



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

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, April 2, 2012. Executive Session 5:30 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

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

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

President, Bob Scott, 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.

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

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

### **Agenda Item #2 – Call Regular Meeting to Order**

President, Bob Scott, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

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

There was no action resulting from Executive Session.

### **Agenda Item #4 – Historic Facilities Advisory Committee**

Lisa Novak, Superintendent of Special Activities, introduced Jan Regnier, Chair of the Historic Facilities Advisory Committee, and Lynda Myers, Jenkins Estate Center Supervisor, to make a presentation to the Board of Directors regarding the activities of the Committee during the past year as well as their goals for the coming year.

Jan provided an overview of the Historic Facilities Advisory Committee's past and current focuses via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, and which included the following topics:

- Special Projects
  - Cutting & Herb Gardens at the Jenkins Estate
- Challenge Grant Projects
  - 2011: Window treatments for Main House
  - 2012: Jenkins Estate Centennial Celebration interpretive materials
- Fundraising Efforts
  - Gift boutique
  - Plant sale at Mother's Day Quilt Festival
  - Silent Auction
- Goals for 2012-13
  - Continue to support and encourage programs and activities at historic facilities
  - Jenkins Estate's Centennial Celebration on August 26, 2012

Jan and Lynda offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked for information regarding the fundraising efforts to restore the John Quincy Adams Young House.

- ✓ Jan replied that fundraising efforts for the house are being spearheaded by the Friends of John Quincy Adams Young House.
- ✓ Lynda noted that the Friends group's fundraising has been fairly limited up to this point.

President, Bob Scott, thanked Jan and Lynda on behalf of the Board of Directors for the informative presentation.

#### **Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time**

Paul Blackmore, 17813 SW Washington Drive, Aloha, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing Aloha United Soccer Club (AUSC). Paul read from Addendum #2 of the Operational and Use Agreement for Synthetic Turf Field #2, specifically "*Westside Warriors Soccer Club (WSWSC) agrees to, in good faith, share the time assigned to them with the member clubs of Tualatin Hills Junior Soccer League (THJSL) on a fair and equitable basis*". He noted that this is what he has been asking for over the last few months that he has testified before the Board. He referenced another statement within the agreement, "*WSWSC agrees to provide equitable opportunity to THJSL member clubs requesting time on the Synthetic Turf Field #2*", stating that AUSC has been denied this time. He noted that AUSC has also been told that the time on the field is for competitive clubs only, but the agreