or transported away from the property;
(G) Pollute any stream or waterway on or running through District property;
(H) Wash any clothing, equipment or other material, clean any fish, introduce or place any polluting substance, or waste or litter in any body of water on District property;
(I) Enter, wade, dive into or swim in any body of water on District property unless in specifically designated areas;
(J) Excavate, erect, install, place or perform any action related to the placement of any temporary or permanent structure on District property except for approved temporary placement of personal accessories;
(K) Stay overnight in any vehicle on District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to District property without prior approval of the Manager;
(L) Hit golf balls on or into District property; or
(M) Disobey any reasonable direction or request of a District Employee or peace officer based on the DCP or during an emergency situation.

### 7.03 District Property Hours

Hours of operation are posted on District property that is open to the public and controlled by gates or other devices. The hours of operation for all other District property that is open to the public is from dawn to dusk unless otherwise posted.

### 7.04 Fires

(A) Fires are prohibited on all District property except in areas designed and set aside for such purposes.
(B) Fires on District property shall be confined to barbecue stands, pits, or fireplaces provided for that purpose and portable stove use confined to established picnic areas where fires are allowed.
(C) No fire on District property may be left unattended and every fire must be extinguished by the user before leaving District property.
(D) The Manager may restrict or prohibit fires further than provided in this section when fire hazard conditions are high.

### 7.05 Music / Amplification Systems

No person shall produce amplified sound or use a public address system at sound levels that offend other District property users or extend beyond the boundaries of District property unless by District permission.

### 7.06 Model Devices

(A) No person shall operate motorized model cars, rockets, aircraft, boats or similar devices on District property except by District approval in areas specifically designated for that purpose.
(B) No person shall operate such devices that emit loud noises, foul odors and visible emissions.

### 7.07 Alcohol and Controlled Substances

No person shall:
(A) Display, possess or consume any alcoholic beverages while on District property except by District permit issued by the Manager. A District permit may contain conditions the Manager believes promote the peaceful use of District property by patrons; or
(B) Sell, buy, use or have in possession any drug or narcotic prohibited by state law while on District property.

### 7.08 Vehicles and Watercraft

(A) Bicycles, skateboards, scooters, in-line and roller skates, and other similar devices powered exclusively by humans:
(1) Are permitted on District property except in areas that are posted to exclude such activities;
(2) Shall not move at a speed that endangers other persons or District property;
(3) Shall not be used on any brickwork, ornamental surface, picnic table, tennis court, fountain area, railing, stairwell, doorway access, planter, sculpture, or surfaces not intended for their use on District property; and
(4) Shall not be left so as to obstruct pedestrian traffic on a path, trail, disabled access ramp, or building entrance on District property.
(B) No person shall:
(1) Operate a motorized vehicle or watercraft on District property except:
(a) On roadways and parking areas specifically designated for motor vehicles;
(b) On bodies of water specifically designated for watercrafts;
(c) District maintenance or law enforcement vehicles; or
(d) Wheel chairs or mobility scooters for the use of a disabled person.
(2) Operate a motorized vehicle or watercraft carelessly or in a manner that endangers the rights or safety of others;
(3) Park a motorized vehicle or trailers on District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to and managed by the District for extended periods, while not using District property or with the intent to market, sell, wash or repair the vehicle at any time;
(4) Park motorized vehicles or trailers in parking lots or other areas on District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to District property while not using District property. Any violations are subject to tow and the owner is responsible for costs of impoundment; or
(5) Temporarily stop motorized vehicles or trailers in parking lots or other areas of District property or within a public parking lot adjacent to District property in violation of posted rules designating special use, including fire lanes, temporary drop off areas or handicap parking spaces.

### 7.09 Firearms and Explosives

Except when authorized by the Manager, no person shall:
(A) Possess, discharge or cause to be discharged on or into any District property any fireworks, explosive or other dangerous substance or similar device;
(B) Possess, discharge or cause to be discharged across, on or into any District property a firearm, bow and arrow, or any other weapon or device harmful to the life or safety of persons, property, wildlife or their habitat; or
(C) Possess, discharge or cause to be discharged any device capable of launching a projectile by means of compressed gas, air or electricity or have in one's possession a replica firearm on or into any District property.

### 7.10 Animals

(A) No person shall release animals, domestic, exotic or native, onto District property.
(B) No person shall feed any waterfowl or other wildlife on District property.
(C) Except as authorized by the Manager, no person shall pursue, hunt, trap or capture any wild bird or other animal on District property, or fish in waters within the District, except in areas specifically designated for such purposes.
(D) No person shall mistreat, torment or molest domestic or wild animals on District property.
(E) No person shall allow an animal to injure or intimidate another animal or person while on District property.
(F) No person shall allow an animal to cause damage to any District or other person's property while on District property.
(G) No person shall allow any non-domesticated animal, horse or livestock to enter District property, unless it is specially posted to allow such use.
(H) Dogs are prohibited on District property areas designated as no dog areas, except guide dogs under state law.
(I) Dogs on District property shall be on a leash not more than eight feet in length or confined in a vehicle and must be kept under control at all times.
(J) Dog owners are responsible for the immediate removal of all solid waste from their dog that is deposited on District property.
(K) The District may exclude, by temporary posting, domestic animals from designated District property sites during special events where it is determined that the overcrowding of persons or activities may limit the enjoyment or safety of others.
(L) No person shall allow any domestic animal, horse or livestock to enter any recreational facility, equipment or amenity on District property unless it is a working guide animal.
(M) No person shall ride, lead or keep a horse or livestock on District property.
(N) No person shall tie any animal to any tree or other structure on District property not designated for that purpose.

### 7.11 Solicitation / Signs

(A) Except in specifically designated areas, no person shall erect signs, markers, or inscriptions of any type on District property.
(B) No person shall distribute any notice, pamphlet, handbill, or printed information of any kind, except to a person willing to accept it and if it is distributed without charge and in a location approved by the District.
(C) No person shall solicit money, goods, or services or perform or engage in any act with the intent or expectation of receiving payment from another person on District property.

### 7.12 Vendors / Concessions

No person shall operate a fixed or mobile concession; solicit, sell, offer for sale, peddle, hawk or provide any goods or services; or advertise any goods or services on District property without District approval.

### 7.13 Assemblies / Meetings

No person shall organize and hold any religious or political meeting or other assembly on District property without District approval upon request. Such use may be conditioned as to the time and place of holding such meeting or assembly so as not to unreasonably interfere with other activities. Such conditions may be appealed to the Manager if the applicant feels such conditions are unreasonable.

### 7.14 Enforcement of Regulations

(A) Peace officers and District employees are delegated authority to enforce these regulations. This authority includes the issuance of citations as provided by Oregon law to any person who violates any provision of these regulations, to refuse entrance and to exclude persons from District property.
(B) No person shall interfere with any authorized person enforcing these regulations.
(C) No person shall refuse to leave District property after being directed to leave by a peace officer or District employee.
(D) Violation of these regulations is punishable by exclusion or misdemeanor.
(E) If any regulation is found unenforceable by any court, the remaining regulations remain valid, binding and enforceable.

### 7.15 Exclusion

(A) In addition to other measures provided for violations of these regulations or state laws, any peace officer or District employee may exclude from all or a part of the District property any person who violates any regulation or any state law while on District property. The exclusion period shall not be less than 30 days nor more than 180 days for each occurrence.
(B) A person excluded under this section shall not enter or remain upon District property during the period of exclusion. An excluded person who enters or remains upon District property during the exclusion period is a trespasser and may be arrested and prosecuted for the crime of criminal trespass in the second degree. ORS 164.245.
(C) Written notice signed by the issuing party must be given to a person excluded from District property. The notice will specify the reason for the exclusion, the places and duration of the exclusion, and the consequences for the failure to comply with the notice. The exclusion commences immediately upon delivery of the notice to the excluded person.
(D) Variance.
(1) A person excluded may petition in writing to the Manager at any time during the exclusion period for a temporary waiver of the exclusion.
(2) Petitions must be addressed or delivered to: Exclusion Hearings Officer, Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, OR 97006.
(3) The circumstances and reason for the exclusion, and the places and duration of the exclusion may be reviewed by the Manager in considering approval of a variance.
(E) Appeal Procedures.
(1) Not later than 10 days after receiving the notice of exclusion, an excluded person may appeal in writing to the Manager for review of the exclusion. Appeals must be addressed or delivered to: Exclusion Hearings Officer, Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, OR 97006. A person may petition the Manager to rescind the exclusion, alter the places of exclusion or reduce the duration of the exclusion. An appeal must contain a copy of the exclusion notice, a request for a hearing or request for written review without a hearing, a statement setting forth the reasons that the exclusion is invalid or otherwise improper, and a current address and telephone number. The Manager will make a decision within 10 days after receipt of the appeal, unless a hearing is requested.
(2) If, as a part of a written appeal, a hearing is requested, a public hearing will be conducted by the Manager within 21 days after receipt of the appeal and make a decision within 21 days after the hearing.
(3) At any time during the exclusion, a person may petition in writing to the Manager for a temporary waiver of the exclusion.
(4) Unless the presence of the issuing person at the appeal hearing is requested, the Manager may use the issuing person's affidavit as evidence at the hearing.
(5) No peace officer or District employee has the authority to grant an excluded person permission to be in or on District property other than the Manager through the appeal process.

[8A]

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

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, May 4, 2009. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Larry Pelatt
Bob Scott
William Kanable (via telephone)
Joseph Blowers
John Griffiths
Doug Menke

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

Agenda Item \#1 - Executive Session (A) Legal (B) Land
President, Larry Pelatt, called Executive Session to order for the following purposes:

- To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection,
- To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed, and
- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.
The Executive Session is held pursuant to ORS 192.660(2), which allows the Board to meet in Executive Session to discuss the aforementioned legal and land issues.

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

## Agenda Item \#2 - Call Regular Meeting to Order

President, Larry Pelatt, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Agenda Item \#3 - Action Resulting from Executive Session
John Griffiths moved the Board of Directors, regarding the subject property in the southwest quadrant of the District, direct staff to work with Polygon representatives to prepare a memorandum of understanding specifying the provisions regarding the takeover of the land next to Sexton Crest Park including the internal bonding and repair charges. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

| Joe Blowers | Yes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bill Kanable | Yes |
| Bob Scott | Yes |
| John Griffiths | Yes |
| Larry Pelatt | Yes |
| The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. |  |

John Griffiths moved the Board of Directors approve the acquisition of the subject properties in the northeast quadrant of the District subject to the memorandum of understanding with Polygon to be signed by the General Manager. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

| Bill Kanable | Yes |
| :--- | :---: |
| Joe Blowers | Yes |
| Bob Scott | Yes |
| John Griffiths | Yes |
| Larry Pelatt | Yes |
| The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. |  |

## Agenda Item \#4 - Presentation

A. Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails Report

Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten, a member of the Metro Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails, is before the Board of Directors this evening to make a presentation regarding the Committee's findings and recommendations. The Committee was composed of civic, business (including health care) and elected leaders from throughout the region convened by Metro to take a broad look at the regional trails network. The Committee's charge by the Metro Council was to evaluate the regional trails system and its benefits, determine if the current level of investment in regional trails is commensurate with expected benefits, identify important regional values in developing the system, and propose funding and policy changes necessary to achieve the regional system.

Commissioner Schouten provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation titled Nonmotorized Mobility, a copy of which was entered into the record, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Larry Pelatt, commented that at a cost of $\$ 2.5$ million to complete less than one mile of the Kaiser Ridge Trail, trails could be considered by some as not very cost effective.
$\checkmark$ Dick replied that it is still a lot less expensive than major road widening projects and constructing highways. He provided a brief overview of some of the Committee's recommendations for addressing these issues, such as convening a group of representatives that would have a role in such a project, in both the local government and the private sector, to discuss ways to streamline the process. In addition, if more such projects were constructed, they could be bundled together for economy of scale.
Larry noted that prior to the consideration of bundling projects, all of the policy makers need to be on the same page.
$\checkmark$ Dick agreed, noting that he is feeling more positive about federal funds eventually being made available to this initiative. He provided a brief overview of various areas for possible future funding.

Joe Blowers noted that one of the reasons the cost is so high for that particular section of Kaiser Ridge Trail is due to the topography of the area. He asked whether European countries with extensive trail networks have particular constraints, such as topography, and if so, how they deal with such issues.
$\checkmark$ Dick replied that even though it is less expensive to build a trail on flat land, those countries have other challenges, such as crossing canals. However, these countries do not see a bicycle as a toy; they see it as a mode of transportation that keeps the air cleaner and, therefore, they are willing to spend the money on construction and maintenance in order to capture the audience that would not otherwise bicycle.

John Griffiths commented that the countries profiled in the presentation have flat topography, which in itself encourages ridership.
$\checkmark$ Dick agreed, noting that every mode of transportation has its strengths and that at times a car would be the most useful. However, there is plenty of flat land in this area to be taken advantage of. He described how routing could assist in circumventing hilly areas.

President, Larry Pelatt, thanked Commissioner Schouten on behalf of the Board of Directors for the informative presentation.

## Agenda Item \#5 - First Reading of Ordinance Regarding Park District Rules \& Regulations A. Open Hearing

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the hearing.

## B. Staff Report

Mike Janin, Superintendent of Security Operations, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that the Park District's Rules and Regulations were originally developed in September 1997 and revised in 2002 and that the current time is prudent for another review. He stated that he worked with Tom Sponsler of Beery, Elsner \& Hammond, LLP, the Park District's legal counsel, to update the Park District's Rules and Regulations to meet current practices and to conform to the new format of the District Compiled Policies. Included within the Board of Directors information packet is a memo from Tom, along with the proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations, and an ordinance to adopt the updated Rules and Regulations as Chapter 7 of the District Compiled Policies. Mike offered to answer any questions the Board may have, noting that Tom is also in attendance this evening to answer questions as well.

Bob Scott asked Mike whether he found any glaring discrepancies when researching the rules and regulations of other park districts.
$\checkmark$ Mike replied that he found that the Park District's Rules and Regulations were basically inline with other agencies; however, some agencies were more specific regarding prohibiting skateboarding and inline skating from defined areas, as well as specific rules regarding temporary encroachments onto park property.

Joe Blowers asked whether the proposed removal of the language pertaining to a $\$ 100$ fine is due to the fine not being issued very often.
$\checkmark$ Bill Kanable replied that the language does not need to be included because it is already stated and allowed within the Oregon Revised Statutes.

President, Larry Pelatt, noted that he had a few minor grammatical edits to the proposed Rules and Regulations that he will submit to staff after the meeting this evening.

## C. Public Comment

Greg Cody, 13955 SW Barlow Place, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening to request an amendment to the proposed Rules and Regulations. He noted that some tournament participants from out of the area come to Park District facilities in campers and motor homes to stay overnight onsite in order to reduce traveling costs. He expressed concern that the proposed regulation prohibiting a person from staying overnight in any vehicle on District property may dissuade participation in tournaments. He noted that these tournaments are a benefit to the Park District and local economy and that there are no campgrounds nearby to otherwise accommodate these travelers. He requested that an exemption be included within the regulation allowing a person to stay overnight if they first receive authorization from Park District management to do so.

John Griffiths commented that he believes the Park District could make an exception for larger tournaments and events.

President, Larry Pelatt, noted that the only issue he sees is that the Park District does not have a facility available close by for sanitary waste disposal. He noted that it would depend on the length of stay whether or not this became an issue.

Doug Menke, General Manager, replied that this topic could be brought back to the Board of Directors for consideration during the second ordinance reading at the June 8, 2009 Regular Board meeting.

John suggested staff contact other facilities that allow overnight stays, such as Oregon State University.

## D. Board Discussion

There was no Board discussion.

## E. Close Hearing

President, Larry Pelatt, closed the public hearing.

## F. Board Action

John Griffiths moved the Board of Directors has held a first reading of Ordinance 2009-01
Adopting District Compiled Policies, Chapter 7, Related to Revised District General
Regulations. Final approval and ordinance enactment is scheduled for the June 8, 2009 Regular Board meeting. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

| Bob Scott | Yes |
| :--- | :---: |
| Bill Kanable | Yes |
| Joe Blowers | Yes |
| John Griffiths | Yes |
| Larry Pelatt | Yes |
| The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. |  |

## Agenda Item \#6 - Audience Time

There was no testimony during audience time.

## Agenda Item \#7 - Board Time

Bob Scott asked whether a grand opening event would be scheduled for the Cooper Mountain Nature Park.
$\checkmark$ Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources \& Trails Management, replied that there will be several events, including a VIP event for elected officials and partners, a neighborhood open house, and a series of small events throughout the summer.
$\checkmark$ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the Board would receive an invite to the June 23 VIP event.

Joe Blowers stated that on his way in this evening he saw a large amount of sediment from the dirt parking lot between the baseball fields on the HMT Recreation Complex being washed into the swale. He asked if there is something that could be done to keep the sediment out of the swale.
$\checkmark$ Doug Menke, General Manager, replied that staff would investigate the situation.
President, Larry Pelatt, noted that the water level at Center Street Park appeared to be getting high.
$\checkmark$ Bruce replied that he visited the park today to monitor the situation, noting that the water level will naturally rise and fall.
Larry stated that he is concerned that sediment may be backing up the water levels.
$\checkmark$ Bruce replied that staff would look into it again, noting that this site is being heavily monitored for any issues that may contribute to rising water levels.

## Agenda Item \#8 -Consent Agenda

Bob Scott moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of April 6, 2009 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Athletic Center Advisory Committee, Garden Home Recreation Center Advisory Committee, \& Jenkins Estate Advisory Committee members, (E) Resolution Adopting an Evaluation Document Containing Criteria to be used in Reviewing the Performance of the General Manager, (F) Resolution Adopting the Supplemental Budget for Planning Division Personal Services Costs, (G) Temporary Construction Easement for St. Juan Diego Catholic Parish, and (H) Telecommunications Site Lease Agreement with Clearwire Wireless. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

| John Griffiths | Yes |
| :--- | :---: |
| Bill Kanable | Yes |
| Joe Blowers | Yes |
| Bob Scott | Yes |
| Larry Pelatt | Yes |
| The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. |  |

Agenda Item \#9 - Unfinished Business
A. 2008 Bond Measure

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, to provide an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet.

Hal provided a detailed update of the memo sections regarding Planning Department staffing, Architectural \& Engineering contracts, and land acquisition assistance, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Larry Pelatt, requested that the Architectural \& Engineering contracts request for proposals be provided to the Board of Directors early and in electronic format rather than in the meeting information packet.
$\checkmark$ Doug Menke, General Manager, requested to discuss with Larry the amount of content the Board wishes to see for these items.
Larry confirmed that this is acceptable.
Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the Parks Bond Measure Citizen Oversight Committee will be holding their first meeting later in the week on May 7, 2009. As the Board is aware, Bob Scott will be serving on the Committee as the ex-officio Board of Directors member. Copies of the agenda have been placed at the Board member's chairs this evening.

## B. General Manager's Report

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

- Voluntary Annexation Program
o Doug noted that consideration is being given to incentivizing the Voluntary Annexation Program with between $\$ 100$ and $\$ 200$ in matching funds toward Park District programs.
- Advisory Committee Structure Review
- ADA Compliance for Trail Projects
- Mid-Block Trail Crossings
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule
o It was the consensus of the Board of Directors to schedule the summer Board of Directors meetings as follows: July 13, 2009; August 24, 2009; no September meeting; and October 5, 2009.
- Cooper Mountain Nature Park Dedication Event
- Westside Trail Dedication Event
- Stimulus Funds Update
- Urban Renewal Update
- Washington County Visitors Association Brochures

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

President, Larry Pelatt, expressed support for incentivizing the Voluntary Annexation Program, noting that the Park District has successfully secured those initially willing to annex to the Park District and that remaining property owners likely need some additional incentive.

Joe Blowers asked whether Washington County has changed their position regarding midblock crossings.
$\checkmark$ Doug replied that they are open to reconsidering their position and that Commissioner Schouten has had an impact in this area. County staff has become more willing to accept that transportation includes pedestrian and bicycle traffic and with that, the realization that some of these issues need to be addressed.

Joe asked whether the City of Beaverton will play a role in the Fanno Creek Trail crossing study.
$\checkmark$ Doug confirmed that the City will be an active player and that the process will kick off in October.
$\checkmark$ Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning \& Development, confirmed this, stating that an initial meeting has already been held between Park District, City of Beaverton, and Metro staff members, noting that a large portion of the project is going to involve outreach to everyone involved. He described past attempts the City made in addressing the issue using a median island.

Agenda Item \#10-Adjourn
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Recording Secretary, Jessica Collins

| Tualatin Hills Park \& Rec. |  | Accounts Payable Over \$1,000.00 | April 30, 2009 Summary |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name |  | ck Amount |
| 235676 | 04/15/09 | Recreonics, Inc. |  | 1,241.38 |
| 235431 | 04/06/09 | Recreation Resource, Inc. |  | 3,615.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-ADA Projects | \$ | 4,856.38 |
| 235577 | 04/14/09 | Mersereau \& Shannon, LLP |  | 28,500.00 |
| 235578 | 04/14/09 | Moody's Investors Service |  | 21,500.00 |
| 235584 | 04/14/09 | Standard and Poor's |  | 19,000.00 |
| 235715 | 04/16/09 | Seattle-NW Securities Corp |  | 58,505.00 |
| 235872 | 04/24/09 | i-Deal LLC |  | 1,500.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Bond-Debt Issuance Costs | \$ | 129,005.00 |
| 235668 | 04/15/09 | Peterson Structural Engineers |  | 40,358.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Bond-Facility Expansion \& Improvements | \$ | 40,358.00 |
| 235597 | 04/15/09 | 2.ink Studio |  | 7,257.26 |
| 235675 | 04/15/09 | R \& W Engineering, Inc. |  | 1,092.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Bond-Metro Natural Areas | \$ | 8,349.26 |
| 235373 | 04/06/09 | Dell Marketing L.P. |  | 4,686.60 |
| 235616 | 04/15/09 | CDW Government, Inc. |  | 1,027.15 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Bond-Technology | \$ | 5,713.75 |
| 235703 | 04/16/09 | AAM, Inc. |  | 1,700.00 |
| 235873 | 04/24/09 | Jacobs Heating \& Air Cond. |  | 2,500.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Building Improvements | \$ | 4,200.00 |
| 235457 | 04/06/09 | Western Waterproofing Co., Inc. |  | 10,173.60 |
| 235905 | 04/28/09 | Anderson Door \& Window Mech. |  | 1,941.50 |
| 235671 | 04/15/09 | The Pool \& Spa House, Inc. |  | 4,959.10 |
| 235634 | 04/15/09 | Floor Solutions, LLC |  | 7,420.00 |
| 235757 | 04/23/09 | American Gutter Service |  | 3,785.50 |
| 235429 | 04/06/09 | Platt Electric Supply, Inc. |  | 2,479.31 |
| 235362 | 04/06/09 | Chown, Inc. |  | 8,435.23 |
| 235745 | 04/21/09 | Metro Overhead Door, Inc. |  | 3,201.00 |
| 235864 | 04/24/09 | Exercise Equipment NW, Inc. |  | 16,869.54 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Building Replacements | \$ | 59,264,78 |
| 235371 | 04/06/09 | Crosscut Hardwoods |  | 1,483.39 |
| 235898 | 04/24/09 | Todd Hess Building Co. |  | 10,986.96 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Challenge Grant Competitive Fund | \$ | 12,470.35 |
| 235454 | 04/06/09 | W.M. Smith \& Associates, Inc. |  | 5,885,92 |
| 235549 | 04/09/09 | Exercise Equipment NW, Inc. |  | 5,874.00 |
| 235732 | 04/21/09 | Bigfoot Construction |  | 1,064.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Facility Challenge Grants | \$ | 12,823.92 |
| 235927 | 04/28/09 | TablesNChairs.com, LLC |  | 4,148.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Park \& Trail Improvements | \$ | 4,148.00 |
| 235378 | 04/06/09 | Ewing Irrigation Products, Inc. |  | 11,044.27 |
| 235397 | 04/06/09 | Hydro-Tech Irrigation \& Landscape |  | 4,400.00 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-Park \& Trail Replacements | \$ | 15,444.27 |
| 235372 | 04/06/09 | David Evans \& Associates, Inc. |  | 1,746.27 |
| 235459 | 04/07/09 | Alta Planning \& Design, Inc. |  | 5,674.96 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay-SDC-Fanno Creek Trail | \$ | 7,421.23 |
| 235898 | 04/24/09 | Todd Hess Building Co. |  | 9,356.84 |
|  |  | Capital Outlay--Stuhr Ctr ADA Restroom Renovation | \$ | 9,356.84 |
| 235413 | 04/06/09 | James S. McElhinny |  | 1,982.98 |

Tualatin Hills
Park \& Rec

Accounts Payable
Park \& Rec.
Over $\$ 1,000.00$
April 30, 2009
Summary

| Check Number | Check Date | Yendor Name | Check Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 235552 | 04/09/09 | Bill Kanable |  | 1,053.01- |
| 235556 | 04/09/09 | Douglas R. Menke |  | 1,834.88 |
| 235576 | 04/14/09 | Douglas R. Menke |  | 2,100.98 |
| 235726 | 04/20/09 | PCC Foundation |  | 1,500.00 |
|  |  | Conferences | \$ | 8,471.85 |
| 235978 | 04/30/09 | Vision Action Network |  | 2,057.14 |
|  |  | Dues \& Memberships | \$ | 2,057.14 |
| 235340 | 04/06/09 | PGE |  | 23,267.78 |
| 235719 | 04/17/09 | PGE |  | 4,715.29 |
| 235845 | 04/24/09 | PGE |  | 29,949.42 |
|  |  | Electricity | \$ | 57,932.49 |
| 235592 | 04/15/09 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 166,626.63 |
| 235935 | 04/30/09 | Blue Cross/Blue Shield |  | 155,060.40 |
| 235938 | 04/30/09 | MetLife |  | 19,604.22 |
| 235940 | 04/30/09 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 2,094.93 |
| 235945 | 04/30/09 | UNUM Life Insurance-LTC |  | 1,369.70 |
| 235946 | 04/30/09 | Unum Life Insurance-LTD |  | 9,445.14 |
|  |  | Employee Benefits | \$ | 354,201.02 |
| 235588 | 04/15/09 | Aetna / ING Life Insurance |  | 5,316.66 |
| 235590 | 04/15/09 | Manley Services |  | 6,012.83 |
| 235591 | 04/15/09 | OR Dept of Revenue |  | 1,114.10 |
| 235593 | 04/15/09 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 23,781.14 |
| 235594 | 04/15/09 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 3,037.33. |
| 235934 | 04/30/09 | Aetna / ING Life Insurance |  | 5,316.6 |
| 235937 | 04/30/09 | Manley Services |  | 6,994.83 |
| 235941 | 04/30/09 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 23,737.14 |
| 235942 | 04/30/09 | Standard Insurance Company |  | 3,037.33 |
| 235944 | 04/30/09 | THPRD - Employee Assn. |  | 6,606.59 |
|  |  | Employee Deductions | \$ | 84,954.61 |
| 235875 | 04/24/09 | Kevco Products, LLC |  | 1,340.00 |
|  |  | Fleet Capital Replacement | \$ | 1,340.00 |
| 235339 | 04/06/09 | NW Natural |  | 31,907.13 |
| 235844 | 04/24/09 | NW Natural |  | 31,128.33 |
|  |  | Heat | \$ | 63,035.46 |
| 235361 | 04/06/09 | CDW Government, Inc. |  | 17,274.00 |
|  |  | Information Services-Capital-IT Improvement | \$ | 17,274.00 |
| 235373 | 04/06/09 | Dell Marketing L.P. |  | 7,566.64 |
| 235659 | 04/15/09 | Obsidian Technologies |  | 13,093.55 |
|  |  | Information Services-Capital-IT Replacement | \$ | 20,660.19 |
| 235423 | 04/06/09 | Oregon Fencing Alliance |  | 1,105.00 |
| 235561 | 04/09/09 | Rhythm Of My Heart |  | 2,669.10 |
| 235603 | 04/15/09 | American Red Cross/OTC |  | 3,897.25 |
|  |  | Instructional Services | \$ | 7,671.35 |
| 235316 | 04/02/09 | Anderson Poolworks |  | 2,842.00 |
| 235354 | 04/06/09 | Beaverton Auto Parts |  | 1,115.3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 235395 | 04/06/09 | Hughes Electrical Contractors |  | 1,227.2. |
| 235418 | 04/06/09 | Northwest Control Co. |  | 1,245.75 |
| 235473 | 04/07/09 | Schulz-Clearwater Sanitation, Inc. |  | 1,229.00 |
| 235611 | 04/15/09 | Brandsen Hardwood Floors, Inc. |  | 2,215.00 |
| 235714 | 04/16/09 | Schulz-Clearwater Sanitation, Inc. |  | 9,444.87 |
|  |  | Maintenance Services | \$ | 19,319.47 |

Tualatin Hills
Park \& Rec.

Accounts Payable
Over $\$ 1,000.00$
Check Date Vendor Name


Tualatin Hills
Accounts Payable
Park \& Rec.
Over $\$ 1,000.00$
April 30, 2009

| Check Number | Check Date | Vendor Name | Check Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 235933 | 04/28/09 | Woodco |  | 1,173.00 |
|  |  | Refuse Services | \$ | 6,208.95 |
| 235422 | 04/06/09 | OR Dept of Administrative Services |  | 1,337.05 |
| 235679 | 04/15/09 | Ricoh Americas Corporation |  | 3,020.31 |
|  |  | Rental Equipment | \$ | 4,357.36 |
| 235608 | 04/15/09 | Beaverton Sch. District \#48 |  | 18,434.38 |
| 235866 | 04/24/09 | Fred Shearer \& Sons |  | 8,224.00 |
|  |  | Rental Facilities | \$ | 26,658.38 |
| 235438 | 04/06/09 | Sound Security, Inc. |  | 8,757.00 |
| 235959 | 04/30/09 | Endever Tree Service |  | 1,700.00 |
|  |  | Technical Services | \$ | 10,457.00 |
| 235580 | 04/14/09 | Paul Spindel, LLC |  | 2,000.00 |
| 235870 | 04/24/09 | HR Answers, Inc. |  | 2,800.00 |
|  |  | Technical Training | \$ | 4,800.00 |
| 235843 | 04/24/09 | Integra Telecom |  | 2,917.01 |
| 235338 | 04/06/09 | Nextel Communications |  | 2,364.69 |
| 235724 | 04/17/09 | Verizon Northwest, Inc. |  | 2,486.65 |
|  |  | Telecommunications | \$ | 7,768.35 |
| 235741 | 04/21/09 | Kadel's Auto Body |  | 2,764.31 |
|  |  | Vehicle/Equipment Services | \$ | 2,764.31 |
| 235337 | 04/06/09 | City of Beaverton |  | 4,893.11 |
| 235341 | 04/06/09 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  | 5,990.81 |
| 235722 | 04/17/09 | Tualatin Valley Water District |  | 1,597.27 |
| 235841 | 04/24/09 | Clean Water Services |  | 1,649.07 |
|  |  | Water \& Sewer | \$ | 14,130.25 |
|  |  | Report Total: | \$ | 1,234,127.07 |

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District

General Fund Financial Summary
April, 2009

## Program Resources:

Aquatic Centers
Tennis Center
Recreation Centers \& Programs
Sports Programs \& Field Rentals Nature Park Total Program Resources

| $\$$ | 468,947 | $\$$ | $1,872,358$ | $\$$ | $1,969,364$ | $95.1 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | \$ 2,322,363

## Other Resources:

Property Taxes
Interest Income
Facility Rentals/Sponsorships
Grants \& Donations
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/Nature Park

Total Program Related Expenditures

| 105,613 | 486,482 | 343,024 | $141.8 \%$ | 405,945 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 255,733 | $2,749,973$ | $2,794,072$ | $98.4 \%$ | $3,322,321$ |
| 68,276 | 682,691 | 746,337 | $91.5 \%$ | 891,681 |
| 324,144 | $3,577,527$ | $4,046,389$ | $88.4 \%$ | $4,811,402$ |
| 108,087 | $1,372,764$ | $1,442,015$ | $95.2 \%$ | $1,722,837$ |
| 115,235 | $1,273,199$ | $1,365,593$ | $93.2 \%$ | $1,625,706$ |
| 76,489 | 804,716 | 971,878 | $82.8 \%$ | $1,179,464$ |
| $1,053,577$ | $10,947,352$ | $11,709,308$ | $93.5 \%$ | $13,959,356$ |

## General Government Expenditures:

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

## Total Expenditures

Revenues over (under) Expenditures
Beginning Cash on Hand
Ending Cash on Hand

| 24,027 | 187,492 | $1,301,766$ | $14.4 \%$ | $1,708,354$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 89,999 | $1,256,686$ | $1,268,510$ | $99.1 \%$ | $1,499,421$ |
| 967,472 | $12,067,672$ | $12,256,520$ | $98.5 \%$ | $14,591,095$ |
| 77,750 | 709,633 | 669,838 | $105.9 \%$ | 874,462 |
| 93,857 | $1,157,137$ | $1,810,787$ | $63.9 \%$ | $2,773,027$ |
| $1,253,105$ | $15,378,620$ | $17,307,420$ | $88.9 \%$ | $21,446,359$ |
| $\$ 2,306,682$ | $\$ 26,325,972$ | $\$$ | $29,016,728$ | $90.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 35,405,715$ |
| $\$$ | $(474,111)$ | $\$ 2,496,464$ | $\$$ | $(224,159)$ |
|  |  | $-1113.7 \%$ | $\$(3,838,000)$ |  |
|  |  | $4,660,919$ | $3,838,000$ | $121.4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  | $3,838,000$ |

# Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District 

General Fund Financial Summary
April, 2009


## MEMO

DATE: May 27, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Jim McElhinny, Director of Park \& Recreational Services

## RE: $\quad$ Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center Advisory Committee Member

## Summary

Staff requests Board of Directors approval of a Committee member appointment to the Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center Advisory Committee.

## Background

The Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center Advisory Committee recommends Board of Directors approval to appoint Anne Percell to fill a vacant position on the Committee. No other applications were received.

Please note that the Advisory Committee member's application is attached along with Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center Advisory Committee's current roster.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval to appoint Anne Percell to the Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center Advisory Committee.

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

| Name: Anne Percell | Date: 4/13/09 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

Advisory Committee you are applying for (you must reside within the Park District boundaries):
Cedar Hills Recreation Center $\square$ Garden Home Recreation Center $\square$ Stuhr Center $\square$ Jenkins Estate $\square$ Aquatics Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Facility $\boxtimes$ Tualatin Hills Nature Park $\square$ Athletic Center $\square$ Trails $\square$

1. Please explain your interest in serving on the Advisory Committee: I truly love and appreciate the TH Parks \& Rec District. We are lucky to have it available to us! Therefore

## I'd like to help.

2. How long have you lived in the community? Since Feb. 2000
3. Have you served on other volunteer committees? YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ If yes, please explain where, when, and what your responsibilities were: During college, I was a student advocate (voluntary position), on the Arts Committee (also voluntary). We had regular meetings, fundraisers, Q \& A sessions w/ public, and I gave campus tours. (Western Oregon University)
4. Have you or your family participated in any Center or other Recreation District activities?

What: Myself-fitness classes daughter-preschool/sports activities
When: Myself-on/off since summer 2000, daughter summer 05
Where: C. Hills, Conestoga, Aloha Swim Center, Garden Home, Raleigh Hills pool.
5. Please describe any work experience or areas of expertise that you feel would benefit the Advisory Committee: I have a Bachelors of Science Degree in Psychology and w/ that have worked or volunteered w/ all "walks of life". I am very familiar w/ THPRD as I've used the facilities regularly for 9 years.

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District CONESTOGA RECREATION \& AQUATIC CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE ROSTER

Last Updated: September 16, 2008


# MEMORANDUM 

TO: Board of Directors<br>Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District<br>THROUGH: Doug Menke, General Manager<br>FROM: Pamela J. Beery, Office of District Legal Counsel<br>SUBIECT: Vacation Accrual Resolution<br>DATE: May 28, 2009

Before the Board for consideration is a Resolution to

1. Establish a new limitation on vacation hour accruals that may be carried over from year to year by senior management employees; and
2. Authorize and direct the General Manager to implement the change, including any needed adjustment to the personnel records of affected employees who currently have accruals exceeding the new limitation.

In addition, a clear written policy should be developed consistent with the Board's direction for formal Board approval, which should be reflected in the Employee Handbook. This change will come back to the Board at a meeting in the near future.

Prior to August 2004, the limits on accrued vacation hours for Management Team Employees (the General Manager, Assistant General Manager, Directors and the Executive Secretary) were nọt defined. In August 2004, the then General Manager, Ron Willoughby, issued a memorandum purporting to establish vacation accrual limits for these employees for the first time at 1,040 hours. Since the General Manager is employed under a contract with the Board of Directors, this newly established accrual limit was deemed not to apply to the General Manager. Apparently, at the time this limit was established, none of the impacted employees had hours in excess of 1,040 ; as such, no plan was developed to address excess hours over the new limitation.

The limitations on accrual of vacation hours that are currently in place for the District's various categories of employees are as follows:
$>$ All union-represented employees are allowed to accumulate up to 240 hours of vacation time. When the accrued vacation hours reach 240 , new accruals are suspended until total hours are reduced to less than 240.
$>$ Exempt Management employees may accumulate a maximum carry-over of two times their annual vacation accrual rate ( $160-384$ hours). All new accruals are suspended until total hours are reduced to less than two times the amnual amount.
$>$ Management Team employees may accumulate a maximum carry-over of 1,040 hours. New accruals are suspended until the balance is reduced below 1,040 .

It is the Board's intent at this time to reduce the maximum accrual for senior management team employees to 500 hours.

In order to fully implement the Board's decision, amendments to the Employee Handbook are needed. The Handbook also addresses how accruals are managed for employees over the limit.

The Employee Fandbook is subject to Board authority under existing Board policy 3.00. In the General Manager's contract section 9, his benefits are identified as being those provided to other employees and subject to the Employee Handbook. No existing policy delegates benefit authority to the General Manager. As such, we believe only the Board has authority to amend the Handbook and change accrual limits.

The attached Resolution establishes the new 500 -hour limit. We can then embed the direction you provide in the Employee Handbook as it is reviewed and updated. The Board's action should be reflected in the personnel records of the affected employees, and a release from each of them should be obtained.

The attached Resolution also delegates authority to the General Manager to implement the Board's decision.

We will be happy to provide any additional information or advice you require as you consider the attached Resolution.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2009-09

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon
A RESOLUTION APPROVING NEW LIMITATIONS ON ACCRUAL OF EARNED BUT UNUSED VACATION HOURS, AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE DISTRICT GENERAL MANAGER TO IMPLEMENT THE NEW LIMITATIONS

WHEREAS, the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (District) maintains limitations on the accrual of earned but unused vacation hours for all District employees; and

WHEREAS, the level of limitation accrual for senior management team employees exceeds that for other employees ; and

WHEREAS, the District Board believes as a policy matter that the accrual limitations for those employees should be reduced so that they are more in line with those of other employees.

Now, therefore,

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

Section 1. The maximum accrual of earned but unused vacation hours that may be carried over from fiscal year to fiscal year by senior management employees shall be 500 (five hundred) hours.

Section 2. The General Manager is hereby authorized and directed to take the appropriate steps to implement this Resolution in consultation with District Legal Counsel.

Section 3. This resolution takes effect on July 1, 2009.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVAL: June 8, 2009

Larry Pelatt<br>President / Director

Adoption and date attested by:

[^2]
## MEMO

DATE: $\quad$ May 14, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities
RE: Management Compensation Policy Adjustment/Reduction

## Summary

Staff requests a variance to the Performance Compensation Policy to allow the General Manager to reduce the adjustment factor used in determining management compensation adjustments.

## Background

The Board of Directors, at their December 10, 2007 meeting, adopted the Management Compensation Policy, which established a Management Performance Pay Plan. This policy also established a standard basis for determining management compensation adjustments. The specific policy language addressing this is as follows:

The base labor market rate, standard performance at the midpoint of the salary range of the pay matrix, will be used to determine annual adjustments to the pay ranges. The base labor market rate will be based on the labor costs of public agencies located in the Portland Metro area as published each January by Milliman USA, a global actuarial and consulting survey firm. In addition to the base labor rate, two (2) percent will be added for retention purposes. The retention rate may be adjusted in the future based on economic and competitive reasons as recommended by the Park District's General Manager.

## Proposal Request

In accordance with the Management Compensation Policy, staff is recommending an adjustment for the 2009-10 fiscal year to reduce the two percent retention rate to zero.

## Benefits of Proposal

Given the current employment market, staff does not believe that the retention rate is necessary. Furthermore the adjustment is in recognition of the economic conditions of the community in which the District operates.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

If the employment market improves, the reduction could hurt competitiveness in recruitment, but this can be addressed if conditions change.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the Management Compensation Policy variance, allowing the General Manager to reduce the retention rate for the 2009-10 fiscal year.

## MEMO

DATE: May 28, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning
RE: $\quad$ Washington County Request for Public Utility Easement in Roxie's Place Park

## Summary

Washington County is seeking Board of Directors approval to acquire a Public Utility Easement on THPRD property (Roxie's Place Park). The Public Utility Easement is needed for the relocation of a City of Beaverton maintained sanitary sewer in conjunction with Washington County's 3-lane road project on NW $170^{\text {th }} / 173^{\text {rd }}$ from Baseline Road to Walker Road.

## Background

Washington County is in the process of constructing a major 3-lane road project on NW $170^{\text {th }} / 173^{\text {rd }}$ from Baseline Road to Walker Road. As part of this project, the County is planning to replace the existing undersized storm pipe with a large box culvert to adequately convey the existing Waterhouse Creek under $173^{\text {rd }}$. Perennial flood conditions cause the creek to overtop the road which requires the road to be closed several days a year during heavy rain events. This flooding and subsequent road closure severely impacts public safety access and reduces the mobility of the surrounding community.

The installation of the box culvert will conflict with an existing sanitary sewer mainline on $173^{\text {rd }}$, maintained by the City of Beaverton. To avoid the conflict, part of the sanitary sewer mainline must be shifted westerly from its current position. The proposed relocated sanitary sewer alignment will pass outside of the existing easement and onto Roxie's Place Park, creating a need for the rectangular shaped additional easement (see attached engineering plan). This additional easement is small, only 920 square feet ( 0.021 acre). The proposed 0.021 -acre easement occurs in a location determined to be a wetland area.

The work to install this sanitary sewer relocation is planned for after the start of the In Water Work window of July 1, 2009. However, the contractor intends to apply to ODFW for permission to access the site prior to July 1, 2009 to expedite the work associated with the box culvert and the sanitary sewer work and an associated road closure.

## Proposal Request

Washington County has obtained a Determination of Just Compensation (DJC) through an Administrative Procedure. The value of the proposed easement was determined to be $\$ 325.00$. In addition, the County agrees to monitor and maintain the 0.021 -acre site for the 5 -year length of the Department of State Land (DSL)/Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) permit period.

Staff has reviewed the proposal from Washington County in conjunction with the Park District's Easement Policy 18.00 and the Wetland and Buffer Mitigation Policy 23.00. Staff has negotiated a proposed compensation package with Washington County and the County has agreed to accept and pay the compensation as outlined below.

| 1. Easement Policy (Minimum compensation per project / staff time) | $\$ 750$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2. Wetland/Buffer Mitigation Policy |  |
| a. Application Fee | Waive |
| b. Staff Consulting Fee | Waive |
| c. Minimum Land Fee (Accept Washington County DJC) | $\$ 325$ |
| d. Long-Term Management Fee | $\$ 5,000$ |
| Total Compensation Package | $\$ 6,075$ |

The Natural Resources Department has also reviewed Washington County's proposal and the proposed compensation package and concurs with both components.

## Benefits of Proposal

With the completion of the project, flooding conditions in the intermediate area will be addressed, which will reduce access and public safety issues for the surrounding community. The proposed easement on Park District property is in a natural area/wetland, which will be enhanced and improved as part of this project.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

The proposal will encumber an additional easement on Park District property, but the area is so small ( 0.021 acre), that any future impact to the District is relatively minor.

## Maintenance Impact

Washington County has agreed to monitor and maintain the 0.021 -acre site for five years in accordance with the DSL/ACOE permits. The long-term management fee of $\$ 5,000$ within the proposed compensation package will provide funding for the Natural Resource Department to maintain the site beyond the initial five year permit period.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the following items:

1. Approval of Washington County's Public Utility Easement request for the NW $170^{\text {th }}$ / $173^{\text {rd }}$ Baseline Road to Walker Road project, including all of the project elements and compensation package; and
2. Authorization for the General Manager or his designee to execute the documents for the processing of the Public Utility Easement as presented.

Board of Directors
Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
15707 SW Walker Road
Beaverton, OR 97006

## RE: WASHINGTON COUNTY REQUEST FOR PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT FOR SANITARY SEWER RELOCATION ON NW $173^{\text {RD }}$ SOUTH OF WALKER ROAD

This letter is intended to request the acquisition of a Public Utility Easement from the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) and its impacts and opportunities regarding THPRD property.

## Project Description

Washington County is in the process of constructing a major 3-lane road project on NW $170^{\text {th }} / 173^{\text {rd }}$ from Baseline Road to Walker Road. As part of this project, the County is planning to replace the existing undersized storm pipe with a large box culvert to adequately convey the existing Waterhouse Creek under NW $173^{\text {rd }}$. Perennial flood conditions cause the creek to overtop the road which requires the road to be closed several days a year during heavy rain events. This flooding and subsequent road closure severely impacts public safety access and reduces the mobility of the surrounding community.

## THPRD IMPACTS

The installation of the box culvert will conflict with an existing sanitary sewer mainline on SW $173^{\text {rd }}$, maintained by the City of Beaverton. To eliminate the conflict, part of this sanitary sewer mainline must be shifted westerly from its current position. The sanitary sewer is located in an existing easement on a THPRD parcel. However due to the new alignment, part of the relocated sewer will pass outside of the existing easement on THPRD property, creating a need for the rectangular shaped additional easement shown in exhibit B of the easement legal description. This additional easement is small, only 920 square feet (0.021 acre).

The proposed 0.021 acre easement occurs in an area determined to be a wetland area. The impacts to this wetland area caused by the installation of the sewer are temporary in nature and a permit to mitigate the temporary impacts has been granted by Oregon Division of State Lands (ODSL) and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). An approved Mitigation Site Plan has been included in the permit documents addressing the

THPRD parcel. The identifying map and tax lot information for the THPRD parcel is 1N131CD08000.

Washington County has obtained a Determination of Just Compensation (DJC) through an Administrative Procedure. The value of the easement is $\$ 325$. THPRD staff has reviewed the DJC and has agree with the valuation. Appropriate construction plan sheets and the easement legal description and exhibit have been provided.

THPRD staff has determined associated fees for this Public Utility Easement of $\$ 750$ for staff time and $\$ 5000$ for Long Term Management. The County will provide payment to the District for the land value and fees totaling $\$ 6,075$.

The County agrees to monitor and maintain the 0.021 acre site for the 5 year length of the ODSL/ USACOE monitoring period.

Financial assurances are already in place. Washington County has set aside funding for installation and maintenance of the project and the contractor has provided a performance bond. Washington County assures THPRD that the work will be performed and maintained.

The Washington County project team has been working closely with THPRD and we seek Board approval of this Public Utility Easement.


Sr. Project Manager
cc: Joe Younkins, Jim Brink




DATE: May 28, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Transfer of System Development Charge Credits from Sexton Crest Park to Timberland Development (Polygon NW)

## Summary

Staff is seeking Board of Directors approval of Polygon Northwest Company's (Polygon) System Development Charge (SDC) credit transfer request from their Sexton Crest development project to their Timberland development project.

## Background

In 2004, the Board of Directors approved Polygon's request to transfer extra SDC credits generated from the completion of their Progress Ridge project to four future projects that they were anticipating. The list of projects eligible to receive the SDC credit transfers was amended with Board approval in 2005 and 2007 due to changes in Polygon's development plans.

One of the projects on the original approved list was Polygon's Sexton Crest residential development. As a result of SDC credits transferred to that project from Progress Ridge as well as credits generated from the development of Sexton Crest Park by Polygon, the project resulted in creditable expenses that exceeded system development charges by approximately $\$ 130,000$.

## Proposal Request

Polygon is requesting a transfer of the SDC credits with a value of approximately $\$ 130,000$ from their completed Sexton Crest project to their Timberland project.

## Benefits of Proposal

By allowing the credit transfer, the Park District would continue its "good faith" partnership and working relationship with Polygon to provide quality park and recreational services to the community through the execution of the SDC fee/credit program.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There appears to be none. Transferring of excess SDC credits from one approved SDC credit project to another approved SDC credit project is an allowable practice of the SDC program and has been done before.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors authorization for staff to transfer SDC credits valued at approximately $\$ 130,000$ from Sexton Crest to the Timberland project with appropriate documentation.

# POLYGON ANORTHWEST COMPANY 

JUNE 1, 2009
HAL BERGSMA
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING
TUALATIN HILLS PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT 15707 SW WALKER ROAD BEAVERTON, OR 97006

## RE: SDC CREDIT TRANSFER

## DEAR HAL:

Polygon Northwest Company would like to formally request that the District's Board of Directors allow the transfer of SDC credits with a value of approximately $\$ 130,000$ from our Sexton Crest project to our Timberland project.

I appreciate your consideration in this matter.
Sincerely,


DATE: May 24, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities

## RE: Telecommunications Site Lease Amendment at Garden Home Recreation Center

## Summary

Staff requests Board of Directors approval to amend the lease agreement for the continued placement of the monopole telecommunication tower at Garden Home Recreation Center.

## Background

Under the provisions of ORS 266, the Park District is authorized to enter into written agreements with other organizations for the performance of any or all functions and activities as deemed necessary. Additional authority for the Park District to consider telecommunication site lease agreements is specifically created in Board Policy 21.00.

On July 1, 1996, the Park District entered into a contract with Sprint (Crown Castle) to lease an area approximately 850 square feet, to install a monopole telecommunication tower within the Garden Home Recreation Center property. Over the years, the Park District has leased ground space to four additional carriers. At present, these five lease agreements provide slightly more than $\$ 60,000$ annually in compensation. Overall site plan is provided in Attachment A.

## Proposal Request

Crown Castle is seeking approval to amend their ground space lease, which is due to expire on June 30, 2016, in order to provide continued cellular services for five (5) carriers. The amended terms will provide for:

- Additional four (4) automatically renewing terms of five (5) years each, plus the remaining term. New lease expiration will be June 30, 2036;
- Modification to amend rent increase to annual COL adjustments (NTE 4\%), versus $20 \%$ per five-year term. Current lease rate is $\$ 1,440$ per month.

The lease agreements for the other carriers at this location expire in 2017 and 2021. Future amendments to these leases will be brought before the Board of Directors for approval.

## Benefits of Proposal

Approval of this lease renewal provides annual compensation, while improving wireless services to the community.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

The only apparent downside to the renewal is the continued use of the ground space covered by the lease, although this will have minimal impact to park users.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval to amend the lease agreement with Crown Castle for the placement of the monopole telecommunication tower within Garden Home Recreation Center property, and to delegate authority to the General Manager, or his designee, to enter into the agreement.


## Attachment B



# MEMORANDUM 

TO: Board of Directors, Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District
FROM: Pamela J. Beery, Office of District General Counsel
SUBJECT: General Manager Employment Agreement
DATE: May 29, 2009 (for Board meeting of June 8, 2009)

On your agenda for consideration at the June 8, 2009 meeting will be a proposed form of employment agreement for General Manager Doug Menke. A copy of the agreement is attached for your reference.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve proposed employment agreement for General Manager Doug Menke.

## DISCUSSION

The agreement in its current form has been in place since November 16, 2006. It is generally sound. That said, our office was asked to review the agreement and to recommend revisions to the agreement to clarify and improve it.

The attached agreement reflects changes from the previous version. In summary, those changes address changes in state law and the adoption of the District Compiled Policies, both of which have occurred since the initial agreement date. In addition, we have recommended the addition of some basic terms including a dispute resolution mechanism; we also recommended deletion of provisions that are duplicated in the District's employment records to ayoid potential confusion and inconsistency.

I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have about the new agreement.

Attachment<br>cc: Nancy Hartman-Noye, Human Resources Manager

## EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

This Employment Agreement (the "Agreement") is effective as of $\qquad$ 2009 by and between the TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT (the "District"), an Oregon public body and special service district, and DOUG MENKE (the "General Manager"), collectively the "parties".

## RECITALS:

A. The District desires to employ Doug Menke as the General Manager and to establish by this Agreement the terms and conditions of employment of the District's General Manager.
B. Doug Menke desires to be employed as the General Manager of the District according to the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement.

Now, therefore, in consideration of Doug Menke's employment with the District pursuant to the terms, conditions, and covenants as set forth below, the parties agree as follows:

1. Duties. The District shall employ Doug Menke as the General Manager, responsible for the management and operations of the District. Menke agrees to perform the functions and duties of the General Manager as specified in the Job Description for the General Manager, attached hereto as Exhibit A and fully incorporated into this Agreement. The General Manager further agrees to perform his duties consistent with District policies and procedures, rules and regulations, and as prescribed or assigned by the Board of Directors of the District periodically. The Board of Directors vests in the General Manager the day-to-day management of District operations, and reserves to itself sole policy-making authority including, but not limited to, personnel, budget, and financial policies.
2. Term of Agreement. This Agreement shall commence on July 1, 2009, and will continue until June 30, 2013 according to its terms unless specifically terminated as set forth in Section 10 below. This Agreement replaces the previous agreement between the parties dated November 16, 2006.
3. Renewal. This Agreement may be renewed by consent of the parties for further terms of such duration and upon such terms and conditions, as the District and the General Manager shall mutually agree upon in writing. If either party desires to terminate the Agreement upon its expiration, such party shall give written notice of such intent at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to such expiration date. A decision by either the District or General Manager to terminate the Agreement shall be subject to the terms set forth in Section 10 below.
4. No Term of Employment. Notwithstanding the term of this Agreement, the employment relationship between the parties is at-will. The District may terminate the General
[^3]Manager's employment at any time for any lawful reason or for no reason at all, subject to the provisions of this Agreement. Similarly, the General Manager may resign his employment at any time, subject to the provisions of this Agreement.
5. Outside Employment. Subject to prior approval of the District Board, and consistent with the limitations of state law governing use of public office for personal financial gain, the General Manager may engage in outside employment, provided that the outside employment:
a) In no way detracts from the efficiency of the General Manager while performing his District work.
b) Does not occur during the normal business hours of the District and in no way interferes with the General Manager's ability to effectively discharge his assigned duties and responsibilities.
c) In no way discredits the District.
d) In no way constitutes a conflicting interest with the General Manager's employment at the District.
6. Hours of Work. The General Manager shall determine his hours of work so as to be available to the public on a predictable and regular basis and so as to accomplish the goals and tasks directed by the Board of Directors. The General Manager is salaried and exempt from overtime compensation.
7. Annual Performance Evaluation. The Board of Directors shall meet with the General Manager annually in the month of June or as soon thereafter as reasonably practicable (unless the General Manager's performance dictates otherwise) to evaluate and assess the performance of the General Manager in meeting or progressing toward the goals set forth in the Job Description, this Agreement, or as otherwise adopted by the Board of Directors. In the event that the District determines that the performance of the General Manager is unsatisfactory in any respect or needs improvement in any area, the Board of Directors shall describe those concerns in reasonable detail and as objectively as practicable. Failure to improve performance or otherwise cure such deficiencies can be grounds for Termination for Cause as set forth below in Section 10(b).
8. Compensation. Commencing on the effective date of this Agreement, the District shall pay the General Manager for services rendered an annual base salary to be determined by the Board in its discretion and reflected in adopted Board action in the General Manager's personnel file. In addition, the District, at its discretion, may award the General Manager some,
none, or all of an annual bonus not to exceed $\$ 5,000$ based on the Board of Directors' assessment of the General Manager's performance in the preceding fiscal year. The District will review the base salary, potential bonus, and other benefits available to the General Manager at the General Manager's annual performance review.
9. Benefits. The General Manager shall be eligible to participate in all employee pension and welfare benefit plans and programs made available and as hereafter may be provided to regular District employees generally per the Employee Handbook, including but not limited to the following fringe benefits: health insurance programs covering medical insurance, dental insurance, life insurance, and long term disability; retirement benefits pursuant to the group annuity contract with Standard Insurance Company and deferred compensation plan; vacation; and sick leave. With respect to vacation hours, the parties have separately resolved the question of the General Manager's accrual being in excess of the maximum otherwise allowed by District policy by written agreement.
10. Termination and Severance. The General Manager's employment is at-will meaning that the General Manager can be terminated at any time, including before the expiration of the initial or any subsequent term of this Agreement, in which event the General Manager's compensation and benefits shall terminate except as otherwise specified below:
a. Termination Without Cause. The General Manager's employment may be terminated by either the District or the General Manager for any reason whatsoever upon the giving of thirty (30) calendar days' written notice to the other party. During the notice period, the General Manager must continue to fulfill all of his duties and responsibilities and use his best efforts to aid in the transition of any replacement. However, nothing herein shall require the District to maintain General Manager in active employment during the notification period. Regardless of whether the General Manager remains in active employment, he shall be entitled to receive his salary and benefits during the thirty (30) day notice period unless he engages in conduct that would give rise to Termination for Cause as defined below.
b. Termination for Cause. The General Manager's employment may be terminated immediately in the sole discretion of the District upon the occurrence of any one of the following events:
i. The General Manager willfully and/or continuously fails or is negligent in the performance of his duties, or refuses to comply with the policies, standards and regulations of the District or Board directives as are established periodically. The Board of Directors has the discretion, but not the requirement, to allow the General Manager to remedy such misconduct or negligence to the Board's reasonable satisfaction within thirty (30) calendar days after written

[^4]notice, including a description of the misconduct or negligence, has been delivered to the General Manager by the Board.
ii. The General Manager has committed acts of fraud, dishonesty, misappropriation of funds or other District assets, intentional deception of the Board or other authority, embezzlement, or other crimes, or otherwise engaged in misconduct or fraternization reflecting poorly on the General Manager or the District; or
iii. The General Manager has violated any material term of this Agreement.
c. Severance Upon Termination Without Cause. In the event that the General Manager is involuntarily terminated by the District without cause before the expiration of the term of this Agreement or any subsequent renewal period per Section 10(a) above, and prior to such time the General Manager has been fulfilling his duties and obligations pursuant to this Agreement, then upon the execution of a mutual release and waiver of any and all potential claims by the parties against each other, the District agrees to pay the General Manager twelve (12) months of base salary, computed based upon the General Manager's then current annual base salary. This amount shall be payable by the District to the General Manager either as a lump sum or in equal monthly allotments over twelve (12) months subject to mutual agreement by the District and the General Manager. . In addition, solely during the twelve (12) month period immediately following termination without cause, the District shall enable the General Manager to continue to receive those District medical, dental, long-term disability insurance, and life insurance benefits that the General Manager was eligible for and received immediately prior to termination, provided that during the twelve (12) month period the General Manager continues to pay to the District or the other relevant parties the appropriate deductibles, co-payments, and benefit plan participation fees required of District employees. If terminated for cause under Section 10(b) of this Agreement, or if the General Manager voluntarily resigns under Section 10(d) of this Agreement, then the District shall have no obligation to provide for or pay any severance payment and the District shall have no obligation to provide the General Manager with any continuing benefits of any kind. If, within the twelve (12) month period following termination without cause, the General Manager accepts a new job or position with an organization that provides some or all of the aforementioned benefits then the General Manager's eligibility to continue to receive medical, dental, long-term disability insurance, and life insurance benefits from the District for the remainder of the twelve (12) month period shall immediately cease.
d. Voluntary Resignation. If the General Manager voluntarily resigns his employment and thereby terminates this Agreement before the expiration of the term of

[^5]the Agreement or any subsequent renewal period, then in order to resign in good standing the General Manager shall give the District at least thirty (30) calendar days' notice.
e. Termination by Death or Disability. The General Manager's employment and right to compensation and other benefits under this Agreement shall terminate if the General Manager is unable to perform the duties and responsibilities of his position due to health or disability in excess of ninety (90) calendar days, unless otherwise required by law. The General Manager's heirs, beneficiaries, successors, or assignees shall not be entitled to any of the compensation benefits to which the General Manager is entitled under this Agreement except: (i) to the extent required by law; and (ii) to the extent such benefit plans and policies under which the General Manager is covered provide a benefit to his heirs, beneficiaries, successors, or assignees.
11. Reimbursement of District-related Expenses. The District shall reimburse the General Manager for reasonable expenses of a non-personal and District-related nature, which the General Manager incurs, upon receipt of expense vouchers, receipts, or other statements supporting the reimbursement request. The General Manager is authorized to expend District funds in the amount up to $\$ 5,000$ without pre-approval from the Board for the execution of District business and in representing the District at conferences and otherwise, and to incur travel and lodging expenses in the conduct of District business.
12. Reimbursement of Training, Development, Dues and Subscription Expenses. The District will reimburse the General Manager up to $\$ 5,000$ per year, upon receipt of expense vouchers, receipts or other statements supporting the reimbursement request, for the General Manager's professional dues, subscriptions, training, and development provided by appropriate associations and organizations and that are necessary and desirable for the General Manager's professional growth and development or to improve his performance as the General Manager.
13. Entire Agreement. Except as set forth herein, this Agreement represents the entire agreement and understanding between the parties regarding its subject matter, and supersedes and replaces any and all prior agreements, whether written or oral, formal or informal, regarding its subject matter. This provision is not intended to limit the application of otherwise applicable District policies or requirements.
14. Amendments. This Agreement only may be amended by written agreement executed by and delivered to both parties.
15. Waiver. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be valid unless in writing, signed by the party against whom the waiver is sought to be enforced. The waiver of any breach of this Agreement or failure to enforce any provision of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of any subsequent breach.
16. Governing Law. This Agreement shall be construed with and governed by the laws of the State of Oregon.
17. Mediation. Should any dispute arise between the parties regarding the terms of this Agreement or work or services covered thereby, it is agreed that such dispute is required to be submitted to a mediator prior to arbitration. The parties shall exercise good faith efforts to select a mediator. The mediator shall be compensated by the District. Mediation will be conducted in Portland, Oregon, unless both parties agree otherwise. Both parties agree to exercise good faith efforts to resolve disputes covered by this section through this mediation process. If a party requests mediation and the other party fails to respond within ten calendar days, or if the parties fail to agree on a mediator within ten calendar days, a mediator shall be appointed by the presiding judge of the Washington County Circuit Court upon request of either party.
18. Arbitration. In the event the parties have a dispute concerning the terms of this Agreement or the terms and conditions of the employment relationship (and they have not otherwise resolved the matter through the mediation process set out in subsection (17) above) then the dispute shall be resolved by submitting it to binding arbitration.

1. Within thirty (30) calendar days of a notice by either party to the other requesting arbitration, District and General Manager shall select an arbitrator from a list of three (3) names obtained from Arbitration Services of Portland, Inc. (ASP). The arbitrator shall for purposes of the arbitration proceedings, apply the rules of mandatory arbitration as adopted by the ASP in effect at the time of the arbitration. The arbitrator shall not have the authority nor the jurisdiction to change, modify or otherwise fail to adhere to the provisions of this Employment Agreement.
2. Within sixty (60) calendar days of the selection or appointment of the arbitrator, both District and General Manager shall concurrently submit to the arbitrator (supplying a copy to each other) a written statement of their respective legal and factual positions on the dispute. The arbitrator shall determine, after a hearing on the merits and within forty-five (45) calendar days after receipt of the statements, the determination of the dispute which determination shall be final and binding unless the arbitrator has exceeded his/her authority and/or jurisdiction.
3. Each party shall bear equally the expense of the arbitrator and all other expenses of conducting the arbitration. Each party shall bear its own expenses for witnesses, depositions and attorneys in any arbitration or any other action arising out of or related to this Agreement or the terms and conditions of the employment relationship.
4. Severability. If any provision of this Agreement is declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, such provision shall be severed from the Agreement and the other provisions shall remain in full force and effect.
5. Terms. The terms of this Agreement are contractual in nature, and are not to be construed as mere recitals.
6. Personal Nature. This Agreement is a contract for personal services and may not be assigned in whole or part by the General Manager.
7. Notices. All notices, requests, demands, and other communications required by this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be delivered by any method, which provides for proof of delivery, to the respective parties at the addresses provided below:

## Doug Menke

565 NW $167^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
Beaverton, OR 97006

Board of Directors
Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District
15707 SW Walker Road
Beaverton, OR 97006

Dated this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2009.

## Doug Menke

Dated this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2009.

TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT

By
Larry Pelatt
President of the Board

## MEMO

DATE: June 1, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Consultant Contract for Cedar Hills Park

## Summary

Staff requests Board of Directors approval to negotiate with the Consultant of Record, MacKay \& Sposito, for the design of the Cedar Hills Park Project.

## Background

On May 5, 2009, staff issued a Request for Quotes (RFQ) from MacKay \& Sposito, Walker Macy, David Evans \& Associates, WHPacific, and OTAK, who are all on the Consultant of Record roster for Category II, Community Parks. With the information these five (5) firms submitted in their original Consultant of Record (COR) proposals, staff believes they are each highly qualified consultant firms for this community park project.

On May 15, 2009, David Evans \& Associates submitted a signed letter to the Park District informing of the firm's decision to "opt out" of the Cedar Hills RFO process. On May 26, 2009, staff received four (4) COR proposals for the Cedar Hills Park project.

Staff has reviewed and evaluated the four proposals and recommends negotiating the final scope of work and fee with MacKay \& Sposito. MacKay \& Sposito's proposal provides a greater understanding of the project and the required process. Their proposal is also more detailed and clear in the project approach. MacKay \& Sposito includes additional tasks in their scope which staff believes are required based on recent information received from the City of Beaverton and staff's understanding of project conditions and goals. In addition, MacKay \& Sposito's proposed schedule is 8 to 10 months shorter than the other three COR's due to a good approach within the land use review and permitting phases, and because of faster document production and deliverable(s) schedules throughout all document development phases of the project.

MacKay \& Sposito's proposed base fee is $\$ 435,907$, while WHPacific's base fee is $\$ 520,041$, Walker Macy's base fee is $\$ 530,350$, and OTAK's base fee is $\$ 546,436$. The base fees cannot be the sole basis for comparison as they all include slightly different assumptions, proposed tasks, deliverables and project duration. Staff has carefully evaluated all fees as proposed by each COR in order to derive the most appropriate comparison.

The following examples are some of the additional services included in MacKay \& Sposito's scope, which are required to complete the project and distinguished their proposal from the other consultants.

- Identifies a good understanding of land use requirements, process and permitting, and will provide deliverables required for either City of Beaverton Type II or Type III land use review.
- Identifies the potential issue of undersized City of Beaverton/Clean Water Services (CWS) storm sewer systems, and provides an innovative approach to addressing and resolving the issue by performing required analysis and providing cost estimates for multiple conceptual options within the Master Plan phase. Includes original City of Beaverton/CWS storm drainage consultant on project team. Also identifies Low Impact Development strategies for increasing onsite storm drainage capacity and reducing impacts to off-site storm sewer systems. Other proposals do not identify nor address this issue.
- Identifies the potential requirement and provides scope of work for $1 / 2$ street improvement design, coordination, and drawings along SW Cedar Hills Boulevard.
- Identifies the potential for avoiding requirement for $1 / 2$ street improvement design, coordination, and drawings along SW Walker Road based on information provided by Washington County. All other proposals anticipate public improvements to SW Walker Road.
- Identifies a clear and comprehensive understanding of parking issues, traffic impacts, and jurisdictional process. Provides a Traffic Impact Analysis Report in base scope of work.
- Identifies a good approach for avoiding CWS Site Assessment review/permitting and associated Service Provider Letter by providing scope for an environmental site assessment and CWS Sensitive Area Certification Form within the Design Development phase.
- Provides a clear and comprehensive approach to the Splash Pad design, coordination, and drawings that include the services of an aquatic systems designer capable of accommodating sole source products at the District's discretion. Consultant has existing working relationship with the District's Aquatics and Maintenance staff. Identifies a good understanding of Park District's goal of coordinating the two (2) Bond Program splash pads.

MacKay \& Sposito's base fee of $\$ 435,907$ is below staff's original A/E cost estimate range shared with the Board of $10 \%-15 \%$ ( $\$ 512,125-\$ 768,187$ ).

## Proposal Request

Staff is recommending Board of Directors approval of MacKay \& Sposito as the lead consultant with a proposed not-to-exceed contract amount of $\$ 435,907$. Staff will negotiate the final scope of work and fees. These negotiations will be based upon detailed project discussions.

## Benefits of Proposal

With the hiring of the lead consultant, the Park District will be able to proceed with the project as presented in the 2008 Bond Measure.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There are no apparent downsides to this proposal.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the following items:

1) Approval of MacKay \& Sposito as the lead consultant for the Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment Project; and
2) Authorization for staff to negotiate the final scope of work and fees with a not-toexceed contract amount of $\$ 435,907$, and to execute the contract once it is finalized.



MEMO

DATE: May 28, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Consultant Contract for Schiffler Park Renovation Project

## Summary

Staff requests Board of Directors approval to negotiate with the recommended Consultant of Record, David Evans and Associates, for the design and construction of the Schiffler Park Renovation Project.

## Background

On April 6, 2009, staff issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to WH Pacific, David Evans and Associates (DEA) and OTAK, who are on the Consultant of Record roster for Category II, Community Parks. With the information these firms submitted in their original Consultant of Record proposals, staff believes they are the most qualified consultant firms for this community park renovation project.

Staff's evaluation of the proposals has determined that DEA has the best understanding of the project and required process. The DEA proposal is more detailed in its approach and clearly identifies all tasks, deliverables and durations to complete them. DEA has also included several tasks in their scope that the other firms did not. Staff has evaluated the proposed schedules and found DEA is the most accurate and realistic compared to the other two firms.

DEA's proposed base fee is $\$ 432,697$ with WH Pacific's base fee at $\$ 309,979$ and OTAK's base fee at $\$ 223,097$. The base fees cannot be used as a basis for comparison as they all include different assumptions, proposed tasks and deliverables. It is staff's opinion that it may be possible to reduce DEA's fees through the negotiation process without compromising the Scope of Work.

The following examples are some of the additional services included in DEA's scope, which are required to complete the project and distinguished their proposal from the other consultants:

- Includes Professional Cost Estimator.
- Identifies the potential need for $1 / 2$ street improvement design, coordination, and drawings.
- Identifies the potential need for $1 / 2$ street right-of-way survey dedication coordination/exhibits.
- Project Manager has ample hours and duration for the project.
- Task 3 includes input of all red line comments.
- The most clear, comprehensive description of the needed land use and environmental reviews and permits, their timelines and submittals.
- Allowed for unlimited addenda, change orders, and requests for information during construction. Other proposers limited these services.

DEA's base number of $\$ 432,697$ is within staff's original A\&E cost estimate range to the Board of $10 \%-15 \%(\$ 297,500-\$ 446,250)$.

## Proposal Request

Staff is recommending Board of Directors approval of DEA as the lead consultant with a proposed not-to-exceed contract amount of $\$ 432,697$. Staff will negotiate the final Scope of Work and fees. These negotiations will be based upon detailed project discussions.

## Benefits of Proposal

With the hiring of the lead consultant, the Park District will be able to proceed with the project as presented in the 2008 Bond Measure.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There are no apparent downsides to this proposal.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the following items:

1) Approval of DEA as the lead consultant for the Schiffler Park Renovation Project; and
2) Authorization for staff to negotiate the final Scope of Work and fees with a not-toexceed contract amount of $\$ 432,697$, and to execute the contract once it is finalized.



# MEMO 

DATE: $\quad$ May 26, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad$ Consultant Contract for Westside Trail Segments 1, 4 and 7

## Summary

Staff requests Board of Directors approval to negotiate with the Consultant of Record, David Evans and Associates, for the design of the Westside Trail Segments 1, 4 and 7 Project.

## Background

On April 6, 2009, staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) from David Evans and Associates (DEA) and OTAK, who are both on the Consultant of Record roster for Category III, Trails and Linear Parks. With the information these two firms submitted in their original Consultant of Record proposals, staff believes they are the two most qualified consultant firms for this regional trail project.

Staff has reviewed and evaluated both proposals and recommend negotiating the final scope of work and fee with DEA. DEA's proposal provides a greater understanding of the project and the required process. Their proposal is also more detailed and clear in the project approach. DEA includes numerous additional tasks in their scope which staff believes are required based on our recent Westside Trail project completion. In addition, DEA's proposed schedule is 15 months shorter than OTAK's due to a good approach within the permitting phases.

DEA's proposed base fee is $\$ 511,335$ and OTAK's base fee is $\$ 381,279$. The base fees cannot be the basis for comparison as they all include different assumptions, proposed tasks, deliverables and project duration. It is staff's opinion that it may be possible to reduce DEA's fee through the negotiation process without compromising the Scope of Work.

The following examples are some of the additional services included in DEA's scope, which are required to complete the project and distinguished their proposal from the other consultant.

- Survey of a single, 3-acre or less off-site mitigation site.
- Wetland delineation of off-site mitigation site.
- Detailed coordination with utility companies including pot holing Kinder Morgan's gas line and meeting Bonneville Power Administration requirements for coordination.
- City of Beaverton site development permit.
- Washington County facility permit.
- Mid block crossing approach and design at Scholls Ferry Road.
- Boundary surveys for 12 properties needed for right-of-way acquisition.
- Traffic generation memo for City of Beaverton Type 3 application.
- Realistic project management services throughout project timeline.

DEA's base number of $\$ 511,335$ is slightly below staff's original A\&E cost estimate range to the Board of $15 \%-20 \% ~(\$ 529,125-\$ 705,500)$.

## Proposal Request

Staff is recommending Board of Directors approval of DEA as the lead consultant with a proposed not-to-exceed contract amount of $\$ 511,333$. Staff will negotiate the final Scope of Work and fees. These negotiations will be based upon detailed project discussions.

## Benefits of Proposal

With the hiring of the lead consultant, the Park District will be able to proceed with the project as presented in the 2008 Bond Measure.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

There are no apparent downsides to this proposal.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of the following items:

1) Approval of DEA as the lead consultant for the Westside Trail Project; and
2) Authorization for staff to negotiate the final Scope of Work and fees with a not-toexceed contract amount of $\$ 511,335$, and to execute the contract once it is finalized.
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## MEMO

DATE:
May 29, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning

## RE: $\quad 2008$ Bond Measure

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 2008 Bond Measure. Topics addressed include the initial Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee meeting, the status of land acquisition efforts and the status of the Sunset Swim Center project.

## Initial Bond Oversight Committee Meeting

The first meeting of the Bond Oversight Committee was held May 7. Nine of the twelve Oversight Committee members were able to attend, as well as Director Bob Scott, Keith Hobson and myself as ex-officio members. Other staff attending included yourself, Steve Gulgren, Gery Keck and Dave Chrisman. The meeting followed the agenda previously provided to the Board. Marc San Soucie was elected Chair and Spence Benfield was elected Vice-Chair, both by consensus. Bob Scott did a good job of explaining the Committee's roles and responsibilities and setting the tone for the meeting, which was positive. There was good participation in discussion by all members attending. Meeting outcomes included:

- All attendees seemed to have a good understanding of the Committee's role, including their role in the acquisition process. There seemed to be a clear understanding that we could not provide them with site-specific information about potential acquisitions. We did agree to attempt to provide information about the level of land acquisition activity, such as number of owner contacts, number of appraisals conducted, etc.
- At the completion of the meeting the attendees had a good understanding of the various elements of the bond program such as commitments made prior to the election, the bond sale, project budgets, the consultant selection process, staffing and project scheduling. The only concern expressed related to the lack of specificity about the timing of acquisitions. It was noted that because acquisitions are opportunity driven and dependent on owner willingness, it is difficult to forecast when they would occur.
- It was agreed that the Committee would try to make decisions by consensus, but may choose to vote on issues if consensus could not be achieved. There was agreement that minority reports should be allowed within the annual public report.
- It was agreed that reports to the Board should be in writing, with a preference that the Committee or an appointed subcommittee rather than staff would write the reports.
- There was good discussion of policy issues. In addition to issues suggested by staff for consideration (budget adjustments, use of interest and project savings, performance measurement, setting value for acquisitions), there were also suggestions to consider the effectiveness and accuracy of communications efforts; how to assure acquisitions are for the purpose intended (i.e., is it really a "natural area"); how to assure the effectiveness of natural area restoration projects; how to maximize opportunities to leverage bond measure funds.
- There was some discussion about public communications of Oversight Committee activities, and who should speak for the Committee. It was generally agreed it should be the Chair.
- There was agreement the next meeting should not be until the latter part of September, although there was interest by some members in being kept up-to-date on bond measure activities in the interim. Staff will provide members with this monthly update.


## Land Acquisition Efforts

A temporary part time (approximately $3 / 4$ time) Land Acquisition Specialist, William (Wil) Eadie, has been hired to lead bond program land acquisition efforts. Wil started work May 11. He has experience working as an appraiser and for nine years as a land acquisition person for Metro's bond-supported natural area program. He will attend the Executive Session of the Board's June 8 meeting.

Initially, Wil has been directed to gather information on potential acquisition sites in the District. He will be working full time over the next couple of months to do this, in anticipation of bringing the information to the Board in Executive Sessions at the July and August meetings. At those meetings, staff will be seeking Board guidance on prioritization of acquisition targets. Staff intends to focus on larger and more time sensitive acquisition targets at the July meeting, including a community park site in the District's northeast quadrant, a community center site in the southwest quadrant, land for expansion of Cedar Hills Park, and land for completion of the Jordan Park Trail. At the August meeting, we will begin discussion of potential acquisition targets for neighborhood park sites, natural areas and land for linear parks/trails.

It should also be noted that Melanie Moon, the District's land acquisition specialist who was previously working under contract, has now been hired as a part-time employee (approximately $1 / 4$ time). Although her focus will be on non-bond related acquisitions, she will also assist in land and easement acquisitions for trail projects funded with bond money.

Finally, staff continues to work with The Trust for Public Land (TPL) on certain higher-value acquisition efforts that involve a greater degree of complexity including the acquisition of a community park site in the northeast quadrant and a community center site in the southwest quadrant. Staff and TPL representatives have had recent discussions about clarifying the relationship through a memorandum of understanding.

## Sunset Swim Center Update

The first bond project, the rebuild of the air-handling tunnel at Sunset Swim Center, is now completed and the pool re-opened on June 1, 2009.

This project rebuilt the tunnel around the perimeter of the pool, which is used to circulate heated air to the facility. Due to time and moisture, the concrete in this tunnel was deteriorating and the exposed rebar was beginning to corrode. The project removed the decking over the tunnel and the very top of the pool walls in order to expose the tunnel. The concrete in the tunnel was then rebuilt, and sealed with a watertight liner. The deck and pool walls were then reconstructed and refinished.

This project was budgeted in the bond package at $\$ 500,000$, and the actual cost of the project will come in less than $\$ 300,000$. The project was completed within a tight window to minimize program impacts and was completed on time.

Staff will show photos of the project, both during the construction and as completed, during the June 8, 2009 Board of Directors meeting.

DATE: June 2, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Bob Wayt, Director of Communications \& Development

## RE: Family Assistance Program Revision

## Summary

The Family Assistance Program Task Force, composed of community members and Park District staff, first met in late 2007 to review the program and make recommendations for improvement. The changes were adopted by the Board of Directors at their meeting on November 5, 2007 and implemented January 1, 2008. In February 2009, the task force reconvened to assess the program and propose adjustments. Staff has reviewed those adjustments and recommends changes to the Family Assistance (FA) Program to increase equality among patrons while ensuring the program is fiscally responsible to taxpayers.

## Highlights of Current Family Assistance Program

- Requesters apply annually. Qualifying households receive $\$ 200$ per person per year.
- Eligibility is based on federal poverty guidelines. Income is verified by THPRD.
- Fee waivers are accessed through gift cards coded to FA.
- Families may use their total allowance in any way they choose, including the commingling of funds among members of the same household.
- Cards are valid for one year from date of activation.
- Unused amounts are not carried over from year to year.
- Qualifying households may register for an affiliated sports league program.
- Current usage of FA is sharply higher than pre-2008 levels and continues to trend upward.

|  | Total Waivers <br> Approved | Total Waivers <br> Used | Total \# of <br> Households | Total \# of <br> Patrons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FY 2007-08 <br> Actual* * | $\$ 383,181$ | $\$ 177,466$ | 871 | 1,457 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FY 2008-09 <br> Projected | $\$ 650,000$ | $\$ 360,000$ | 2,389 | 4,583 |

[^6]
## Benefits of Program

More families living at or below the line of poverty have been able to access recreation programs that would have been cost-prohibitive. Beneficiaries are able to participate in healthful activities. The program has helped mitigate the impact of district fee increases that began phasing in January 1, 2008 and the economic downturn we are experiencing. Due to the program's establishment of income requirements based on federal poverty guidelines, those being helped are truly in need.

The following areas of the program were reviewed and discussed by the Family Assistance Program Task Force in February 2009. The subsequent recommendations have been reviewed by Park District staff and are noted as follows:

## 1. Individual/Household Amount

Task Force Recommendation: Provide a minimum of $\$ 400$ per household to effectively allow seniors living on a fixed income to participate in recreation programs at the same level as they did prior to the program being revamped. This would also treat single adults under the age of 55 more fairly.

Staff Recommendation: After review, THPRD staff believes statistical evidence is not strong enough to support an adjustment specific to the senior category. Staff believes equality of benefits can best be ensured by strictly limiting Family Assistance allowances to $\$ 200$ per person per household per year. Assistance will not be transferable between household members.

## 2. Addition of New Child

Task Force Recommendation: Make it possible to add a new child, six months or older, to a household account and prorate the amount based on the time of year the child is added. This recommendation is designed to benefit foster and adopted children as well as new babies.

Staff Recommendation: Children six months or older may be added to a household at any time in the year and should be credited a prorated percentage of the standard $\$ 200$ perperson allocation. Again, the amount may not be used by other household members. When it is time for an eligible household to renew FA, any unused funds should be erased from the account. All household members should be renewed at the same time.

## 3. Volunteer Opportunities

Task Force Recommendation: Allow recipients to give back to THPRD and the community by offering them the opportunity to volunteer in appropriate Park District programs. In addition, invite the affiliated sports groups to participate in the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation Hike ' $n$ ' Bike. Half of the money raised by a group would help to fund the Family Assistance Program and the other half would be returned to the group. The Tualatin Hills Park Foundation would retain the first $\$ 10$ each person pays to attend the event.

Staff Response: Allowing recipients the opportunity to give back to the program is an appealing concept. Staff wishes to study the idea further and implement where possible.

## Potential Benefits of the Changes

By providing Family Assistance on a per-person basis and discontinuing the practice of commingling household allowances, all households participating in the program would receive equal scholarship opportunities regardless of the number of individuals in each household.

## Potential Downside of the Changes

Some households are currently allocating their total assistance to one or more children. The new restriction would mean that some children may be unable to participate at their current level of activity, as family resources may not be available to make up the difference in overall program cost.

## Summary

Consistent with Board and Budget Committee members' comments, staff intends to monitor the program closely to ensure a balance between expenditures and need. The program must be reasonable and controlled while at the same time offering assistance to those who meet the need criteria. The action requested below, we believe, achieves that purpose.

## Action Requested

Staff requests the Board of Directors accept the staff recommendations for 1 and 2 as detailed within this memo. Implementation will commence July 1, 2009 and will apply to all new applicants and renewals. Staff will monitor the impact of these changes and review overall program effectiveness after six months.

## MEMO

DATE: May 28, 2009
TO: The Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager

## RE: District Compiled Policies

Attached please find a memo from Tom Sponsler with Beery, Elsner \& Hammond, LLP, Park District legal counsel, along with a Resolution approving Chapter 8 of the District Compiled Policies.

In addition, please find attached the following documents: Proposed District Compiled Policies Chapter 8, the accompanying Operational Policies \& Procedures relating to the policy statements contained within the proposed Chapter 8, and the Board of Directors' current policies 18.0 (Easements/Right-of-Way/Permits on District Owned Property), 19.0 (Encroachments of District Owned Property), 21.0 (Telecommunication Site Agreement and Implementation), and 23.0 (Wetland and Buffer Mitigation Policy).

No substantive changes have been made to the current Board of Director Policies referenced above. As recommended by legal counsel, the current Policies have been divided into two separate portions: Board of Director policy statements (Chapter 8) and operational rules guiding the implementation of those statements (Operational Policies \& Procedures).

Tom will be at your meeting to provide an overview of the memo and attachments and to answer any questions the Board of Directors may have.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors approval of Resolution 2009-10 - Approving District Compiled Policy Chapter Eight, as Revisions of Previously Adopted Board Policies.

## MEMORANDUM

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { TO: } & \text { THPRD Board of Directors } \\ \text { FROM: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Thomas Sponsler } \\ \text { Office of General Counsel }\end{array}\end{array}$
SUBJECT: District Compiled Policies - Chapter 8, District Property
DATE: June 8, 2009

## Introduction

We reviewed the 26 Board policies adopted between 1975 and 2008. At the February 2, 2009 Board meeting we proposed a new organization and comprehensive format for the policies. We presented chapters one through six for approval at the April 6, 2009 Board meeting. At the May 4, 2009 Board meeting we proposed and the Board approved for the first time the ordinance to adopt Chapter 7, District Regulations. Chapter 7 is before you again today for final approval and enactment. Chapter 8, District Property is also presented for consideration and adoption.

## Chapter 8

The attached Chapter 8 resolution is submitted for approval by the Board. As previously discussed, some former policies were not included in the previously approved District Compiled Policy(DCP) format. Chapter 8 continues edited versions of previous policies 18, 19, 21 and 23. The chapter refers to District Operating Rules adopted by the Manager. The chapter is consistent with current District practice and state law.

## Conclusion

The memo and attachment presents the Board with the amended version of the new DCP Chapter 8. You are asked to approve the Chapter 8 resolution.

TS/sg
Enclosures

## RESOLUTION NO. 2009-10

## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, Oregon

A RESOLUTION APPROVING DISTRICT COMPILED POLICIES CHAPTER EIGHT, AS REVISIONS OF PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BOARD POLICIES
a. The Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (District) board first adopted 26 policies on October 28, 1975 and last amended them on February 4, 2008;
b. The General Counsel revised the policies to provide updated legal context, and edited them for clarity and consistent word usage. The revised policies were placed into chapters as the District Complied Policies (DCP) and made more useful and readable; and
c. DCP chapters one through six were adopted by Board resolution on April 6, 2009. Chapter eight contains portions of former policies not included in chapters one through six.

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

Section 1. The new DCP chapter eight, as attached as Exhibit $A$ to this Resolution is approved.

Section 2. This resolution takes effect on July 1, 2009.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVAL: June 8, 2009

Larry Pelatt
President / Director

Adoption and date attested by:

[^7]
## 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 Rules 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.
(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 Rules 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 Rules adopted by the Manager. The rules 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 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 Rules 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 Rules to reflect inflationary increases in staffing, materials and land costs. Updates will take into account local, regional and statewide planning and regulatory initiatives.

Date: June 8, 2009
Adopted by: Doug Menke
General Manager
Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

Supersedes Policy: Board Policy 18.00
Implemented by: Hal Bergsma
Director of Planning
Signature:
Date:

## 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.

## PROCEDURE

A. Permanent Easement Requests (including right-of-way requests)

All Permanent Easement requests greater than 350 square feet shall be approved by the Board of Directors. Any Permanent Easement request that is 350 square feet or less in size may be reviewed, denied or approved, and processed by the General Manager or designee.
B. Temporary Easement Requests

1. Construction Easements (Negative Impact to Site)
a. Any Temporary Construction Easement that is associated with a Permanent Easement request that is greater than 350 square feet in size will need Board of Directors approval along with the Permanent Easement request.
b. Any Temporary Construction Easement that is greater than 350 square feet in size that is not associated with a Permanent Easement request will need Board of Directors approval if it is likely to result in a negative impact to the site, as determined by the General Manager or designee.
c. Any Temporary Construction Easement request that is 350 square feet or less in size and is not associated with a Permanent Easement request may be reviewed, processed and approved or denied by the General Manager or designee.
2. Temporary Access Easements (No Negative Impact to Site)
a. All access requests, permit-of-entry, right-of-entry and any other similar associated types of access-only requests that are temporary in nature and are determined by the General Manager or designee to have no negative impact to the site may be reviewed, processed and approved or denied by the General Manager or designee.
C. The General Manager or designee shall have the discretionary authority to bring to the Board of Directors for approval any easement request that does not fit a typical category or that the General Manager decides needs Board of Directors approval even though these administrative rules do not require it.
D. The general process for obtaining Board of Directors approval for any easement request shall be to present the request and seek approval in a single Board meeting.
3. At the discretion of the General Manager or designee, however, requests that are deemed to be significant, complex, or potentially contentious, may be handled over two Board meetings. In this case the first meeting would be for presentation and review, and the second meeting would be to address questions raised during the first meeting and seek approval for the request.
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## Easements on District Property

2. The Board of Directors will always have the prerogative to delay a decision on a request to a subsequent meeting and request additional information prior to approving or rejecting a request.

## E. Submittal Requirements

Requests for easements shall be submitted in writing to District staff. Easement requests shall include the following:

1. Narrative Proposal. Proposals shall include a narrative description of the easement; timeline for construction; anticipated impacts; mitigating measures; and proposed compensation to the District.
2. Location, Site \& Easement Maps. Maps shall include a scaled drawing which includes all boundaries of the District property; existing and proposed improvements; and easement location.
3. Assurances. Written assurances shall be provide to include (1) a commitment to provide acceptable District compensation; (2) a commitment to provide required liability insurance indemnifying the District; (3) a commitment to provide a maintenance bond/surety for $110 \%$ of the estimated cost (to be verified by a qualified landscape architect or engineer) for restoration/re-vegetation of the District property; submission of an acceptable restoration/re-vegetation plan; (4) a commitment to take adequate measures to protect public safety during and after construction; (5) a commitment to assume all costs for processing an approved easement through appropriate city and/or county land use fees and legal procedures; and (6) a commitment to properly notify adjacent neighbors of construction activities at least one week prior to the beginning of construction.

Upon receipt of a complete easement request staff shall review such requests and make a recommendation to the General Manager or designee.
F. Compensation. Compensation shall be negotiated by staff and should include consideration of one or all of the following measures:

1. Fair market values of the easement area (to be determined by a property appraisal acceptable to staff which is paid for by the applicant, or by an amount determined by staff from recent District property appraisals prepared for similar properties) Consideration will be made by the Board that the cost of the easement may include the cost of staff time to review and process.
2. Park Improvements.
3. Donation(s) of land.

The minimum compensation amount shall be $\$ 750$ per project. The Board or General Manager may waive the compensation requirement if it is felt that it would be in the District's best interests to do so.
G. Approval Authority. Approval or disapproval of all easement requests shall be made per the operational policies and procedures. If it is determined that the proposed easement is acceptable, staff shall proceed to formalize the easement. No construction may begin until written authorization to proceed is received from District staff, and written authorization shall not be provided until all city and/or county land use and legal requirements are satisfied. All decisions of the Board of Directors are final.

Date: June 8, 2009
Adopted by: Doug Menke General Manager

Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

Supersedes Policy: Board Policy 19.00
Implemented by: Robert Wayt
Director of Communications \& Development
Signature:
Date:

## 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.

## PROCEDURE

A. Evaluation/Identification of an Encroachment. Each encroachment on District property shall be evaluated individually and on its own circumstance by District staff. Upon discovery that an encroachment has occurred, staff shall review the encroachment and report their findings to District Management staff for review. If it is determined that an encroachment exists on District property, steps to remove the encroachment will proceed per the terms of the operational policies and procedures.
B. Removal After Notification. If it is determined that an encroachment exists, the violator will be notified in writing and directed to remove the encroachment within 90 days of the date of the notification (or other time frame as agreed to by the District). If the violator fails to comply with the written notice, the District will remove the encroachment and submit an invoice to the violator to recover all costs for such removal and restoration work.
C. Boundary Disputes. If the property boundary is disputed, the District may commission a boundary survey by a licensed surveyor. The cost of such a survey will be the sole responsibility of the violator if it is determined that an encroachment upon District property has occurred. The District will pay for any boundary survey where it is determined that no encroachment has occurred.
D. Cost to Resolve Encroachments. All costs to resolve or correct encroachments will be paid by the violator, or reimbursed to the District within 30 days of invoicing. If the violator fails to meet this financial obligation, District staff may pursue any legal options for recovery of all costs for such efforts. Such costs may include, but are not be limited to, boundary surveys, construction permit fees, engineering or architectural fees, demolition, removal and restoration, legal fees, Park District staff time, and accrued interest if payment is not received within 30 days of invoicing.
E. Appeal Process. Individuals may appeal encroachment decisions to the District Board of Directors. Written requests to appeal must be received in the office of the District General Manager within 30 days of receipt of the written notice of encroachment. Requests to appeal must be accompanied by a $\$ 250$ non-refundable fee. Appellants will receive a formal notice of the hearing before the District Board of Directors by certified mail no less than 10 calendar days prior to the appeal hearing.

Date: June 8, 2009
Adopted by: Doug Menke
General Manager
Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

Supersedes Policy: Board Policy 21.00
Implemented by: Keith D. Hobson
Director of Business \& Facilities
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.

## PROCEDURE

1. Lease Requests
a) The District will consider proposals for lease agreements on District properties if it can be demonstrated that such agreements will not materially impact the intended function and use of a property. Generally, it is the District's preference to allow placement of telecommunications equipment within District property on existing structures, e.g., powerline structures and buildings.
b) Staff will evaluate each proposal on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the following procedures, and forward a recommendation to the General Manger or designee. The General Manger or designee, prior to submission to the Board of Directors, may deny the applicant's proposal.
2. Submittal Requirements
a) Requests for telecommunication lease agreements shall be submitted in writing to the Risk and Contract Manager. Requests shall include the following:
i. Narrative Proposal. Proposals shall include a narrative description of the size and location of area to be leased, including any proposed structures, and a description of property access requirements. Applicants shall identify:
(1) the purpose of communication facility;
(2) area to be served; and
(3) a list of previous or alternate lease locations being considered to provide the same coverage.
ii. Location and Site Maps. Maps shall include a scaled drawing, which includes all boundaries of the District property; existing and proposed improvements, and site detail location. Photo simulations are required if the proposal includes the installation of a monopole on District property.
iii. Assurances. Written assurance shall be provided to include:
(1) a commitment to provide a maintenance bond/surety for $110 \%$ of the estimated cost for restoration/re-vegetation of the District property; submission of an acceptable restoration/re-vegetation plan;
(2) a commitment to take adequate measures to protect public safety during and after construction;
(3) a commitment to provide and maintain landscape for two (2) years from an approved list of landscape material provide by the District;
(4) a commitment to assume all costs for city and/or county land use fees and legal procedures; and
(5) a commitment to properly notify adjacent neighbors of construction activities at least one week prior to the beginning of construction.
iv. Project Timeline. An estimated project timeline, with tentative construction date.
v. Anticipated Impacts. Identify any anticipated impacts and measures to mitigate.
vi. Application Fee. A one-time application fee of $\$ 1,000$ must accompany the proposal. The application fee will not be refunded if the District denies the proposal at any level. If there are no anticipated material impacts to the property, the District will sign an option agreement renewable for a second one-year period.
3. Compensation
a) Compensation shall be negotiated by staff and should include, but not necessarily be limited to, one or all of the following measures:
i. Fair market values of the lease area;
ii. Improvements as appropriate to the surrounding lease area, e.g., pathway improvements, additional landscaping, play equipment, irrigation, etc.
4. Staff Assessment
a) The District's Planning \& Development and Maintenance Departments will complete an initial assessment regarding the proposal. Natural Resources and the appropriate Recreation Division Department will be included in the assessment process if the proposal impacts their services. As part of their review, the following will be considered:
i. Whether proposals materially affect the purpose of:
(1) Current or future public access;
(2) Intended recreational use; or
(3) Access to or functions of the park or natural resource area.
ii. Mitigating efforts on behalf of the applicant:
(1) Landscaping and screening
(2) Alternate facility designs
5. Public Meeting Requirement
a) The applicant is required to host at its expense, a public informational meeting with the surrounding property owners to obtain comments to be included in the staff review. District staff will participate in the meeting. The following are required for the public meeting:
i. Location, site and easement maps will be provided at the meeting, to include: a scaled drawing which includes all boundaries of the District property; existing and proposed improvements; and lease site location;
ii. Notice of the public meeting is to be mailed to the surrounding property owners within 1,000 feet of the lease site;
iii. Notice of the public meeting is to be sent to all homeowner associations, within the notice area;
iv. Notice of the public meeting is to be sent to the area Citizen Participant Organizations (CPO) or Neighborhood Association of Citizens (NAC) for inclusion in their monthly newsletter. Ample time must be allowed for publication;
v. Notice is to be provided to impacted District Advisory Committees.
b) Upon completion of the public informational meeting, District staff will provide to the General Manger or designee a final report on the findings relative to the proposal, with comments obtained from the public meeting.
6. Approval Authority
a) Based on the findings, the General Manager or designee may deny the request, or forward the proposal to the Board of Directors for review and consideration for approval.
b) If the Board of Directors approves the lease proposal, staff will then formalize the lease agreement.
c) All decisions as to the approval or denial made by the Board, or any denials made by staff, are final and will be provided to the applicant within ninety (90) days of the latter of the public informational meeting or the submission of the final written proposal to the District.

Date: June 8, 2009
Adopted by: Doug Menke
General Manager
Signature:
Date: $\qquad$

Supersedes Policy: Board Policy 23.00
Implemented by: Jim McElhinny
Director of Park \& Recreational Services
Signature:
Date:

## 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.

## PROCEDURE

Because wetlands are difficult to restore or create, and often fail, they require a great deal of monitoring, follow-up, and ongoing maintenance beyond the required legal time period to ensure success. Due to the delicate nature of new mitigation sites, they require more attention than existing natural areas, so appropriate fees are charged to offset staff time spent on these projects.

The applicant is responsible for federal, state, and local permit acquisition, project design, construction, plant installation, maintenance, and monitoring of the site.

The following mitigation process is described in detail later in this document:

- Inquiry/Proposals
- Plan Review/Approval
- Fee Assessment
- Construction/Installation
- Maintenance/Monitoring

1. Inquiry/Proposals
1.1. Proposals for Park District projects. When a District project necessitates wetland mitigation, Natural Resources Department staff will identify an appropriate site. The District will follow the steps outlined below; however, no fees will be charged to the District.
1.2. Inquiries/proposals from outside parties. When an outside party wishes to have a mitigation project on District property, they will contact the Natural Resources Department. It is the responsibility of the applicant to identify potential mitigation sites. Natural Resources staff is available for an hourly fee of $\$ 70$ per hour (minimum two hours) to meet with prospective applicants at park sites. Staff will only provide site information and not legal or technical/ regulatory advice. All fees must be paid prior to the meeting and are non-refundable. Upon site selection and a written confirmation that the site may be suitable from Natural Resources Department staff, applicants shall submit a written proposal and application fee for each mitigation project. This proposal shall contain a brief description of the project with the following details ${ }^{1}$ :
1.2.1. Proposed location.
1.2.2. Size of mitigation required (in acres).

[^9]1.2.3. Type of mitigation required in Cowardin Classification System ${ }^{2}$ and Hydrogeomorphic Assessment ${ }^{3}$.
1.2.4. Source of hydrology.
1.2.5. What impact is the project mitigating for AND where is the location of the impact.
1.2.5.1. The submission of a proposal in no way indicates that it will be approved. If a proposal is deemed acceptable, an explanation of conditions of approval for the use of District property will be provided to the applicant during an in-person meeting. It is the responsibility of the applicant to see that all conditions of approval are followed and integrated into the project plan.
2. Proposal Review/Plan Approval
2.1. Upon preliminary staff review that the proposal is feasible to both parties, a project plan will be developed by the applicant expanding on the concepts presented in the proposal. The process includes the following steps:
2.2. The Staff Consulting fee will be paid at the time of plan submittal.
2.3. Drawings showing pre-existing and post-project conditions shall be provided to the District by the applicant and shall include: survey, planting plan, construction details, easements, grading, irrigation or hydrologic changes as is appropriate, impacts to existing park assets, habitat, or recreational uses, a planting plan with a list of vegetation species, sizes, and quantities, as well as a maintenance schedule. Plant materials are to be native to the northern Willamette Valley and suitable to the site.
2.4. After staff review, proper neighborhood notification must be given by one or both of the following methods which shall be determined by District staff (depending on the scale of the project):
2.4.1. Neighborhood Notice: Written notice (approved by District staff), with a contact person and phone number identified on the notice, must be mailed to residences in a District-approved area surrounding the site at least 10 days prior to the public meeting, if one is required. If a public meeting is not required, the notice must be mailed to residences at least 10 days prior to any comment deadline.
2.4.2. Neighborhood Meeting: To be held by the applicant to solicit input from the surrounding park neighbors. This meeting will be attended by District staff; however, the meeting will be run by the applicant.
2.5. To gain final approval the following steps must be completed:
2.5.1. The proposed mitigation project plan shall be approved or denied after review by the General Manager or designee. Input from the neighborhood will be taken into account during the decision making process. Approved project installation must be completed within 24 months of approval or else it will be subject to another review and fee assessment.
2.5.2. Fees, as noted below, must be paid.
2.6. Waiver Option At the option of the General Manager or designee, fees related to this policy may be waived and/or other assurance/review methods may be waived should it be deemed in the best interest of the District to do so.

[^10]2.7. Appeal of Conditions of Approval/Assessment of Fees
2.7.1. The applicant may appeal staff's decision regarding denial, conditions of approval and/or assessment of fees pursuant to this policy by filing a written request for an Appeal Hearing to the Office of the General Manager. The appeal must be submitted in writing no later than fourteen (14) days after the delivery of the notice of denial, final written conditions of approval, and/or fee assessment received from the District. The fee for appealing the decision to the Board of Directors shall be $\$ 250$.
2.7.2. The appeal to be filed with the Board of Directors shall contain the following:
2.7.3. Name and address of the applicant.
2.7.4. A brief description of the project and the location of the proposed mitigation.
2.7.5. A statement of reasons as to why the applicant is appealing the decision and how the policy was not correctly applied.
2.7.6. The Board of Directors will schedule a Public Hearing within ninety (90) days of receipt of the appeal. The Board will review all pertinent information and render a decision in a timely manner as to their disposition of the appeal.
3. Fee Assessment.
3.1. Financial Assurance. Performance assurance for approved mitigation work shall be provided by the applicant at $110 \%$ of the value of the proposed mitigation work prior to the start of the project (by bond, certificate of deposit, or money market account with the District as a co-owner). The value of the work shall be verified in writing by a licensed landscape architect, engineer, or architect as appropriate. Should an applicant default on their responsibilities, these funds will be used for project implementation. Any damage to District property or facilities (such as sidewalks, trails, turf, trees, benches, etc.) shall be repaired or replaced by the applicant at their expense to the satisfaction of the District prior to the release of the surety. At the successful conclusion of the monitoring period, after the project is approved by the applicable regulatory agencies (such as the Army Corps Of Engineers and/or the State of Oregon Division of State Lands) the surety shall be released to the applicant.
3.2. Fees to conduct a mitigation project on a District site cover the following costs: staff consulting time, land value, and long-term site management. Because mitigation is a legal requirement, the District will not issue statements that applicants have made donations, contributions, or other improvements to Park properties. Fees (except where noted) shall be placed in the Special Revenue, Natural Resources Mitigation Fund ${ }^{4}$.
3.2.1. Application Fee $-\$ 500$. Initial inquiries are at no charge. Once an applicant has reviewed the District's Mitigation Policy and wishes to proceed with a project, they will submit the application fee along with the preliminary proposal. This fee covers staff costs to review the proposal. Fees are non-refundable whether the project is accepted or not nor are they applicable to other fees.
3.2.2. Staff Consulting Fees $-\$ 2,000$. For sites up to three acres, a flat fee is charged to cover the costs of staff time to review and comment on proposals, attend the public meeting, and make construction as well as growing season site visits. A combination of staff involvement and feedback to the applicant is a key step in project success. For projects over three acres, an additional fee will be calculated on a case-by-case basis. Fees are non-refundable whether the project proceeds or not.
3.2.3. Minimum Land Fee - $\$ 15,000$ per acre. Because a mitigation site limits and effectively locks up land to most future uses, a fee is charged to cover this limitation. The base land fee is $\$ 15,000$ per acre. If the District feels a parcel is worth more than that fee, an appraisal may be required (at the applicant's expense) to determine land

[^11]value. If the land value is still in dispute, a mutually agreed upon second appraiser will be retained at the applicant's expense. Land fees are assessed in half-acre increments and are rounded up. For example, a project which is required to mitigate for $1 / 3$ acre would need to pay for a half-acre. A .75-acre mitigation would need to pay for one whole acre. The Land Fee will be deposited in the District's General Fund.
3.2.4. Long-term Management Fee $-\$ 11,000$ per acre. This fee will allow the site to receive additional care to ensure native plant establishment after the legal monitoring period. Allowing native plants to become well established before reducing maintenance practices to minimum levels should produce a more sustainable and selfsupporting system. Items such as overhead, additional plants, herbicide, materials, and other project support costs are included in this fee. Like the land fee, the postmonitoring fee is assessed in half-acre increments, rounded up.
3.3. Fee calculation example. The fee for an $8 / 10$ of an acre mitigation for an outside group would be calculated as follows:

| Application fee | $\$ 500$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Staff consulting fee | $\$ 2,000$ |
| Land fee | $\$ 15,000$ |
| Long-term management fee | $\$ 11,000$ |
|  |  |

4. Construction/Installation.
4.1. Project construction may begin after the following conditions are met:
4.1.1. District staff approval, including authorization by the General Manager or designee, of project plan.
4.1.2. Signing of a District-applicant contract.
4.1.3. Payment of Land and Long-term management fee.
4.1.4. Receipt of applicant's bond of surety
4.1.5. Granting of a District construction easement.
4.1.6. Acquisition of appropriate permits.
4.1.7. Submission of annual Certificates of Insurance naming and indemnifying the District as an additionally insured entity by the applicant.
4.1.8. Notification to District staff before the start of each major phase of construction.
5. Maintenance \& Monitoring of Project Area.
5.1. The applicant must maintain the mitigation project area for a minimum period of five years from the date of installation or until Clean Water Services, Department of State Lands, Army Corps of Engineers release the project. Applicants must perform routine maintenance at least four times per year for the first three years (one occurrence during each season) and twice a year for the last two years. Additional maintenance (i.e., weeding, herbicide application, replanting, etc.) may need to be performed to meet the requirements listed below.
5.2. All plantings will be required to have a minimum $80 \%$ survival rate annually. The applicant shall replace, as necessary, the non-surviving plants with viable plants to achieve the $80 \%$ survival rate each year. During no month in a given calendar year shall non-native noxious weeds such as reed canary grass, purple loosestrife, thistle, or Himalayan blackberry make up more than $5 \%$ relative cover.
5.3. A monitoring report, plus a copy of any regulatory reports such as the annual Department of State Lands and Army Corps of Engineers monitoring report, must be submitted to the Natural Resources Department annually based on a late spring evaluation.
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5.4. Long Term Management. At the conclusion of the monitoring period, the Natural Resources Department will use mitigation fund fees to continue to provide a high level of site management for an additional five years in order to allow the native plant community to become fully established. When mitigation fees for a site have run out, site maintenance will transition to a routine level of service. At that time, it is expected that the site will have become established and will be prospering.

It is the policy of the Board of Directors to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of parks and facilities of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District. In the spirit of cooperation with citizens, adjacent property owners and the business community, it may sometimes be acceptable to allow the use of District property for other than public park and recreation purposes if there are benefits to the District without adverse impact to park properties and uses.

The purpose of this policy is to provide staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers and the business community written guidelines for requesting and securing easements on District property.

Upon request staff may consider proposals for easements on District park properties if it can be demonstrated that such easements will not permanently and/or adversely impact the intended function and use of said park properties. Examples of such easements may include conservation, storm water/sanitary sewer/domestic water, access, emergency access, utility, or other types of easements which may be deemed suitable.

Staff shall evaluate each easement proposal on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the following implementation procedures, and forward a recommendation to Management. Depending on the type of easement/right-of-way/permit request some decisions regarding easement proposals shall be made by the District Board of Directors and some will be made by the General Manager or his or her designee.

## I. GENERAL GUIDELINES

A. Permanent Easement Requests (including right-of-way requests)

All Permanent Easement requests greater than 350 square feet need to be approved by the Board of Directors. Any Permanent Easement request that is less than 350 square feet in size may be reviewed, denied or approved, and processed by the General Manager or his or her designee.

## B. Temporary Easement Requests

1. Construction Easements (Material Impact to Site)
a. Any Temporary Construction Easement of any size that is associated with a Permanent Easement request that is greater than 350 square feet in size will need Board of Directors approval along with the Permanent Easement request.
b. Any Temporary Construction Easement that is 350 square feet or larger in size that is not associated with a Permanent Easement request will need Board of Directors approval.
c. Any Temporary Construction Easement request that is 350 square feet or less in size and is not associated with a Permanent Easement request may be reviewed, denied or approved, and processed by the General Manager or his or her designee.
2. Temporary Access Easements (No Material Impact to Site)
a. All access requests, permit-of-entry, right-of-entry and any other similar associated types of access-only requests that are temporary in nature and have no material impact to the site may be reviewed, denied or approved, and processed by the General Manager or his or her designee.
C. Staff shall have the discretionary authority to follow the above guidelines insofar as staff could, at their own discretion, bring to the Board of Directors for approval any extraneous request that does not fit a typical category or that staff feels needs Board of Directors approval even though the guidelines do not require it.
D. The general process for obtaining Board of Directors approval for any easement, right-of-way, or permit request shall be to present the request and seek approval in a single Board meeting.
3. At staff's discretion, however, requests that are deemed to be significant, complex, or potentially contentious, may be handled over two Board meetings. In this case the first meeting would be for presentation and review, and the second meeting would be to address questions raised during the first meeting and seek approval for the request.
4. The Board of Directors will always have the prerogative to delay a decision on a request to a subsequent meeting and request additional information prior to approving or rejecting a request.

## II. PROCEDURES, COMPENSATION \& APPROVAL AUTHORITY

A. Requests for Easements on District Property

Requests for easements shall be submitted in writing to District staff. Easement requests shall include the following:

1. Narrative Proposal. Proposals shall include a narrative description of the easement; timeline for construction; anticipated impacts; mitigating measures; and proposed compensation to the District.
2. Location, Site \& Easement Maps. Maps shall include a scaled drawing which includes all boundaries of the District property; existing and proposed improvements; and easement location.
3. Assurances. Written assurances shall be provide to include (1) a commitment to provide acceptable District compensation; (2) a commitment to provide required liability insurance indemnifying the District; (3) a commitment to provide a maintenance bond/surety for $110 \%$ of the estimated cost (to be verified by a qualified landscape architect or engineer) for restoration/re-vegetation of the District property; submission of an acceptable restoration/re-vegetation plan; (4) a commitment to take adequate measures to protect public safety during and after construction; (5) a commitment to assume all costs for
processing an approved easement through appropriate city and/or county land use fees and legal procedures; and (6) a commitment to properly notify adjacent neighbors of construction activities at least one week prior to the beginning of construction.

Upon receipt of a complete easement request staff shall review such requests and make a recommendation to Management.
B. Compensation. Compensation shall be negotiated by staff and should include consideration of one or all of the following measures:

1. Fair market values of the easement area (to be determined by a property appraisal acceptable to staff which is paid for by the applicant, or by an amount determined by staff from recent District property appraisals prepared for similar properties). Consideration will be made by the Board that the cost of the easement may include the cost of staff time to review and make their recommendation to the Board.
2. Park Improvements.
3. Donation(s) of land.

The minimum compensation amount shall be $\$ 750$ per project. The Board may waive the compensation requirement if it is felt that it would be in the District's best interests to do so.
C. Approval Authority. Approval or disapproval of all Easement/Right-ofWay/Permit requests shall be made per the General Guidelines above. If it is determined that the proposed Easement/Right-of-Way/Permit is acceptable, staff shall proceed to formalize the Easement/Right-of-Way/Permit. No construction may begin until written authorization to proceed is received from District staff, and written authorization shall not be provided until all city and/or county land use and legal requirements are satisfied. All decisions of the Board of Directors are final.

It is the policy of the Board of Directors to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of the parks and facilities of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District (District).

Any encroachment on (or modification to) District property will be deemed trespassing when it comes to the attention of the District regardless of when the property was initially encroached upon (or by whom) and the violator of such action shall be notified and directed to remove any and all encroachments. Examples of encroachments include, but are not limited to, landscape installation, physical structures, fence/wall installation and pathway/driveway construction.

Failure to remove such encroachments to the land as directed within a ninety (90) day period (or other timeframe as agreed to by the District) after receiving notice will warrant District action to restore the property to its original condition, with the cost for such action being assumed by the violator.

District staff shall evaluate each encroachment on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the following evaluation and implementation procedures, and will forward their findings to the District Management staff. In the event the violator would like to appeal the Management staff's decision, the violator may request a hearing before the District Board of Directors.

## I. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- Evaluation/Identification of Encroachments. All encroachments on District property shall be evaluated individually and on its own circumstance by District staff. Upon discovery that an encroachment has occurred, staff shall review the encroachment, and report their findings to District Management staff for review. If it is determined that an encroachment exists on District property, steps to remove the encroachment will proceed per the District's encroachment policy.
- Removal After Notification. If it is determined that an encroachment requires corrective action, the violator shall be notified in writing and directed to remove the encroachment within 90 days of the date of the notification (or other timeframe as agreed to by the District). If the violator fails to comply with the written notice, the District shall remove the encroachment and submit an invoice to the violator to recover all costs for such removal and restoration work.
- Boundary Disputes. In the event that the property boundary is disputed, a boundary survey may be commissioned by a licensed and qualified surveyor. Cost for surveys shall be paid entirely by the violator if it is determined that there is an encroachment upon District property. The District shall pay for any boundary survey where it is determined that no encroachment has occurred.
- Cost to Resolve Encroachments. All costs to resolve or correct encroachments shall be paid by the violator, or reimbursed to the District within 30 days of invoicing (if applicable). If the violator fails to meet their financial obligation, District staff may pursue any legal options for recovery of all costs for such efforts. Such costs shall include, but are not be limited to, boundary surveys, construction permit fees, engineering or architectural fees, demolition, removal and restoration, legal fees, Park District staff time, and accrued interest if payment is not received within 30 days of invoicing.
- Appeals. Individuals may appeal encroachment decisions to the District Board of Directors. Written requests to appeal must be received in the office of the District General Manager within 30 days of receipt of the written notice of encroachment. Requests to appeal must be accompanied by a $\$ 250$ non-refundable fee.
Appellants will receive a formal notice of the Hearing before the District Board of Directors by certified mail no less than 10 calendar days prior to the Appeal Hearing.


## Telecommunication Site Agreement and Implementation

## PURPOSE

This policy provides guidelines to the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District for the placement of telecommunications equipment on District owned property. Any permission granted by the District is subject to land use laws and permitting as required by the appropriate outside agencies. The purpose of this policy is to provide staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers, and the business community written guidelines for requesting and securing telecommunication site lease agreements on District property.

## POLICY

It is the policy of the Board of Directors of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District to preserve the integrity, investment; public access and function of parks and facilities of the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District. In the spirit of cooperation with citizens, adjacent property owners and the business community, it may sometimes be acceptable to allow the use of District property for the installation and operation of telecommunication equipment if there are benefits to the District without material impacts to park properties and uses. Consideration will also be given to the impact of telecommunications equipment on the properties adjacent to the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District property under consideration.

Upon request, staff may consider proposals for lease agreements on District park properties if it can be demonstrated that such agreements will not materially affect the intended function and use of a park property. Generally, it is the District's preference to allow placement of telecommunications equipment on District property within existing structures, e.g., powerline poles, lattice structures.

Staff will evaluate each lease proposal on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the following implementation procedures, and forward a recommendation to District management. Denial of a telecommunication site lease proposal may be made by the Board of Directors or by staff prior to submission to the Board of Directors. Approval of telecommunication site lease proposals will be made by the Board of Directors.

## PROCEDURES

1. Requests for lease agreements will be submitted in writing to District staff. Proposals will include a general narrative description of the following:
a. Size and location of area to be leased, including a description of tower access required and proposed structures.
b. Estimated time-line for project and a tentative construction date
c. Anticipated impacts and mitigating measures
d. Purpose of communications facilities and area to be served. e.g., RF reports
e. List of previous or alternate lease locations being considered to provide service to the same coverage area

## Telecommunication Site Agreement and Implementation

f. Proposed compensation to the District

1. Compensation will be negotiated by staff and should include, but not necessarily limited to consideration of the following measures:
a. Fair market value
b. Improvements as appropriate to the surrounding lease area, e.g., pathway improvements, additional landscaping, play equipment, irrigation, etc.
2. An initial assessment will be completed by staff from both the District's Planning and Maintenance Departments regarding the proposal. As part of their review, the following will be considered:
a. Whether proposals materially affect the purpose of:
i. Current or future public access
ii. Intended recreational use; or
iii. Access to or functions of the park or natural resource area.
a. Mitigating efforts on behalf of the applicant:
i. Landscaping and screening
ii. Alternate facility designs
3. If there are no anticipated material impacts to the property and its uses, the District may sign an Option Agreement (one-year), renewable for a second one-year period with an application fee of $\$ 1,000$. The application fee would not be refunded to the applicant if the District denies the proposal at any level.
4. The applicant is required to host at its expense, a public informational meeting with the surrounding property owners to obtain comments to be included in the staff review. District staff will participate in the meeting. The following are required for the public meeting:
a. Notice of the public meeting is to be mailed to the surrounding property owners within two times the required distance as required by the permitting code or statute, and
b. Notice of the public meeting is to be sent to all homeowner associations, within the notice area, and
c. Notice of the public meeting is to be sent to the area CPO or NAC for inclusion in their monthly newsletter. Ample time must be allowed for publication, and
d. Notice is to be provided to District Advisory Committees, and
e. Location, site and easement maps will be provided to the District and at the meeting, to include: a scaled drawing which includes all boundaries of the
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District property; existing and proposed improvements; and lease site location.

1. Upon completion of the public informational meeting, District staff will provide to management a final report on the findings relative to the proposal, with comments obtained from the public meeting.
2. Based on the findings, management may forward the proposal to the Board of Directors for review and approval. The THPRD Board of Directors may hold further hearings with the public as deemed necessary. Requests for a public hearing may come from:
a. Board of Directors request
b. Formal public requests of the Board of Directors
c. Staff request
3. If it is determined that the proposal is acceptable, the District Board of Directors will give written approval of all lease agreement requests. Staff will then formalize the lease agreement. All decisions of the Board of Directors are final.
4. All final decisions as to the approval or denial made by the Board, or any denials made by staff, will be provided to the applicant within sixty (60) days of the public informational meeting.

It is the policy of the Board of Directors to preserve the integrity, investment, public access and function of parks and facilities of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District. In the spirit of cooperation with citizens, adjacent property owners and the business community, it may at times be acceptable to allow the use of Park District property for other than public park and recreation purposes if there are benefits to the Park District without adverse impact to park properties and uses.

The purpose of this policy is to provide staff, citizens, adjacent property owners, developers, and the business community written guidelines for requesting and securing permission to perform mitigation on Park District property.

This policy shall be updated administratively (every two years or as needed) to reflect inflationary increases in staffing, materials and/or land costs. The update will also take into account local, regional and statewide planning and regulatory initiatives. Any language that would alter the intent of the policy will be brought to the Board of Directors for consideration and approval.

## I. PROCEDURES, COMPENSATION AND APPROVAL AUTHORITY

Because wetlands are difficult to restore or create, and often fail, they require a great deal of monitoring, follow-up, and ongoing maintenance beyond the required legal time period to ensure success. Due to the delicate nature of new mitigation sites, they require more attention than existing natural areas, so appropriate fees are charged to offset staff time spent on these projects.

The following mitigation process is described in detail later in this document:

- Inquiry/Proposals
- Plan Review
- Fee Assessment
- Construction/Installation
- Maintenance/Monitoring
- Long Term Management
a. Proposals for Park District projects. When a Park District project necessitates wetland mitigation, Natural Resources Department staff will identify an appropriate site. The Park District will follow the steps outlined below; however, no fees will be charged to the Park District.
b. Inquiries/proposals from outside parties. When an outside party wishes to have a mitigation project on Park District property, they will contact the Natural Resources Department. It is the responsibility of the applicant to identify potential mitigation sites. (Natural Resources staff is available for an hourly fee of $\$ 60$ per hour (minimum two hours) to meet with prospective applicants at park sites. Staff will only provide site information and not legal or technical/ regulatory advice. All fees must be paid prior to the meeting and are non-refundable.) Upon site selection and a written confirmation that the site may be suitable from Natural Resources Department staff, applicants shall submit a written proposal and application fee for each mitigation project. This proposal shall contain a brief description of the project with the following details ${ }^{1}$ :

[^12]i. Proposed location.
ii. Size of mitigation required (in acres).
iii. Type of mitigation required in Cowardin Classification System ${ }^{2}$ and Hydrogeomorphic Assessment ${ }^{3}$.
iv. Source of hydrology.
v. What impact is the project mitigating for AND where is the location of the impact.

The submission of a proposal in no way indicates that it will be approved. If a proposal is deemed acceptable, an explanation of conditions of approval for the use of Park District property will be provided to the applicant during an in-person meeting. It is the responsibility of the applicant to see that all conditions of approval are followed and integrated into the project plan.
c. Proposal review/plan development. Upon preliminary staff review that the proposal is feasible to both parties, a project plan will be developed by the applicant expanding on the concepts presented in the proposal. The process includes the following steps:
i. The Staff Consulting fee will be paid at the time of plan submittal.
ii. Drawings showing pre-existing and post-project conditions shall be provided to the Park District by the applicant and shall include: survey, planting plan, construction details, easements, grading, irrigation or hydrologic changes as is appropriate, impacts to existing park assets, habitat, or recreational uses, a planting plan with a list of vegetation species, sizes, and quantities, as well as a maintenance schedule. Plant materials are to be native to the northern Willamette Valley and suitable to the site.
iii. The proposed mitigation project plan shall be approved or denied after review by Park District staff and approved or denied by the General Manager. Approved project installation must be completed within 24 months of approval or else they will be subject to another review and fee assessment.
iv. The applicant is responsible for federal, state, and local permit acquisition, project design, construction, plant installation, maintenance, and monitoring of the site.
d. Neighborhood Notice. Prior to approval or denial, proper neighborhood notification must be given by one or both of the following methods which shall be determined by Park District staff (depending on the scale of the project):
i. Neighborhood Notice: Written notice (approved by Park District staff), with a contact person and phone number identified on the notice, must be mailed to residences in a Park District approved area surrounding the site at least 10 days prior to the public meeting, if one is required. If a public meeting is not required, the notice must be mailed to residences at least 10 days prior to any comment deadline.
ii. Neighborhood Meeting: To be held by the applicant to solicit input from the surrounding park neighbors. This meeting will be attended by Park District staff; however, the

[^13]meeting will be run by the applicant. Input from the neighborhood will be taken into account during the decision making process.
e. Financial Assurance. Performance assurance for approved mitigation work shall be provided by the applicant at $110 \%$ of the value of the proposed mitigation work prior to the start of the project (by bond, certificate of deposit, or money market account with the Park District as a coowner). The value of the work shall be verified in writing by a licensed landscape architect, engineer, or architect as appropriate. Should an applicant default on their responsibilities, these funds will be used for project implementation. Any damage to Park District property or facilities (such as sidewalks, trails, turf, trees, benches, etc.) shall be repaired or replaced by the applicant at their expense to the satisfaction of the Park District prior to the release of the surety. At the successful conclusion of the monitoring period, after the project is approved by the applicable regulatory agencies (such as the Army Corps Of Engineers and/or the State of Oregon Division of State Lands) the surety shall be released to the applicant.
f. Fees. Fees to conduct a mitigation project on a Park District site cover the following costs: staff consulting time, land value, and long-term site management. Because mitigation is a legal requirement, the Park District will not issue statements that applicants have made donations, contributions, or other improvements to Park properties. Fees (except where noted) shall be placed in the Special Revenue, Natural Resources Mitigation Fund ${ }^{4}$.
i. Application Fee - \$500. Initial inquiries are at no charge. Once an applicant has reviewed the Park District's Mitigation Policy and wishes to proceed with a project, they will submit the application fee along with the preliminary proposal. This fee covers staff costs to review the proposal. Fees are non-refundable whether the project is accepted or not nor are they applicable to other fees.
ii. Staff Consulting Fees $-\$ 2,000$. For sites up to three acres, a flat fee is charged to cover the costs of staff time to review and comment on proposals, attend the public meeting, and make construction as well as growing season site visits. A combination of staff involvement and feedback to the applicant is a key step in project success. For projects over three acres, an additional fee will be calculated on a case by case basis. Fees are non-refundable whether the project proceeds or not.
iii. Minimum Land Fee $-\$ 15,000$ per acre. Because a mitigation site limits and effectively locks up land to most future uses, a fee is charged to cover this limitation. The base land fee is $\$ 15,000$ per acre. If the Park District feels a parcel is worth more than that fee, an appraisal may be required (at the applicant's expense) to determine land value. If the land value is still in dispute, a mutually agreed upon second appraiser will be retained at the applicant's expense. Land fees are assessed in half acre increments and are rounded up. For example, a project which is required to mitigate for $1 / 3$ acre would need to pay for a half-acre. A . 75 acre mitigation would need to pay for one whole acre. The Land Fee will be deposited in the Park District's General Fund.
iv. Long-term Management Fee - $\$ 10,000$ per acre. This fee will allow the site to receive additional care to ensure native plant establishment after the legal monitoring period.

[^14]Allowing native plants to become well established before reducing maintenance practices to minimum levels should produce a more sustainable and self-supporting system. Items such as overhead, additional plants, herbicide, materials, and other project support costs are included in this fee. Like the land fee, the post-monitoring fee is assessed in half-acre increments, rounded up.
g. Fee calculation example. The fee for an $8 / 10$ of an acre mitigation for an outside group would be calculated as follows:

| Application fee | $\$ 500$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Staff consulting fee | $\$ 2,000$ |
| Land fee | $\$ 15,000$ |
| Long-term management fee | $\$ 10,000$ |
| Total: | $\mathbf{\$ 2 7 , 5 0 0}$ |

h. Construction/Installation. Project construction may begin after the following conditions are met:
i. Park District staff approval, including authorization by the General Manager, of project plan.
ii. Signing of a Park District-applicant contract.
iii. Payment of Land and Long-term management fee.
iv. Receipt of applicant's bond of surety
v. Granting of a Park District construction easement.
vi. Acquisition of appropriate permits.
vii. Submission of annual Certificates of Insurance naming and indemnifying the Park District as an additionally insured entity by the applicant.
viii. Notification to Park District staff before the start of each major phase of construction.
i. Maintenance of Project Area. The applicant must maintain the mitigation project area for a minimum period of five years from the date of installation or until Clean Water Services, Department of State Lands, Army Corps of Engineers release the project. Applicants must perform routine maintenance at least four times per year for the first three years (one occurrence during each season) and twice a year for the last two years. Additional maintenance (i.e., weeding, herbicide application, replanting, etc.) may need to be performed to meet the requirements listed below.
i. All plantings will be required to have a minimum $80 \%$ survival rate annually. The applicant shall replace, as necessary, the non-surviving plants with viable plants to achieve the $80 \%$ survival rate each year. During no month in a given calendar year shall non-native noxious weeds such as reed canary grass, purple loosestrife, thistle, or Himalayan blackberry make up more than $5 \%$ relative cover.
ii. A monitoring report, plus a copy of any regulatory reports such as the annual Department of State Lands and Army Corps of Engineers monitoring report, must be submitted to the Natural Resources Department annually based on a late spring evaluation.
j. Long Term Management. At the conclusion of the monitoring period, the Natural Resources Department will use mitigation fund fees to continue to provide a high level of site management for an additional five years in order to allow the native plant community to

## Wetland and Buffer Mitigation Policy

become fully established. When mitigation fees for a site have run out, site maintenance will transition to a routine level of service. At that time, it is expected that the site will have become established and will be prospering.
k. Waiver Option At the option of the Board of Directors, fees related to this policy may be waived and/or other assurance/review methods may be waived should it be deemed in the best interest of the Park District to do so.

1. Appeal of Conditions of Approval/Assessment of Fees

The applicant may appeal staff's decision regarding conditions of approval and/or assessment of fees pursuant to this policy by filing a written request for an Appeal Hearing to the Office of the General Manager. The appeal must be submitted in writing no later than fourteen days after the delivery of the final written conditions of approval and fee assessment received from the Park District. The fee for appealing the decision to the Board of Directors shall be $\$ 250$.

The appeal to be filed with the Board of Directors shall contain the following:
(1) Name and address of the applicant.
(2) A brief description of the project and the location of the proposed mitigation.
(3) A state of reasons as to why the applicant is appealing the decision and how the policy was not correctly applied.

The Board of Directors will schedule a Public Hearing within sixty (60) days of receipt of the appeal. The Board will review all pertinent information and render a decision in a timely manner as to their disposition of the appeal.

DATE: June 2, 2009
TO: The Board of Directors
FROM: Doug Menke, General Manager

## RE: $\quad$ General Manager's Report for June 8, 2009

## Advisory Committee Structure Review

As the Board is aware, a Task Force made up of current Advisory Committee members and staff have reviewed the current structure of the District's nine Advisory Committees and have submitted their recommendations. Staff has since reviewed those recommendations and submitted a memo regarding that review to the Advisory Committees on June 1 in order to allow the Committees an opportunity to discuss the staff recommendations prior to being presented to the Board of Directors for consideration at your June 22 Regular Board meeting.

## Interfund Loan in lieu of Tax Revenue and Anticipation Notes (TRANS)

Based on a less favorable interest rate market for borrowing in FY 2009-10, staff will be recommending that the District use an interfund loan from the Bond Projects Fund to the General Fund in lieu of TRANS. Staff will request Board approval for this interfund loan at the June 22 Regular Board meeting, and it will include a provision that the Bond Fund be paid interest at the rate the funds would have earned if invested in the Local Government Investment Pool. Based on this, the General Fund will save approximately $\$ 6,300$ in cost of issuance fees, along with an approximately $2.5 \%$ interest rate savings. This will result in a net savings to the General Fund of approximately $\$ 53,175$. Furthermore, the Bond Capital Project Fund will be guaranteed at least the market rate of interest on the interfund loan.

## Cooper Mountain Nature Park Grand Opening

Staff have been working closely with Metro on the final details of the Cooper Mountain Nature Park, including programming and a play area. We expect to have a new park ranger start by June 12. The Board is invited to attend the VIP event scheduled for Tuesday, June 23 from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. In addition, a neighborhood open house will take place on June 24 from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m., and the park will open to the public on Saturday, June 27.

## Tualatin Hills Nature Park Native Plant Garden

Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) and Nature Park staff have been working on a sponsorship agreement for the native plant garden located in front of the Interpretive Center. TVWD is interested in donating $\$ 10,000$ toward completion of the garden which meets joint educational goals of teaching patrons about low-water use plants, natural gardening techniques, and the use of native plants around the home. Details are being finalized

## Urbanization Update

The Urbanization Steering Committee, on which I represent special districts, continues to meet and make progress. A proposed resolution, tentatively scheduled to be before the Board for consideration at your June 22, 2009 Regular Board meeting, expresses support for the Urbanization Forum process and commits all participating jurisdictions to the goal of having all future additions to urban growth boundaries in Washington County be governed and urbanized by a city designated by separate agreements. The resolution also commits participating jurisdictions to support management of a county-wide road system by Washington County, with transfer of lesser roads to a city when annexed. With respect to existing areas of urban unincorporated Washington County, the resolution recognizes that some areas may remain under County governance and commits participants in the Forum process to identifying and developing appropriate financial tools that can be used to provide urban services.

## Oregon Emergency Jobs Program

On May 15, the Governor announced an emergency jobs program hoping to provide up to 12,000 entry-level, temporary jobs to Oregonians. The jobs will be for those that are 18 years of age and older, are unemployed, and will pay a wage of between $\$ 8.40$ and $\$ 10.00$ per hour. The positions do not offer benefits. The program intends to put unemployed Oregonians back to work beginning July 1. Funding for the program will come from the unemployment insurance program and will need to be legislatively approved. The Park District is eligible for funding and I have had staff apply in order to support temporary, part time positions in our Maintenance Operations and Natural Resources Departments. I will update the Board as news of funding becomes available.

## Annual Policy Makers Bicycle Ride

The $5^{\text {th }}$ Annual Policy Makers Bicycle Ride will take place on Friday, July 10. The 32 -mile bicycling expedition will highlight the region's most exciting policy initiative - an integrated bistate, trail network that will serve cyclists and walkers throughout the metropolis. The group will consist of elected officials, policy makers and civic leaders and is being organized by, among others, Cycle Oregon, Metro, and the Urban Greenspaces Institute.

## Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Please note the following Board of Directors meeting schedule:

- July Regular Board Meeting - Monday, July 13, 2009
- August Regular Board Meeting - Monday, August 24, 2009
- September Regular Board Meeting - No September Board Meeting
- October Regular Board Meeting - Monday, October 5, 2009

DATE:
May 13, 2009
TO: Doug Menke, General Manager
FROM: Keith Hobson, Director of Business \& Facilities

## RE: $\quad$ Park District Auditor

## Summary

The District Audit Committee and staff are recommending appointment, by the Board of Directors, of Talbot, Korvola \& Warwick, LLP to conduct the annual audit of District financial statements, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009.

## Background

Within the financial function, best practices recommends that an agency should consider solicitation of audit services on an average of every four to five years. Since the District has contracted with Merina \& Company for the past four years, the Audit Committee recommended, and the Board of Directors concurred, that the District solicit proposals for the District annual audit.

On April 8, 2009 staff sent letters of interest to seven firms. The District received proposals from the following six firms:

1. Isler CPA
2. Jarrard, Seibert, Pollard \& Co., LLC
3. Jones \& Roth, PC
4. Merina \& Company, LLP
5. Talbot, Korvola and Warwick, LLP
6. Van Beek \& Co., LLC

Staff scored the proposals based on three main categories: 1) Audit Plan, 2) Staff Qualifications and 3) Fee/Value Added Services and ranked the firms based on this scoring. After the Audit Committee reviewed the rankings, it was determined to interview the top three firms, Talbot, Korvola and Warwick, Isler CPA's and Merina \& Company.

Interviews were conducted on April 30, 2009 by staff and a representative from the Audit Committee, Kathleen Leader. A table of the final scoring is attached.

## Proposal Request

Based on final scoring from the interviews, the recommendation for appointment as the District Auditor is Talbot, Korvola and Warwick (TKW), based on the following factors:

## Audit Plan

TKW presented a comprehensive, detailed and thorough Audit Plan for both the District and the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation financial records. Total hours forecasted for interim and final fieldwork are 298/20 respectively, and will ensure the quality of audit required by our residents, bond holders, Board of Directors and the State. An extensive review process is conducted on the final statements, prior to issue, by the Audit Manager, Senior Manager and Engagement Partner, along with a thorough review and assessment of our internal controls.

## Staff Qualifications

TKW has a highly qualified staff of 55 , including 23 CPAs and seven municipal auditors. Seventy-three percent of their audit hours are devoted to public sector organizations - special districts, counties, cities, school districts and not-for-profit organizations. The Engagement Partner, Rob Moody, spent over 14 years as Assistant Finance Director/Finance Director for the Cities of Wilsonville, Sherwood and The Dalles, ensuring a complete, full circle understanding of the governmental environment. TKW has the depth, capacity and expertise to meet the completion schedule, as determined by our needs.

## Fee/Value

While TKW's proposed fees are higher than both of the other firms interviewed, as well as representing an increase over the current year audit fees, this is attributable to their estimated hours rather than higher billing rates. As mentioned previously, TKW has forecasted a total of 318 hours for both the District and Foundation, and the proposed fees include a $20 \%$ savings from their standard fees. TKW's average cost per hour is actually less than the other two firms interviewed. The recommendation of TKW reflects the need to balance efficiency of the audit work with the need to conduct a thorough examination. The total proposed fees are an estimate only, and would be revised based upon final work plan development, with the proposal representing a not-to-exceed stipulation. In addition, the proposed fee is within the budget appropriation for FY 2009-10 of $\$ 32,500$.

Staff is seeking approval to enter into contract negotiations with TKW, to finalize fees and contract terms. The contract period is anticipated to run for a period not to exceed five years, subject to annual approval by the District Audit Committee.

## Benefits of Proposal

With the growth of the District, including the implementation of the Bond Capital Projects and related financing, it is critical that our financial processes and controls are adequately safeguarding our assets. The recommended firm of TKW would provide the expertise and knowledge necessary to ensure the Board that the necessary safeguards are in place.

The 2008 Bond Measure included a stipulation that the bond funds are subject to an annual financial audit. While bond fund activity would be included in any audit of the District, this provision certainly raises the public visibility of the annual audit. This increased visibility makes it imperative that the annual audit be complete, thorough and well executed. Staff believes that the TKW proposal meets this standard.

Furthermore, TKW offers on-going assistance throughout the fiscal year, providing guidance and training on new pronouncements and requirements that affect both the District and Foundation. These trainings are conducted on a periodic basis, along with quarterly calls from the Engagement Partner to each client.

Staff conducted reference checks with similar agencies within the area, and received assurance on all areas of importance as to the qualifications of TKW, and their professional staff.

## Potential Downside of Proposal

As noted above, the proposed fee represents an increase in cost of total audit services over the previous year by approximately $\$ 13,000$. Also as noted above, however, this increase is attributable to the higher number of hours estimated in the proposal, and may be reduced down if not actually required during the audit.

## Action Requested

Board of Directors appointment of Talbot, Korvola and Warwick, LLP, to provide audit services to the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District and its component unit, the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation, and authorize staff to negotiate the contract for services commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009.

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Audit Firm Scoring:
(Score $=1$ to 5 , low to high)

| Firm | Overall Ranking | InterviewScore (Max 50) | Total Score | Audit Plan | Staff Qualifications | Cost/ Value |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Score | District | Foundation | Hours |
| TKW | \#1 | 39 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 4 | \$30,300 | \$2,700 | 298/20 |
| Isler \& Co. | \#2 | 32 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 4 | \$19,000 | \$2,750 | 172/24 |
| Merina \& Co. | \#3 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 4 | \$17,000 | \$3,000 | 150/28 |
| Jones \& Roth | \#4 | n/a | 9 | 2 | 4 | 3 | \$27,500 | \$8,500 | 287/88 |
| Van Beek \& Co. | \#5 | n/a | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | \$17,000 | \$2,800 | not provided |
| Jarrard, Seibert, Pollard \& Co. | \#6 | n/a | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | \$48,000 | not provided separately | not provided |

Management Report to the Board June 8, 2009

Administration

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

1. THPRD's Web site is being updated with new pages focused on the bond measure. Among other details, the site will show a master schedule of projects along with individual pages of information on each project, including descriptions and time lines. Patrons will have opportunities to ask questions and post comments, review notices and see photos. The Web site will also contain information about THPRD's Citizens Oversight Committee, assembled to ensure that the bond funds are invested as planned.
2. About 50 people attended on a beautiful Saturday morning May 9 to celebrate the official debut of the new two-mile Westside Trail segment between the Tualatin Hills Nature Park and Schuepbach Park. A grand opening ceremony was held on the trail adjacent to the Nature Park. Among the speakers were state legislators Tobias Read and Chris Harker as well as Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten, Beaverton Mayor Denny Doyle, and THPRD Board Members Bill Kanable and Bob Scott. Park Ranger Scott Hinderman led a group of bicyclists through the ceremonial ribbon and down the new trail for a leisurely ride. The event was coordinated by THPRD staff and the Trails Advisory Committee.
3. Preparations continue for the Tualatin Hills Park Foundation's sixth annual "Hike 'n Bike" event, moved to a new month this year. The event will be held Saturday, August 29. Despite the wobbly economy, Hike 'n Bike has received strong support from business sponsors, which means greater proceeds for charity. In other Foundation news, the nonprofit announced it will hire its first-ever Executive Director to lead its partnership efforts in the local community. Applications are being taken through June 9; following the interview process, the Foundation expects to have the winning candidate in place this summer.

Aquatics
Sharon Hoffmeister, Superintendent of Aquatic Program Services

1. Spring was a busy season for the instructional program for the developmentally delayed and physically limited program at Beaverton Swim Center, with 132 participants. Previously, the highest enrollment for the program had been 115.
2. The Aquatic Center is offering a Lifeguard Training class June 1-12. This is a last chance class for those seeking summer employment in lifeguarding. There are currently 20 registered for the class.
3. Tualatin Valley Junior Academy brought 114 elementary students to the Aquatic Center for two weeks of swim lessons in May. This is their third year in the Learn To Swim program.
4. Raleigh Swim Center will open for the summer program season beginning June 15. Somerset West will open one week prior on a limited schedule to accommodate displaced programs due to a closure at Aloha.
5. Sunset Swim Center is back up and running after a ten-week closure to repair the tunnel. The pool area looks great. Staff and customers are very happy to be back.

## Maintenance Dave Chrisman, Superintendent of Maintenance Operations

1. The Sunset Swim Center pool deck and tunnel repair project is complete. The pool had been out of service since March 20 for repairs to the HVAC air supply tunnel and deck. The center reopened on schedule on June 1. Repairs included a complete rebuild of the concrete tunnel walls, rust protection for exposed steel rebar, and installation of a protective fiber membrane in the tunnel walls. In addition, new tunnel access hatches were installed, new tile at the water line and deck was installed, a non-skid deck surface was applied and the dive board stands were reinforced.
2. Staff recently assisted with the set up for the Memorial Day Event at Memorial Park. The annual celebration is conducted by the American Legion Beaverton Post with Park District support. The Park District provides bleacher set up, general site preparations and toilet rentals. This year, the District also installed flagpole anchors around the entire perimeter of the park. The Veterans Post purchased the flags to be displayed during future memorial celebrations at the park.
3. Parks staff recently assisted the Planning Department with the installation of a temporary chip trail pathway at the Bluffs Park. The pathway enables residents living in a newer residential development access to play equipment in the Bluffs Park. Maintenance staff will provide further assistance with the installation of a temporary chip trail extension between the Bluffs Park and Bonny Slope Elementary School. Work on this temporary trail extension will begin in June.

## Natural Resources \& Trails Management

Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources \& Trails Management

1. Cedar Mill Park Trail. A temporary trail has been marked which will connect the neighborhood near Jackie Husen Park with Cedar Mill Park. Construction is expected to begin later in the summer.
2. Murrayhill Update. Staff are wrapping up the first phase of the Murrayhill habitat restoration project. Blackberry has been mowed from the site and is receiving treatment in preparation for a winter planting.
3. Sustainability Education. Nature Park Interpretive Center staff visited with facilities and work groups to discuss recycling and the District's sustainability program. Staff are also testing a sustainability financial costing model which helps us understand the true costs of sustainable activities from start to finish.
4. Volunteer Summary. Five hundred fifty volunteers worked in 13 different parks over the last month, including Matrix Hill Park, the HMT Recreation Complex, and along the Fanno Creek Trail. They removed approximately 115 cubic yards of weeds, as part of a SOLV sponsored stream-side clean-up pulled over 40 cubic yards of trash from Beaverton Creek, Fanno Creek, Cedar Mill Creek, and the Westside Regional Trail. Together our volunteers contributed approximately 1,830 hours of time, valued at approximately $\$ 33,000$.

## Planning \& Development

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning \& Development

1. 2008 Bond Measure: Planning staff has completed the review and recommendations for consultants based on the submitted project quotes for the first phase of five projects: Westside Trail (Segments 1, 4 \&7), Schiffler Park, Cedar Hills Park, Meadow Waye Park and AM Kennedy Park. The first three projects will be presented to the Board for approval at their June 8, 2009 meeting. The last two projects need approval by the General Manager in order for staff to proceed.

Staff is currently reviewing proposals for four additional projects: Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center, Jordan (Husen) Park, Lowami Hart Woods and the Waterhouse Trail. The Conestoga Recreation \& Aquatic Center and Waterhouse Trail projects will be presented to the Board of Directors for their approval at their July 13, 2009 meeting.
2. Voluntary Annexation \#5: Planning staff has met with the Communications \& Development Department to discuss the upcoming Voluntary Annexation Program schedule and to review work tasks for each Department. The schedule will be very similar to the previous annexation programs with applications being mailed in early summer, Board approval in early fall, submittal to Washington County in November and completion of the process in spring 2010.
3. Winkleman Park: Planning staff is working with Washington County to finalize the plans and acquire the project permits for the entrance road widening and installation of the temporary ( 6 stall) gravel parking lot. The temporary parking lot needs to be installed to provide access to the site so it can be opened for recreational use to fulfill the requirements of the 20 -acre donation to the District. The Winkleman Park project is tentatively scheduled to obtain construction quotes in early June and start construction in late June or early July. The project is scheduled for completion by the end of August and the site will then be opened for recreational use.

Programs \& Special Activities<br>Lisa Novak, Superintendent of Programs \& Special Activities

1. The expansion work at the John Marty Park Community Garden is expected to be completed by June 5. Waitlisted gardeners will fill the 26 -plot expansion.
2. The Annual Mother's Day Quilt Show was held on May 9-10 and had Clara Barefoot as an honored guest. Clara, who is 92 , started the Quilt Show $30+$ years ago.
3. The Stuhr Center celebrated Older Americans Month in May by inviting patrons to try a new class or program. The theme for this year is "Living Today For a Better Tomorrow."
4. The Tennis Center hosted the NW Oregon Conference Districts May 11-13, Metro League Districts May 14-16, and the OSAA High School State Tournament May 2123. During the State Tournament, the girls played at the Tennis Center on May 2122 while the boys played at West Hills Racquet Club. All final matches for boys and girls were played at the Tennis Center on Saturday, May 23.

## Recreation

Eric Owens, Superintendent of Recreation

1. The first ever "all" recreation Summer Orientation will be held June 13 in the Athletic Center. Staff from Conestoga, Garden Home, Cedar Hills, Nature Park and Athletic Center have worked together to provide a training for nearly 400 staff. This will help reduce the duplication of many processes, from Safety/Risk to Human Resources, who will now be able to provide information at one site instead of five.
2. The Garden Home Spring Recital was held May 21 and was very successful. Over 200 dance class participants performed for their families. Attendance for the event was approximately 300 spectators.
3. Enrollment for the Cedar Hills summer specialty camps is going very well. Two new camps were offered: "Settlin Days" - Homestead Camp and Eco-Fashion Camp. Enrollment for the Homestead Camp is full for both sessions with waiting lists.

## Security Operations

Mike Janin, Superintendent of Security Operations

1. Security Operations has created two new Park Watch groups. Dan and Rachel Lucas, neighbors of Hyland Forest Park and Meadow Waye Park, are organizing efforts to have neighbors join them as they walk both parks. Liz and Chuck Knapp, our volunteers who have picked up trash for a number of years on the HMT Recreation Complex most mornings, after receiving training are also proudly wearing the orange Park Watch vests as they make their morning rounds.
2. The Superintendent was asked to speak to the PGE Summer Park Hosts for their 17 regional parks. A two-hour seminar was conducted on defusing difficult people, safety concerns and the handling of unique situations that they may encounter.
3. The Beaverton Police Department recently conducted a refresher training for our Park Patrol employees on mountain bicycle operation. The certified officers also assisted with a spring tune-up of our bicycles.
4. Park Patrol begins their summer hours on June 15 extending to Labor Day. Hours of operation are mid-morning to 12 midnight.

## Sports

Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports

1. Beaverton School District: Staff has begun work on an operational procedure manual for facility use and coordination. The manual will augment the Intergovernmental Agreement and provide detailed inter-agency processes for working on facility use and coordination.
2. Sports Leagues: While softball league numbers remained static overall this year, there is league growth. Spring Volleyball grew from 12 teams in 2008 to 20 teams in 2009, Summer Coed Kick Ball grew from 5 teams in 2008 to 8 teams in 2009 and Coed Sand Volleyball grew from 4 teams in 2008 to 11 teams in 2009.
3. Special Events: The HMT Recreation Complex hosted the 2009 Oregon Girls Lacrosse Semi-Finals and Championship as well as the OYSA Nike Friendship Cup in May. Staff is preparing for the summer event season which will include large tournaments for soccer, lacrosse and softball as well as smaller events for baseball.

## Business Services

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

Phil Young, Information Services Manager

1. The Park District's Workers Compensation Experience Modification Rate will rise to 0.82 in FY 2009-10. The Experience Modification Rate is used as a multiplier in computing the Park District's Workers Compensation premiums. It is based on a scale of 1.00 being the average incident rate for similar work nationwide. The Park District continues to be below the national average.
2. An Employee Handbook for part-time employees has been developed and implemented. Each part-time employee will receive a copy of the new handbook that will serve as a useful resource in understanding District employment policies and work rules. The handbook will also be distributed, to each new hire, at the District-wide summer orientation session, scheduled for June 13.
3. Due to a restructuring of the $\$ 5$ million TRANS financing for 2008-09, the District will save approximately $\$ 64,000$ in interest costs over the previous year's rate structure, and over $\$ 131,000$ from budgeted costs. The interest rate for this financing was a variable rate based on a percentage of the prime rate. The current rate based on this formula is $0.46 \%$.
4. The Technical Energy Audit, the next phase in the Energy Savings Performance Contract with McKinstry is underway with an anticipated completion of the end of June.

## Calendar of Upcoming Meetings \& Events



*Please note that only athletic events expecting 500 or more attendees are listed *

*Please note that only athletic events expecting 500 or more attendees are listed *

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

## Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

## Through 04/30/09



## GENERAL FUND

CAPITAL OUTLAY DIVIIIIN

| Off Leash Dog Park Construction | 15,000 | 15,000 |  | 15,000 | 15,000 |  |  | 15,000 | Budget | 15,000 | 15,000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Acquisition/Jenkins Estate Right of Way | 90,000 | 90,000 |  | 90,000 | 90,000 |  | 6,800 | 83,200 | Budget | 90,000 | 90,000 |  |  |
| Restoration of John Quincy Adams Young House (JQAY) | 100,000 | 5,000 |  | 100,000 | 5,000 | 85,687 |  | 5,000 | Budget | 90,687 | 5,000 | 9,313 |  |
| Stuhr Center Bequest Foundation Project | 75,000 | 63,000 |  | 75,000 | 63,000 | 6,443 |  | 63,000 | Budget | 69,443 | 63,000 | 5,557 |  |
| GIS Development | 37,000 | 37,000 | 3,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 7,036 | 32,964 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
| Is Kiosks | 5,000 | 2,000 |  | 5,000 | 2,000 | 5,000 |  |  | Complete | 5,000 |  |  | 2,000 |
| Board/Conference Room Audio | 8,000 | 6,500 |  | 8,000 | 6,500 | 1,073 |  | 6,500 | Budget | 7,573 | 6,500 | 427 |  |
| Sottware Upgrades | 20,000 | 20,000 | 5,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 6,420 |  | 25,000 | Budget | 31,420 | 25,000 | $(6,420)$ |  |
| Challenge Grant Compeetitive Fund | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 30,000 | 30,000 |  | 17,027 | 1,907 | Award | 18,934 | 18,934 | 11,066 | 1,066 |
| John Marty Park Community Garden | 14,750 | 5,700 | - | 14,750 | 5,700 | 9,039 |  | 5,700 | Budget | 14,739 | 5,700 | 11 |  |
| Lan/Wan Equipment | 9,000 | 8,000 |  | 9,000 | 8,000 | 851 | 8,000 |  | Complete | 8,851 | 8,000 | 149 |  |
| Jenkins Estate Cable Connection | 18,100 | 18,100 |  | 18,100 | 18,100 |  | 18,100 |  | Complete | 18,100 | 18,100 |  |  |
| IP Alarms | 9,200 | 9,200 |  | 9,200 | 9,200 | - |  |  | Reallocated |  |  | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| PCC WAN Connection | 12,250 | 9,000 |  | 12,250 | 9,000 | - | 300 | 8,700 | Budget | 9,000 | 9,000 | 3,250 |  |
| PCC Timeclock | 3,000 | 3,000 |  | 3,000 | 3,000 |  | 2,950 |  | Complete | 2,950 | 2,950 | 50 | 50 |
| HMT Landscaping | 3,000 | 3,000 |  | 3,000 | 3,000 |  | 1,833 | 1,167 | Budget | 3,000 | 3,000 |  |  |
| HVAC Control System (2 sites) | 26,000 | 26,000 | - | 26,000 | 26,000 |  |  | 26,000 | Budget | 26,000 | 26,000 |  |  |
| Brookhaven Park Bridge/Boardwalk Repair | 35,000 | 35,000 |  | 35,000 | 35,000 | - | 33,918 |  | Complete | 33,918 | 33,918 | 1,082 | 1,082 |
| Aloha Park Lights | 200,000 | 100,000 | - | 200,000 | 100,000 |  | 105,398 |  | Complete | 105,398 | 105,398 | 94,602 | $(5,398)$ |
| Barnes School Field Restoration \& Replacement | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | ${ }^{-}$ |  | 10,000 | Budget | 10,000 | 10,000 |  |  |
| Raleigh Pool Solar Project | 35,000 | 32,000 |  | 35,000 | 32,000 | 5,901 |  | 32,000 | Budget | 37,901 | 32,000 | $(2,901)$ |  |
| Stuhr Center ADA Restroom Renovation | 50,000 | 42,500 |  | 50,000 | 42,500 | 4,811 | 29,806 | 12,694 | Budget | 47,311 | 42,500 | 2,689 |  |
| TOTAL CARRYOVER PROJECTS | 805,300 | 570,000 | 8,000 | 813,300 | 578,000 | 125,225 | 231,168 | 328,832 |  | 685,225 | 560,000 | 128,075 | 18,000 |
| ATHLETIC FACILITY REPLACEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resurface Tennis Courts (2 sites) |  |  | 67,490 | 67,490 | 67,490 |  | 438 | 67,052 | Budget | 67,490 | 67,490 |  |  |
| Basketball Court Resurfacing (2 sites) |  |  | 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 |  |  | 12,008 | Award | 12,008 | 12,008 | 3,392 | 3,392 |
| Backstop Replacements (6 sites) |  |  | 13,672 | 13,672 | 13,672 |  | 13,278 |  | Complete | 13,278 | 13,278 | 394 | 394 |
| Awning Replacement |  |  | 3,800 | 3,800 | 3,800 | - | 3,780 |  | Complete | 3,780 | 3,780 | 20 | 20 |
| Baseballsotitall Asphalt Pads |  |  | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 |  | 7,000 | 705 | Award | 7,705 | 7,705 | (705) | (705) |
| Install Bleacher Backs \& Rails |  |  | 6,600 | 6,600 | 6,600 | - |  | 6,600 | Buadget | 6,600 | 6,600 |  |  |
| Athetic Field Turf Renovation |  |  | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |  | 380 | 99,620 | Budget | 100,000 | 100,000 |  |  |
| Somerset Meadows Park Field lrigation |  |  | 9,000 | 9,000 | 9,000 |  |  | 9,000 | Budget | 9,000 | 9,000 |  |  |
| Barnes School Field Irrigation Restoration TOTAL ATHLETIC FACILITY REPLACEMENT |  |  | $\xrightarrow{245,000}$ | 25,000 247,962 | 254,000 | - | 24,876 | 25,000 219,985 | Budget | 25,000 244,861 | 25,000 | 3,101 | 3,101 |
| ATHLETIC FACILTY IMPROVEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunset Wing Extensions |  |  | 1,400 | 1,400 | 1,400 | - | 1,386 | - | Complete | 1,386 | 1,386 | 14 | 14 |
| Lacrosse Equipment |  |  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |  | 2,788 | 1,212 | Budget | 4,000 | 4,000 |  |  |
| TOTAL ATHLETIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENT |  |  | 5,400 | 5,400 | 5,400 | - | 4,174 | 1,212 |  | 5,386 | 5,386 | 14 | 14 |
| PARK AND TRALL REPLACEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Event Canopies |  |  | 1,688 | 1,688 | 1,688 | - | - | 1,688 | Budget | 1,688 | 1,688 | - |  |
| Hideaway Park Play Equipment |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
| Parking Lots (2 sites) |  |  | 68,874 | 68,874 | 68,874 | - | 83 | 68,791 | Budget | 68,874 | 68,874 |  |  |
| Asphalt Path Replacement \& Repair (6 sites) |  |  | 145,000 | 145,000 | 145,000 |  | 4,914 | 129,979 | Award | 134,893 | 134,893 | 10,107 | 10,107 |
| Concrete Sidewalk Repair (6 sites) |  |  | 55,280 | 55,280 | 55,280 | - | 35,641 | 16,220 | Award | 51,861 | 51,861 | 3,419 | 3,419 |
| Commonwealth Lake Bridge/Boardwalk Repairs |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - | 1,915 | 38,325 | Award | 40,240 | 40,240 | (240) | (240) |
| Fence Replacement (2 sites) |  |  | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | - | 4,379 | 12,621 | Budget | 17,000 | 17,000 |  |  |
| Slurry Seal Parking Lots (6 sites) |  |  | 20,500 | 20,500 | 20,500 | - |  | 19,290 | Award | 19,290 | 19,290 76,105 | 1,210 | 1,210 |
| Irigation System Repair/Replacement $(5$ sites) Rock Creek Soccer Field Drinking Fountain Replacement |  |  | 76,105 5,000 | 76,105 5,000 | 76,105 5,000 | - | 46,415 3,776 | 29,690 1,224 | Budget Budget | 76,105 5.000 | 76,105 5,000 | - |  |
| Rock Creek Soccer Field Drinking Fountain Replacement TOTAL PARK AND TRAIL REPLACEMENTS |  |  | 5,000 469,447 | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 56,000 } \\ \hline 18\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 56, } 000 \\ \hline 47\end{array}$ |  | 37,123 <br> 9 | 1,224 |  | 54,951 | 54,951 | 14,496 | 14,496 |

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

## Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

## Through 04/30/09



PARK AND TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS Jenkins Bridal Path Lights
Special Event Support Traile
Event Support Set Up Equipment
EMX Annex Trash Comp
BMX Park Maintenance
Cooper Mountain Start Memorial Benches
Rock Creek Trail East End Connector
RTP Grant - Cedar Mill Park Trail
LWCF Grant - Schiffler Park Pavil
LGGP Grant - Camille Park
CHALLENGE GRANTS
Challenge Grants
BUILDING REPLACEMENTS
Doors \& Windows Replacements (7 sites)
Aloha Dive Stand
Aquatic Center Filter Pit Sump Pump
Harmon Chemtrol Unit
Beaverton Pool Filter Me
Beaverton Pool Filter Media
CRA Lap Pool Tank Resurfacing
CRA Siding \& West Side Window Rep
Jenkins Carriage House Roof Replacement
Aloha Swim Center Dressing Room Roof Replacement
Tennis Center Roof Overlay Panels
Tennis Center Roof Overlay Panels
Athletic Center Roof Flashing Replacement
Cedar Hills Gym Roof Replacement (Upper Section)
Fanno Farm House Roof Replacement
Garden Home Lower Hallway Tile
Maintenance Shop Floor Tiie
Cedar Hills Kitchen Floor Tile
Aquatic Center Non Skid Flooring (Staff Room)
CRA Mechanical Room Floor Resurfacing
Garden Home Carpet Replacement (Rm 13B)
Harmon Pool Non Skid Flooring/Deck \& Locker Rooms
Aquatic Center Non Skid Flooring (2 rooms)
Raleigh Pool Security Light Fixtures
CRA Pathway Light Fixtures
HMT Parking Lot Lamps
Stuhr Center Roof Gutter \& Downspouts Replacement
Beaverton Pool Rooof Gutter \& Do
Raleigh Pool Office Circruit Panel
Cedar Hills Light Fixture (Rms
Cedar Hills Light Fixtures (Rms $5, \mathrm{D} \&$ Copy)
Aquatic Center Roof Exhaust Fans (3)
Stuhr Center Heat Coils (5 locations)
Aloha Pool Deck Heat Grate Vents
Cedar Hills \& Stuhr Center Compresso
Cedar Hills \& Stuhr Center Compressors
Jenkins Estate Stable A/C Condensers
Dryland \& Harmon Rooftop HVAC Units
Aquatic Center Supply Fans

| 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | - | 2,003 | Award | 2,003 | 2,003 | 497 | 497 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | - | 6,870 |  | Complete | 6,870 | 6,870 | 130 | 130 |
| 4,550 | 4,550 | 4,550 | - | 4,148 |  | Complete | 4,148 | 4,148 | 402 | 402 |
| 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 |  | 22,500 |  | Complete | 22,500 | 22,500 | $(4,500)$ | $(4,500)$ |
| 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | - |  | 3,000 | Budget | 3,000 | 3,000 |  |  |
| 24,400 | 24,400 | 24,400 | - |  | 24,400 | Budget | 24,400 | 24,400 |  | - |
| 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | 3,838 | 4,162 | Budget | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | - |
| 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 | - |  | 6,500 | Budget | 6,500 | 6,500 |  |  |
| 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - |  |  | Cancelled |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - |  | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
| 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | - | - |  | Cancelled |  |  | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| 353,950 | 353,950 | 353,950 | - | 37,356 | 80,065 |  | 117,421 | 117,421 | 236,529 | 236,529 |
| 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | - | 25,802 | 49,198 | Budget | 75,000 | 75,000 |  |  |
| 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | - | 25,802 | 49,198 |  | 75,000 | 75,000 | - |  |
| 35,920 | 35,920 | 35,920 | - | 32,284 | 5,839 | Award | 38,123 | 38,123 | $(2,203)$ | $(2,203)$ |
| 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | - |  | 4,000 | Budget | 4,000 | 4,000 |  |  |
| 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | - | 3,255 |  | Complete | 3,255 | 3,255 | 2,745 | 2,745 |
| 6,380 | 6,380 | 6,380 | - | 3,523 |  | Complete | 3,523 | 3,523 | 2,857 | 2,857 |
| 4,700 | 4,700 | 4,700 | - | 4,514 | - | Complete | 4,514 | 4,514 | 186 | 186 |
| 4,400 | 4,400 | 4,400 | - | 4,959 |  | Complete | 4,959 | 4,959 | (559) | (559) |
| 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | - |  | 38,971 | Award | 38,971 | 38,971 | 1,029 | 1,029 |
| 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 | - | 64,304 | . | Complete | 64,304 | 64,304 | 5,696 | 5,696 |
| 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |  | 25,533 |  | Complete | 25,533 | 25,533 | 24,467 | 24,467 |
| 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 | - | 14,681 | - | Complete | 14,681 | 14,681 | 3,319 | 3,319 |
| 23,000 | 23,000 | 23,000 | - |  | 24,200 | Award | 24,200 | 24,200 | $(1,200)$ | $(1,200)$ |
| 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | - | 5,500 | 14,500 | Budget | 20,000 | 20,000 |  |  |
| 8,500 | 8,500 | 8,500 |  | 8,942 | 4,795 | Award | 13,737 | 13,737 | $(5,237)$ | $(5,237)$ |
| 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | - | 19,027 | - | Complete | 19,027 | 19,027 | 973 | 973 |
| 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | - | 17,026 |  | Complete | 17,026 | 17,026 | $(1,026)$ | $(1,026)$ |
| 21,200 | 21,200 | 21,200 | - | 15,952 | - | Complete | 15,952 | 15,952 | 5,248 | 5,248 |
| 8,200 | 8,200 | 8,200 | - | 7,420 | - | Complete | 7,420 | 7,420 | 780 | 780 |
| 8,500 | 8,500 | 8,500 | - | 7,240 |  | Complete | 7,240 | 7,240 | 1,260 | 1,260 |
| 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | 8,282 |  | Complete | 8,282 | 8,282 | (282) | (282) |
| 3,500 | 3,500 | 3,500 | - | 3,500 |  | Complete | 3,500 | 3,500 |  |  |
| 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | 27,000 | - | Complete | 27,000 | 27,000 | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ |
| 10,750 | 10,750 | 10,750 | - | 7,669 |  | Complete | 7,669 | 7,669 | 3,081 | 3,081 |
| 29,500 | 29,500 | 29,500 | - | 29,500 | - | Complete | 29,500 | 29,500 |  |  |
| 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 |  | 6,500 |  | Complete | 6,500 | 6,500 |  |  |
| 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | 852 | - | Complete | 852 | 852 | 1,648 | 1,648 |
| 3,500 | 3,500 | 3,500 |  | 2,678 |  | Complete | 2,678 | 2,678 | 822 | 822 |
| 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | - | 3,469 |  | Complete | 3,469 | 3,469 | 1,531 | 1,531 |
| 3,400 | 3,400 | 3,400 | - | 2,475 | 925 | Budget | 3,400 | 3,400 |  |  |
| 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |  | 3,786 | 2,214 | Budget | 6,000 | 6,000 |  | - |
| 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 | - | 3,267 | 1,573 | Award | 4,840 | 4,840 | (840) | (840) |
| 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |  | 4,300 |  | Complete | 4,300 | 4,300 | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | - |  | 2,000 | Award | 2,000 | 2,000 |  |  |
| 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |  | 2,298 | 942 | Award | 3,240 | 3,240 | (240) | (240) |
| 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | - | 19,047 |  | Complete | 19,047 | 19,047 | 953 | 953 |
| 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | 1,648 |  | Complete | 1,648 | 1,648 | (648) | (648) |
| 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | 10,000 | 17,015 | Award | 27,015 | 27,015 | $(2,015)$ | $(2,015)$ |
| 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | 2,409 |  | Complete | 2,409 | 2,409 | 91 | 91 |
| 6,500 | 6,500 | 6,500 | - | 6,531 |  | Complete | 6,531 | 6,531 | (31) | (31) |
| 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | 9,585 |  | Complete | 9,585 | 9,585 | 415 | 415 |
| 56,000 | 56,000 | 56,000 | - | 21,343 | 34,657 | Budget | 56,000 | 56,000 |  | (53i) |
| 4,400 | 4,400 | 4,400 | - | 4,931 | - | Complete | 4,931 | 4,931 | (531) | (531) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | of 5 |

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

## Through 04/30/09

|  | 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 <br> 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) |  |  |

BUILDING REPLACEMENTS (continued)
Jenkins Estate Stable Furnace
Fanno Farm House Furrace
Waters Htrs @ Somerset, Cedar Hills \& Athletic Center
Cedar Hills Holding Tank (Showers)
Domestic Holding Tanks @ Aloha and Harmon Pools
CRA Exposed Drain Pipe Replacement
Somerset Pool Shower Stall Tile Replacemen
CRA Rewire Underwater Lights
Tennis Center Emergency Lights Wiring
Cedar Hills Washer and Dryer units
Cedar Hills Panic Bar Hardware Replacement (10 doors)
Cedar Hills Gymnastic Mats
Garden Home Weight Equipment
Garden Home Courtyard Project
Main Drain Covers at Pools
total building replacements
BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS
UULD Do Pool Fanily Chents
HMT Admin Building Reception Area Remodeling
Stuhr Center Hardwood Floor (Exercise Room)
Stuhr Center Hardwood Floor (Pool Room)
Asbestos Abatement (2 sites)
ormance Contract)
Hit Cable Phase II (switch gear to AC)
Hast Annex Expansion Set Up Costs
East Annex Expansion Set Up Costs
Harman Pool UV Sanitizer
Office/Restroom @ PCC Maintenance
ADA PROJECTS
Sunset Pool Water Wheel Chair Bethany Lake Pathway
Bethany Lake Pathway
Bethany Lake ADA Picnic Table Cedar hills ADA Sidewalk
Garden Home Drinking Fountain
Hideaway Park ADA Improvements
15,400

| 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 | - | 15,232 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3,500 | 3,500 | 3,500 |  | 2,56 |
| 23,200 | 23,200 | 23,200 |  | 5,550 |
| 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |  | 2,00 |
| 20,600 | 20,600 | 20,600 |  |  |
| 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 |  |  |
| 7,480 | 7,480 | 7,480 |  | 7,47 |
| 47,000 | 47,000 | 47,000 |  | 1,573 |
| 6,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |  | 6,17 |
| 1,600 | 1,600 | 1,600 |  |  |
| 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 |  | 11,69 |
| 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |  | 2,76 |
| 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 |  | 16,72 |
| . |  |  |  | 6,85 27,60 |
| 766,730 | 766,730 | 766,730 |  | 522,17 |


| 15,232 |  | Complete | 15,232 | 15,232 | 168 | 168 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,562 |  | Complete | 2,562 | 2,562 | 938 | 938 |
| 5,550 | 17,650 | Budget | 23,200 | 23,200 |  |  |
| 2,000 |  | Complete | 2,000 | 2,000 |  |  |
|  | 20,600 | Budget | 20,600 | 20,600 |  |  |
| 744 |  | Complete | 744 | 74 | 356 | 356 |
| 7,471 |  | Complete | 7,471 | 7,471 | 9 | 9 |
| 1,573 | 45,427 | Budget | 47,000 | 47,000 |  |  |
| 6,174 |  | Complete | 6,174 | 6,174 | (174) | (174) |
|  | 1,600 | Budget | 1,600 | 1,600 |  |  |
| 11,691 |  | Complete | 11,691 | 11,691 | 309 | 309 |
| 2,764 |  | Complete | 2,764 | 2,764 | 236 | 236 |
| 16,721 |  | Complete | 16,721 | 16,721 | $(1,721)$ | (1,721) |
| 6,856 |  | Complete | 6,856 | 6,856 | $(6,856)$ | $(6,856)$ |
| 27,609 |  | Complete | 27,609 | 27,609 | $(27,609)$ | (27,609) |
| 522,177 | 236,908 |  | 759,085 | 759,085 | 7,645 | 7,645 | TOTAL ADA PROJECTS

TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY DIVISION $\quad 805,300 \quad 570,000$


| - | 10,000 | Budget | 10,000 | 10,000 | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6,378 | 8,622 | Budget | 15,000 | 15,000 |  |  |
| 8,678 |  | Complete | 8,678 | 8,678 |  |  |
| 7,318 | - | Complete | 7,318 | 7,318 | 42 | 42 |
| 6,735 | 2,900 | Award | 9,635 | 9,635 | (635) | (635) |
|  | 14,500 | Budget | 14,500 | 14,500 |  |  |
| 6,479 |  | Complete | 6,479 | 6,479 | 23,521 | 23,521 |
| 67,000 |  | Complete | 67,000 | 67,000 |  |  |
| 38,635 |  | Complete | 38,635 | 38,635 | $(3,635)$ | $(3,635)$ |
| 29,314 |  | Complete | 29,314 | 29,314 | 1,686 | 1,686 |
| 1,275 | 5,925 | Budget | 7,200 | 7,200 | - |  |
| 8,283 | 467 | Award | 8,750 | 8,750 | $(8,750)$ | (8,750) |
| 180,095 | 42,414 |  | 222,509 | 222,509 | 12,229 | 12,229 |

al building improvements
$\qquad$

| 1,800 | 1,800 | 1,800 |  | 1,241 |  | Complete | 1,241 | 1,241 | 559 | 559 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  | Complete | 5,000 | 5,000 |  |  |
| 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 6,303 |  | Complete | 6,303 | 6,303 | 3,697 | 3,697 |
| 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 19,325 |  | Complete | 19,325 | 19,325 | 5,675 | 5,675 |
| - | - | - |  | 2,500 |  | Complete | 2,500 | 2,500 | $(2,500)$ | $(2,500)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3,700 | Award | 3,700 | 3,700 | (3,700) | $(3,700)$ |
| 41,800 | 41,800 | 41,800 |  | 34,369 | 3,700 |  | 38,069 | 38,069 | 3,731 | 3,731 |
| 2,203,027 | 3,008,327 | 2,773,027 | 125,225 | 1,157,140 | 1,320,142 |  | 2,602,507 | 2,477,282 | 405,820 | 295,745 |

## ualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budget

## Through 04/30/09

|  | Through 04/3 | 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 | Cumulative Project Budget | Current Year | Expended Prior | Expended Year-to-Dat | Estimated Cost to | Basis of <br> Estimate | Project | Current Year | Project Cumulative | Current Year |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }^{(3)}$ | (1+3) | (2+3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (4+5+6) | ${ }^{(5+6)}$ |  |  |

## INFORMATION SERVICES DEPARTMENT

System/workstn Replcmnt
Server Rplcmnt (4)
LANWAN Replcmnt
Printer/Network Printers
Misc. Application Software
GIS Development
Email Risk Mgmt Server
Telephone for Comm \& Dev Position
Workstation/Telephone for Comm Specialist Position
Laptops for Rangers (2)
Catering Software for Jenkins Estate
Fiber Line Installation to WAN
TOTAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS

total information systems department $\qquad$ |  | - | 259,751 | 49,368 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5,400 | - | 259,751 | 49,368 |

|  | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,0 |
|  | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,00 |
|  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,00 |
|  | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,0 |
|  | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,0 |
|  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,0 |
|  | 400 | 400 |  |
|  | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,00 |
|  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,00 |
|  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
|  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,00 |
|  | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,0 |
| S | 295,400 | 295,400 | 295,40 |
| T | 295,400 | 295,400 | 295,4 |


| 70,000 | 29,628 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 35,000 | 43,211 |
| 35,000 | 59,047 |
| 10,000 | 1,570 |
| 20,000 | 18,203 |
| 15,000 | 16,299 |
| 10,000 | - |
| 400 | - 435 |
| 2,000 |  |
| 4,000 | - - |
| 4,000 | - |
| 5,000 | 6,287 |
| 85,000 | 84,146 |
| 295,400 | 259,751 |
|  | 259,751 |

000

| 29,628 | 20,372 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43,211 |  | Complete | 43,211 | 43,21 |
| 59,047 | 10,694 | Award | 69,741 | 69,741 |
| 1,570 | 3,430 | Budget | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 18,203 | 1,797 | Budget | 20,000 | 20,00 |
| 16,299 |  | Complete | 16,299 | 16,299 |
|  | 12,000 | Award | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| 435 |  | Complete | 435 | 435 |
| 925 | 1,075 | Budget | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| - |  | Complete |  |  |
|  |  | Complete |  |  |
| 6,287 |  | Complete | 6,287 | 6,287 |
| 84,146 |  | Complete | 84,146 | 84,146 |
| 259,751 | 49,368 |  | 309,119 | 309,119 |


| 20,000 |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $(8,211)$ | 20,000 |
| $(84,741)$ | $(8,211)$ |
| 5,000 | $(34,741)$ |
| - | 5,000 |
| $(1,299)$ | - |
| $(2,000)$ | $(1,299)$ |
| $(35)$ | $(2,000$ |
| - | $(35)$ |
| 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 4,000 | 4,000 |
| $(1,287)$ | $(1,287)$ |
| 854 | 854 |
| $(13,719)$ | $(13,719)$ |

$\qquad$

| Garden Home Carpet Extractor |  |  | 3,650 | 3,650 | 3,650 |  | 2,883 |  | Complete | 2,883 | 2,883 | 767 | 767 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plasma Torch |  |  | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 |  | 1,519 |  | Complete | 1,519 | 1,519 | (19) | (19) |
| Tennis Center Vacuum |  |  | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 |  | 3,247 |  | Complete | 3,247 | 3,247 | (447) | (447) |
| Annex Compressor |  |  | 1,200 | 1,200 | 1,200 |  |  | 1,200 | Budget | 1,200 | 1,200 |  |  |
| Pallet Shelving Annex Set Up |  |  | 9,200 | 9,200 | 9,200 |  | 7,344 |  | Complete | 7,344 | 7,344 | 1,856 | 1,856 |
| TOTAL BUILDING EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT |  |  | 18,350 | 18,350 | 18,350 |  | 14,993 | 1,200 |  | 16,193 | 16,193 | 2,157 | 2,157 |
| FLEET REPLACEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large Rotary Mower |  |  | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |  |  | 50,000 | Budget | 50,000 | 50,000 | - |  |
| Trim Rotary Mowers (3) |  |  | 33,000 | 33,000 | 33,000 |  | 31,984 |  | Complete | 31,984 | 31,984 | 1,016 | 1,016 |
| Utility Vehicle |  |  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |  | 9,913 |  | Complete | 9,913 | 9,913 | 87 |  |
| Full Size Pickups (2) |  |  | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 40,192 |  | Complete | 40,192 | 40,192 | (192) | (192) |
| Full Size Utility Truck |  |  | 26,000 | 26,000 | 26,000 |  | 24,754 |  | Complete | 24,754 | 24,754 | 1,246 | 1,246 |
| Compact Pickups (3) |  |  | 42,000 | 42,000 | 42,000 |  | 41,389 |  | Complete | 41,389 | 41,389 | 611 | 611 |
| Spreader |  |  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |  | 3,564 |  | Complete | 3,564 | 3,564 | 436 | 436 |
| Compact Hybrid SUV |  |  | 29,500 | 29,500 | 29,500 |  | 29,494 |  | Complete | 29,494 | 29,494 | 6 |  |
| Synthetic Field Sweeper/Groomer |  |  | 7,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 |  | 10,330 |  | Complete | 10,330 | 10,330 | $(2,730)$ | (2,730) |
| Synthetic Field Cleaner |  |  | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 |  | 3,600 |  | Complete | 3,600 | 3,600 | - |  |
| 15-Passenger Van (1) |  |  | 21,500 | 21,500 | 21,500 |  | 23,610 |  | Complete | 23,610 | 23,610 | $(2,110)$ | $(2,110)$ |
| TOTAL FLEET REPLACEMENTS |  |  | 267,200 | 267,200 | 267,200 | - | 218,830 | 50,000 |  | 268,830 | 268,830 | $(1,630)$ | (1,630) |
| total maintenance department | . | . | 285,550 | 285,550 | 285,550 | . | 233,823 | 51,200 |  | 285,023 | 285,023 | 527 | 527 |
| grand total general fund | 805,300 | 570,000 | 2,783,977 | 3,589,277 | 3,353,977 | 125,225 | 1,650,714 | 1,420,710 | . | 3,196,649 | 3,071,424 | 392,628 | 282,553 |

UULING EQUPMENT REPLACEMEN

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District

## Monthly Capital Project Report

## Estimated Cost vs. Budge

## Through 04/30/09

| Through 04/30/09 | 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 <br> Year | Cumulative Project Budget | Current Year Budget Amount | Expended Prior | Expended Year-to-Date | Estimated Cost to Complete | 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) |  |  |

## SDC FUND

LAND ACQUISITION
Land Acquisition (FY 08 )
Bonny Slope/BSD Land Acquisition
Winchester Property Acquisition
total land acquisition
IMPROVEMENTIDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
Design/Construction
nthetic Tur
wami Hart Woold Matching Fund
Novice Skate Park
sw Community Park Planning/Design
Old Wagon Trail Replacement Design
MTIP Grant Match for Westside Trail
Winkleman Park Initial Site Improvement
Bonny Slope/BSD Trail Development
LGGP Grant Match/Camille Park Impri LWCF Grant Match/Schiffler Park Paviliom TE Grant Match/Westside Trail/Segment Jordan-Husen Park
Undesignated Projects
Total - SDC Fund

| 500,000 | 50,000 |  | 500,000 | 50,000 | 24,395 | 6,733 | 43,267 | Budget | 74,395 | 50,000 | 425,605 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 296,448 | 296,448 | 296,448 |  | 5,000 | 291,448 | Budget | 296,448 | 296,448 |  |  |
|  |  | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 |  | 1,029 | 173,971 | Budget | 175,000 | 175,000 |  |  |
| - |  | 523,502 | 523,502 | 523,502 | - | 523,502 |  | Complete | 523,502 | 523,502 |  |  |
| 500,000 | 50,000 | 994,950 | 1,494,950 | 1,044,950 | 24,395 | 536,264 | 508,686 |  | 1,069,345 | 1,044,950 | 425,605 |  |
| 10,140,372 |  |  | 10,140,372 | - | 8,819,730 | 26,490 | 31,484 | Complete | 8,877,704 | 57,974 | 1,262,668 | $(57,974)$ |
| 802,500 | 139,662 |  | 802,500 | 139,662 | 234,413 | 228,835 | 18,575 | Award | 481,823 | 247,410 | 320,677 | $(107,748)$ |
| 800,000 | 600,000 |  | 800,000 | 600,000 | 200,000 |  | 600,000 | Budget | 800,000 | 600,000 |  |  |
| 100,000 | 5,000 |  | 100,000 | 5,000 | 48,429 | 39,937 | 3,742 | Award | 92,108 | 43,679 | 7,892 | $(38,679)$ |
| 150,000 | 50,000 |  | 150,000 | 50,000 | 138,602 | 71,070 |  | Complete | 209,672 | 71,070 | $(59,672)$ | $(21,070)$ |
| 640,000 | 640,000 | 671,950 | 1,311,950 | 1,311,950 | 118,735 | 77,379 | 1,234,571 | Budget | 1,430,685 | 1,311,950 | (118,735) |  |
| 200,000 | 200,000 |  | 200,000 | 200,000 | 67,539 |  | 200,000 | Budget | 267,539 | 200,000 | $(67,539)$ |  |
| 73,000 | 48,000 | - | 73,000 | 48,000 | 33,827 | 101 | 47,899 | Budget | 81,827 | 48,000 | $(8,827)$ | - |
| 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | 283 | 39,717 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  |  |
|  |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | 22,214 | 2,786 | Budget | 25,000 | 25,000 |  | - |
|  |  | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 |  | 47 | 174,953 | Budget | 175,000 | 175,000 |  |  |
|  |  | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |  | . | 200,000 | Budget | 200,000 | 200,000 |  | - |
| - | - | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | - | 40,000 | Budget | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | - |
|  |  | 105,000 | 105,000 | 105,000 |  | 283 | 105,000 | Budget | 105,283 | 105,283 | (283) | (283) |
| - | - | 170,844 | 170,844 | 170,844 | - | - | 170,844 | Budget | 170,844 | 170,844 | - |  |
|  |  | 1,743,434 | 1,743,434 | 1,743,434 | - | - |  | Budget |  |  | 1,743,434 | 1,743,434 |
| 12,945,872 | 1,722,662 | 3,131,228 | 16,077,100 | 4,853,890 | 9,661,275 | 466,639 | 2,869,571 | - | 12,997,485 | 3,336,210 | 3,079,615 | 1,517,680 |


| $13,445,872$ | $1,772,662$ | $4,126,178$ | $17,572,050$ | $5,898,840$ | $9,685,670$ | $1,002,903$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 7 8 , 2 5 7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

KEY
Budget Estimate based on original budget - not started and/or no basis for change
Reallocated Project Scope has been reduced to provide funding for another project
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Award } & \text { Estimate based on Contract Award amount or quote price estim } \\ \text { Complete } & \text { Project completed }- \text { no additional estimated costs to complete. }\end{array}$

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 04/30/09

|  | Project Budget |  |  | Project Expenditures |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Initial Project Budget | Adjustments | Current Project Budget | Expended Prior Years | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Expended } \\ & \text { Year-to-Date } \end{aligned}$ | Estimated Cost to Complete | Project Cumulative | Est. Cost (Over) Under Budget |
|  | (1) | (2) | (1+2) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (4+5+6) | (3-7) |

## BOND CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND

LAND ACQUISITION
New Neighborhood Park
New Neighborhood Park
New Neighborhood Park
New Neighborhood Park
New Neighborhood Park
New Neighborhood Park
New Community Park
Natural Area Acquisitions
New Linear Park and Trail Acquisitions
Community Center Site Acquisition

|  | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | - | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | - | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - |
|  | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | - | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - |
|  | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | - | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - |
|  | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | - | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - |
|  | 1,500,000 | - | 1,500,000 | - | - | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | - |
|  | 10,000,000 | - | 10,000,000 | - | - | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | - |
|  | 8,400,000 | - | 8,400,000 | - | - | 8,400,000 | 8,400,000 | - |
| itions | 1,200,000 | - | 1,200,000 | - | - | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | - |
| n | 5,000,000 | - | 5,000,000 | - | - | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | - |
| TOTAL LAND ACQUISITION | 33,600,000 | - | 33,600,000 | - | - | 33,600,000 | 33,600,000 | - |
| ORHOOD PARKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,285,250 | - | 1,285,250 | - | 220 | 1,285,030 | 1,285,250 | - |
|  | 1,285,250 | - | 1,285,250 | - | - | 1,285,250 | 1,285,250 | - |
|  | 771,150 | - | 771,150 | - | - | 771,150 | 771,150 | - |
|  | 771,150 | - | 771,150 | - | - | 771,150 | 771,150 | - |
|  | 771,150 | - | 771,150 | - | - | 771,150 | 771,150 | - |
|  | 1,125,879 | - | 1,125,879 | - | - | 1,125,879 | 1,125,879 | - |
|  | 514,100 | - | 514,100 | - | - | 514,100 | 514,100 | - |
|  | 1,028,200 | - | 1,028,200 | - | - | 1,028,200 | 1,028,200 | - |
|  | 514,100 | - | 514,100 | - | - | 514,100 | 514,100 | - |
|  | 514,100 | - | 514,100 | - | - | 514,100 | 514,100 | - |
| ection | 1,542,300 | - | 1,542,300 | - | - | 1,542,300 | 1,542,300 | - |
|  | 359,870 | - | 359,870 | - | 163 | 359,707 | 359,870 | - |
|  | 257,050 | - | 257,050 | - | - | 257,050 | 257,050 | - |
| ED NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS | 10,739,549 | - | 10,739,549 | - | 383 | 10,739,166 | 10,739,549 | - |
| NITY PARKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 7,711,500 | - | 7,711,500 | - | ${ }^{-}$ | 7,711,500 | 7,711,500 | - |
|  | 6,194,905 | - | 6,194,905 | - | 377 | 6,194,528 | 6,194,905 | - |
|  | 3,598,700 | - | 3,598,700 | - | 870 | 3,597,830 | 3,598,700 | - |
| LOPED COMMUNITY PARKS | 17,505,105 | - | 17,505,105 | - | 1,247 | 17,503,858 | 17,505,105 | - |

AM Kennedy Park
Barsotti Park
Kaiser Ridge Park
Roy Dancer Park
Roger Tilbury Memorial Park
Cedar Mill Park
Camille Park
Somerset West Park
Pioneer Park
Vista Brook Park
Westside Waterhouse Trail Connection
Nature Park Old Wagon Trai
Quadrant Trail - Bluffs
TOTAL NEW/REDEVELOPED NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS
NEW/REDEVELOPED COMMUNITY PARKS
SW Community Park
Schiffler Park
TOTAL NEW/REDEVELOPED COMMUNITY PARKS
$\frac{\text { TRAILS/LINEAR PARKS }}{\text { Westside Trail Segments }} 1,4, \& 7$
Westside Trail Segments 1
Jordan/Jackie Husen Park
Rowami Hart Woods Park
Rock Creek Try Trail Segent 5
North Bethany Trail Segment 2

| 4,267,030 | - | 4,267,030 | - | 703 | 4,266,327 | 4,267,030 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,645,120 | - | 1,645,120 | - | 49 | 1,645,071 | 1,645,120 |  |
| 822,560 | - | 822,560 | - | 265 | 822,295 | 822,560 |  |
| 1,747,940 | - | 1,747,940 | - | 128 | 1,747,812 | 1,747,940 |  |
| 514,100 | - | 514,100 | - | 51 | 514,049 | 514,100 |  |
| 3,804,340 | - | 3,804,340 | - | 619 | 3,803,721 | 3,804,340 | - |
| 12,801,090 | - | 12,801,090 | - | 1,815 | 12,799,275 | 12,801,090 |  |

YOUTH ATHLETIC FIELDS
-- 92

| 514,008 | 514,100 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 513,911 | 514,100 |
| 514,100 | 514,100 |
| 514,100 | 514,100 |

Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Monthly Bond Capital Projects Report
Estimated Cost vs. Budget
Through 04/30/09


REPLACEMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS
Play Structure Replacements at 11 sites
Bridge/Boardwalk Replacements at 6 sites
Irrigation Replacement at Roxbury Park

| 810,219 | - | 810,219 | - | 206 | 810,013 | 810,219 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244,712 | - | 244,712 | - | 286 | 244,426 | 244,712 | - |
| 49,354 | - | 49,354 | - | - | 49,354 | 49,354 | - |
| 116,188 | - | 116,188 | - | - | 116,188 | 116,188 | - |
| 1,220,473 | - | 1,220,473 |  | 492 | 1,219,981 | 1,220,473 | - |

NATURAL RESOURCES PROJECTS
Roger Tilbury Memorial Park
Cedar Mill Park
Jordan/Jackie Husen Park
NE/Bethany Meadows Trail Habitat Connection
Kaiser Ridge Park
Allenbach Acres Park
Crystal Creek Park
Foothills Park
Commonwea
Nature Park
30,84

Whispering Woods Park
Willow Creek Nature Park
AM Kennedy Park
30,84

| 30,846 | - | 30,846 | - | - | 30,846 | 30,846 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30,846 | - | 30,846 | - |  | 30,846 | 30,846 |
| 308,460 | - | 308,460 | - |  | 308,460 | 308,460 |
| 246,768 | - | 246,768 | - | - | 246,768 | 246,768 |
| 10,282 | - | 10,282 | - |  | 10,282 | 10,282 |
| 41,128 | - | 41,128 | - | - | 41,128 | 41,128 |
| 246,768 | - | 246,768 | - | - | 246,768 | 246,768 |
| 61,692 | - | 61,692 | - | - | 61,692 | 61,692 |
| 41,128 | - | 41,128 | - | - | 41,128 | 41,128 |
| 30,846 | - | 30,846 | - | - | 30,846 | 30,846 |
| 10,282 | - | 10,282 | - | - | 10,282 | 10,282 |
| 51,410 | - | 51,410 | - | - | 51,410 | 51,410 |
| 20,564 | - | 20,564 | - | - | 20,564 | 20,564 |
| 30,846 | - | 30,846 | - | - | 30,846 | 30,846 |
| 77,115 | - | 77,115 | - | - | 77,115 | 77,115 |
| 20,564 | - | 20,564 | - | - | 20,564 | 20,564 |
| 61,692 | - | 61,692 | - | - | 61,692 | 61,692 |
| 82,256 | - | 82,256 | - | - | 82,256 | 82,256 |
| 162,456 | - | 162,456 | - | - | 162,456 | 162,456 |
| 41,128 | - | 41,128 | - | - | 41,128 | 41,128 |
| 61,692 | - | 61,692 | - | - | 61,692 | 61,692 |
| 71,974 | - | 71,974 | - | - | 71,974 | 71,974 |
| 205,640 | - | 205,640 | - | - | 205,640 | 205,640 |
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## MEMORANDUM

Date: April 23, 2009
To: Board of Directors
From: Keith Hobson, Director of Business and Facilities
Re: $\quad$ System Development Charge Report for February, 2009

Below please find the various categories for System Development Charges, i.e., Single Family, Multiple Family, Manufactured Housing Unit, and Non-residential Development. Also listed are the collection amounts for both the City of Beaverton and Washington County, and the 1.6\% handling fee for collections through February 2009.

| Type of Dwelling Unit | Current SDC per Type of Dwelling Unit |
| :--- | :---: |
| Single Family | $\$ 6,888.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 6,777.79$ |
| Multi-Family | $\$ 5,150.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 5,067.60$ |
| Non-residential | $\$ 179.00$ with $1.6 \%$ discount $=\$ 176.14$ |


| 2,377 Single Family Units |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | Single Family Units at \$489.09 |  |
| 1,399 | Multi-family Units |  |
| 0 | Less Multi-family credits |  |
| 174 | Non-residential |  |
| $\underline{\underline{3,965}}$ |  |  |
| Washington County Collection of SDCs |  |  |
| 5,709 | Single Family Units |  |
| -300 | Less Credits |  |
| 1,796 | Multi-family Units |  |
| -24 | Less Credits |  |
| 72 | Non-residential |  |
| 7,253 |  |  |
| Recap by Agency Percent |  |  |
| 3,965 | City of Beaverton | 34.16\% |
| 7,253 | Washington County | 65.84\% |
| 11,218 |  | 100.00\% |


| Receipts |
| ---: |
| $\$ 5,748,625.26$ |
| $\$ 7,336.35$ |
| $\$ 2,624,822.68$ |
| $(\$ 7,957.55)$ |
| $\$ 374,827.16$ |
| $\$ \underline{8,747,653.90}$ |


| Collection Fee |
| ---: |
| $\$ 176,020.19$ |
| $\$ 221.45$ |
| $\$ 80,892.66$ |
| $(\$ 229.36)$ |
| $\$ 11,192.90$ |
| $\$ 268,097.84$ |

Total Revenue
\$5,924,645.45 \$7,557.80
\$2,705,715.34
(\$8,186.91)
\$386,020.06
\$9,015,751.75

| Collection Fee |
| :---: |
| $\$ 409,646.05$ |
| $(\$ 19,285.02)$ |
| $\$ 110,290.65$ |
| $(\$ 1,463.61)$ |
| $\$ 6,055.51$ |
| $\$ 505,243.58$ |

## Receipts

\$8,747,653.90
\$16,874,143.65
\$25,621,797.55

Collection Fee
$\$ 268,097.84$
$\$ 505,243.58$
$\$ \underline{\underline{773,341.42}}$

Total Revenue
\$14,087,256.26
(\$642,834.00)
\$3,774,168.74
(\$48,786.85)
\$209,583.08
\$17,379,387.23

Total Revenue \$9,015,751.75 \$17,379,387.23 \$26,395,138.98

| Recap by Dwelling | Single Family | Multi-Family | Non-Resident | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Beaverton | 2,392 | 1,399 | 174 | 3,965 |
| Washington County | 5,409 | 1,772 | 72 | 7,253 |
|  | $\underline{\underline{7,801}}$ | 3,171 | $\underline{\underline{246}}$ | 11,218 |
| Total Receipts to Dater |  |  | \$25,642,130.92 |  |
| Total Payments to Date |  |  |  |  |
| Refunds |  | (\$1,760,754.62) |  |  |
| Administrative C |  | (\$18.65) |  |  |
| Project Costs -- |  | (\$15,517,640.25) |  |  |
| Project Costs -- | ition | (\$5,801,174.74) | (\$23,079,588.26) |  |
|  |  |  | \$2,562,542.66 |  |
| Recap by Month, FY 2008-09 | Receipts | Expenditures | Interest | SDC Fund Total |
| through June 2008 (1) | \$24,766,077.37 | (\$22,500,136.23) | \$1,868,611.51 | \$4,134,552.65 |
| July | \$197,152.49 | \$488,525.60 | \$9,909.81 | \$695,587.90 |
| August | \$197,464.19 | (\$63,639.56) | \$11,759.66 | \$145,584.29 |
| September | \$104,210.18 | (\$29,198.68) | \$10,425.09 | \$85,436.59 |
| October | \$96,674.65 | (\$61,067.09) | \$9,564.90 | \$45,172.46 |
| November | \$47,961.84 | (\$49,319.92) | \$9,070.10 | \$7,712.02 |
| December | \$57,907.98 | (\$636,145.08) | \$7,163.00 | (\$571,074.10) |
| January | \$111,254.69 | (\$8,882.45) | \$6,339.44 | \$108,711.68 |
| February | \$63,427.53 | (\$219,724.85) | \$4,747.96 | (\$151,549.36) |
| 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 |
|  | \$25,642,130.92 | (\$23,079,588.26) | \$1,937,591.47 | \$4,500,134.13 |

(1) Net of $\$ 667,828.98$ of SDC Credits awarded for park development projects.

Projected SDC receipts through June 30, 2008 per the budget were $\$ 24,321,481$. Actual receipts were $\$ 23,692,502$. This fiscal year's projected total receipts per the budget are $\$ 3,316,596$.


## Everything Dregon

## Althis

## Now 2-mile trail segment in Beaverton completed; grand opening set 融y 9

Tuesday, April 28, 2009

## The Hillsboro Argus

BEAVERTON - Good news for walkers, joggers and bicyciists: A new two-mile section of the Westside Trail is now complete and officially open for public use.

The paved, mostly flat trail segment, owned and maintained by the Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District, extends from the Tualatin Hills Nature Park south to Schuepbach Park, which is at the base of Mount Williams.

Major funding for the project was provided by the Oregon Department of Transportation through a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program grant. THPRD system development charges covered the balance of the total project cost of about $\$ 2.3$ million.

The new trail marks an important link in THPRD's efforts to establish a continuous north-south trail backbone through its district. Combined with other existing segments and additional trail projects to be funded by the district's 2008 bond measure, the backbone will eventually stretch 10 miles from PCC's Rock Creek Campus to Barrows Road.

THPRD and its Trails Advisory Committee will celebrate completion of the trail segment with a grand opening Saturday morning, May 9, at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park, 15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton. The event, open to the public, will start at 8:30 a.m.
Activities will include a ribbon-cutting and remarks by THPRD Board Members Bill Kanable and Bob Scott, Oregon Rep. Tobias Read, Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten, and Beaverton Mayor Denny Doyle. Following the brief ceremony, a Tualatin Hills park ranger will lead all comers on a bicycle ride down the new trail and beyond, starting at 9 a.m.

The ride is scheduled in conjunction with National Bike Month.
In addition to recreation, the new trail will provide for connections to commercial and employment centers, schools, and other public and civic points of interest. It will also enhance future loop trail opportunities within neighborhoods that are adjacent to it.

The evolving Westside Trail (formerly known as the Beaverton Powerline Trail) is a planned continuous multi-use trail corridor from the Tualatin River north to Forest Park and the Willamette River. It follows a Bonneville Power Administration power line corridor and connects to major trails and natural areas. When completed, the Westside Trail will extend about 20 miles through the cities of Portland, Beaverton, Tigard, and Tualatin.

Formed in 1955, THPRD is the largest special park district in Oregon, spanning about 50 square miles and serving more than 200,000 residents in the greater Beaverton area. The district provides year-round recreational and educational opportunities for people of all ages. Offerings include a wide variety of classes and more than 200 park sites, 40 miles of trails, eight swim centers, six recreation centers, and 1,300 acres of nature preserve.

## Park district celebrates two-mile trail work completion on May 9

A new two-mile section of the Westside Trail is now complete and officially open for public use.
$\because$ The paved, mostly flat trail segment, owned and maintained by the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, extends from the Tualatin Hills Nature Park south to Schuepbach Park, which is at the base of Mount Williams.

Major funding for the project was provided by the Oregon Department of Transportation through a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Programgrant.

Park district system developnent charges covered the balance of the total project cost of about $\$ 2.3$ million.

The new trail marks an important link in the park district's efforts to establish a contimous north-south trail backbone through its district. Combined with other existing segments and additional trail projects to be funded by the district's 2008 bond measure, the backbone will eventually stretch 10 miles from Portland Community College's Rock Creek campus to Barrows Road.

THPRD and its Trails Advisory Committee will celebrate completion of the trail segment with a grand opening on Saturday, May 9 at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park, 15655 S W. Millikan Way The community celebration is open to the public and will start at 8:30 a.m.

Activities will include a ribbon cutting and remarks by park district board members Bill Kanable and Bob Scott, Oregon Rep. Tobias Read, Washington County Commissioner Dick Schouten and Beaverton Mayor Dennis Doyle.

Following the brief ceremony, a Tualatin Hills park ranger will lead all participants on a bicycle ride down the new trail and beyond, beginning at $9 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$.

The ride is scheduled in conjunction with National Bike Month.

In addition to recreation, the new trail will provide for connections to commercial and employment centers, schools, and other public and civic points of interest. It will also enhance future loop trail opportunities within neighborhoods that are adjacent to it.

The evolving Westside Trail, formerly known as the Beaverton Powerline Trail, is a planned continuous multiuse trail corridor from the Tualatin River north to Forest Park and the Willamette River.

It follows a Bonneville Power Administration power line corridor and connects to major trails and natural areas.

When completed, the Westside Trail will extend about 20 miles through the cities of Portland, Beaverton, Tigard and Tualatin.

PHELM MEETINGS

MONDAY, MAY 4
Washington County Public Affairs Forum - 11:30 a.m., Beaverton Elks Club, 3500 S.W. 104th Ave. BeavertoniMayor Deninis Doyle and Hillsboro Mayor Jerry Wiley will speak.

Beaverton City Councill - 6:30 p.m., Beaverton City Hall, Council Chambers, 4755 S.W. Griffith Drive.

Beaverton School Board - 6:30 p.m., Beaverton School District Administration Center, 16550 S.W. Merlo Road.

Central Beaverton Neighborhood Association Committee -7 p.m.; Beaverton Community Center, Community Room, 12350 S.W. Fifth St., Suite 100.

Citizen Participation Organization 7 - 7 p.m., Jacob Wismer Elementary School, Cafeteria, 5477 N.W. S.Sycrest Parkway.

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Board of

 Directors - 7 p.m.r. Howard Terpenning Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 S.W. Walker Road.
## New sand volleyball league coming up

Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District will be offering a Coed Sand Volleyball League this summer.

The sand volleyball league is designed for a fun game of volleyball in the sand on summer evenings.

Information on registration procedures, fees and league structure can be found at www.thprd.org.

Team rosters are due on

May 8. If you are looking for a team to join, call the Sports office to put your name on an interest list.

For more information, call Leslie Mundt at the THPRD Sports office at 503-6296330.

# What to do with Tualatin parks' $\$ 100$ million bond? 

## Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District

Editor's note: Candidate responses have been edited for length. Complete versions of candidate responses are on Oregon Live at
thevoterguide.oregonlive.com

## Position 3


dOUGLAS HARMS, 59, of Beaverton; married to Charlotte; two children and four grandchildren.
Education: B.S., electronics management, Southern Illinois University; M.S., engineering and technology management, Portland State University.
Work experience: 15 years at Intel.
Community invalvement: More than 20 years as a Boy Scout/Girl Scout leader; 10 years as a youth sports coach.
Campaign contact: dougharms@verizon.net


BOB SCOTT (Incumbent) 48, Portland resident (north west corner of park district); married with a daughter and

## son.

Education: B.S., finance, Oregon State University.
Work experience: Banking industry for past 20 years. Community involvement: Former board member, Girl Scouts; classroom and fundraising work for Junior Achievement; Central Eastside Industrial Council member; youth basketball coach through THPRD and Hillsboro.

## Position 2



BILL KANABLE, (Incumbent) Beaverton resident, 48; married to Janine two children.

Education: Oregon State University, 1979-83, B.S., business administration (major in operation research/ management information systems and minor in computer sciences).
Work experience: 16 -plus years at Regence Blue Cross Blue Shield of Oregon; eightplus years at American Data Service.
Community involvement: Includes THPRD board, 2005-present; coached soccer teams for 11 years, Westside Warriors Soccer Club (eight years as president and other roles), Westside Metros Soccer Club (four years as development coordinator), Tualatin Hills Junior Soccer League (current president)
Campaign contact: 503-853-4657; thprd.kanable@ verizon.net

## lisa michaels

Candidate did not complete requested information.

May election |Four candidates running for two positions differ on the best focus

Four candidates are running for two contested positions on the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District board in the May 19 election.
Bill Kanable, the Position 2 incumbent, ran for his first term on a crusade for more athletic facilities.
"I got very lucky four years ago. I didn't have anybody run against me," Kanable said.

But Kanable said he's discovered since then that the district's constituents go far beyond his soccer-loving kids.
Community surveys resulted inlast fall's $\$ 100$ million bond request to serve interests ranging from sports and other human activities to natural preservation, and in the coming four years be hopes to maintain "the fine balancing act" while implementing the bond to serve all constituents, he said.
His opponent, Lisa Michaels,
wants to join the boand to steer it away from spending too much of its bond on natural areas she considers "set-asides."
"They need to be providing what the people voted for, which in my opinion is human (recreation) resources," Michaels said.
In the Position 3 race, Douglas Harms hopes to unseat Bob Scott. Harms agrees with bal anced spending of bond money but fears it will prove "tempting to go on a spending frenzy."
Harms also says he doesn't agree with a current process of phasing in higher program costs, which he suspects will lowerparticipation. "Raising fees to me would be the last resort."
Scott helped shape the bond measure after joining the board in 2006. He is the board's nonvoting representative on a citizen panel overseeing bond implementation. "We want to make sure ... we're spending the money in the right places," he said.
Board president Larry Pelatt is unopposed.

- Eric Apalategui, special to The Oregonian



## Mountain preserve set to open June 27

Perched on the southern slope of Mountain's unique landscape and Cooper Mountain, a new 230-acre park has nature lovers high over its planned June 27 opening.

The Cooper Mountain Nature Park, a joint venture of Metro and the Tualatin Hills Parks Recreation Department, is at the intersection of Southwest Kemmer Road and Southwest 190th Avenue in Aloha.

Construction is continuing on a parking area, nature center and trail system that will help park visitors enjoy " 3 beauty of Cooper
learn more about the plants and animals found there.

The nature center will include space for environmental education programs, a base for volunteers and rest rooms. Gardens will showcase native and drought-tolerant plants suited to the dry climate of the mountain's south-facing slopes. The plants have been selected to give local gardeners new ideas they can try out in their own backyards.

The $31 / 2$ miles of graveled trails
offer varying levels of difficulty and include a $3 / 4$ mile loop that is designed for wheelchair accessibility.

From forest to prairie to oak woodlands, visitors will be rewarded with grand views of the Chehalem Mountains and Tualatin Valley, close-up looks at Oregon white oaks and wildflowers, and glimpses of rare animal species like the Northern red-legged frog and Western gray squirrel.

Summer camps, bird walks, wif ${ }^{r^{*}+} \mathrm{e}$ photography workshops,
twilight explorations and stargazing will be part of the inaugural summer season at Cooper Mountain Nature Park. Register for camps and classes by calling 503-629-6350 or visiting THPRD's Web site.

Voter-approved funds allowed Metro to purchase land on Cooper Mountain beginning in 1997. Park development is funded through Metro's voter-approved 2006 Natural Areas bond measure and a grant from Oregon State Parks.

## - THPRD Party in the Park \& the

Classic at T-Hills in Beaverton -
Tualatin Hills Park \& Recreation District hosts an assortment of activities - including classic cars and trucks, entertainment, sports, family triathlon, barbecue and more - at its huge complex at 158th and Walker. (July 25, www.thprd.org, www.thillsclassic.com)


Cooper Mountain park gears up for opening.
This weeks activity at Cooper Mountain Nature Park in Beaverton includes the installation of the last of 15 solar panEs on the roof of the Nature House
The solar panels are expected to produce up to 15 percent of the energy necessary for the bulding.

Crews are also pouring cenent for the patking area, and using Metros 100 percent recyeledlates paint on structures at Ge new park.
The 231-acre nature park, set to open to the public June 27 , Is the third natural area to be developed for public use
Cooper Mountain is home to nime plant and animal species Identified at the state and federal levels as sensitive or species. ofconcern
Lis located Between Farmington and Scholls Ferry toads West of Sonthwest Muray Boulevard Contact Heather Nelson Kent at $503-7971739$ for more: nfomiation of for specific directions to the park.

## Museum event to showcase the "Heart of the county <br> The Washington County

Museum will host the gala event, "A Taste of Washington County," on May 28, 6 to 8:30 p.m. at the Washington County Museum, 17677 N.W. Springville Road, located on the Portland Community College Rock Creek campus.

The event is designed to celebrate the best of the region, featuring local food
and wine, and honoring two distinguished centenarians Barbara Peck and Curtis Tigard - with the Heart of Washington County Award.

Tigard is the grandson of Tigard city founder Wilson Tigard, and still an integral part of the commonity.

Peck was instrumental in founding the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation Distnct,
volunteered for 55 years with the Red Cross, and helped to save the Pittock Mansion from the wrecking ball. She spent many years in Beaverton, and now lives in Forest Grove.

Tickets are $\$ 50$ each and can be purchased online at www.WashingtonCountyMus eum.org or by phone at 503 -645-5353.


[^0]:    *Executive Session: Executive Sessions are permitted under the authority of ORS 192.660. Copies of the statute are available at the offices of Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District. ** Audience Time/Public Comment: If you wish to be heard on an item not on the agenda, or a Consent Agenda item, you may be heard under Audience Time with a 3-minute time limit. If you wish to speak on an agenda item, 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 American 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 two business days prior to the meeting.

[^1]:    Bruce Dalrymple
    Lois Ditmars
    Rob Drake
    Anne M. Thompson
    Wayne Whitbeck
    Agent of Record
    $r$ r Menke

[^2]:    Jessica Collins
    Recording Secretary

[^3]:    1 EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT
    TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT GENERAL MANAGER

[^4]:    3 EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT
    TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT GENERAL MANAGER

[^5]:    4 EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT
    TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT GENERAL MANAGER

[^6]:    *     * Changes to the Family Assistance Program were implemented as of $1 / 1 / 08$. First six months of the FY occurred under the original program.

[^7]:    Jessica Collins
    Recording Secretary

[^8]:    TUALATIN HILLS PARK \& RECREATION DISTRICT
    Operational Policy \& Procedures

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Based Ossigner, M. 1999. Success Standards for Wetland Mitigation Projects- A Guideline. Washington State Depatment of Transportation-Environmental-Affairs Office.

[^10]:    ${ }^{2}$ A hierarchical ecological classification of wetland systems based on: Cowardin, L. M., V. Carter, F. C. Golet, and E. T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States.
    ${ }^{3}$ A system of assessment which shows a wetlands position in the landscape, source of water and hydrologic/habit functions served. Adamus, P.R. 2001. Guidebook for Hydrogeomorphic (HGM)-based Assessment of Oregon Wetland and Riparian Sites: Statewide Glassification and Profiles.

[^11]:    ${ }^{4}$ During the December 2004 Board of Directors meeting, the Board approved a fund with annual carry-over for maintenance-and-materials at wetland mitigation-sites. This was part of the Pioneer Park agenda item.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Based Ossigner, M. 1999. Success Standards for Wetland Mitigation Projects- A Guideline. Washington State Department of Transportation- Environmental Affairs Office.

[^13]:    ${ }^{2}$ A hierarchical ecological classification of wetland systems based on: Cowardin, L. M., V. Carter, F. C. Golet, and E. T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States.
    ${ }^{3}$ A system of assessment which shows a wetlands position in the landscape, source of water and hydrologic/habit functions served. Adamus, P.R. 2001. Guidebook for Hydrogeomorphic (HGM)- based Assessment of Oregon Wetland and Riparian Sites: Statewide Classification and Profiles.

[^14]:    ${ }^{4}$ During the December 2004 Board of Directors meeting, the Board approved a fund with annual carry-over for maintenance and materials at wetland mitigation sites. This was part of the Pioneer Park agenda item.

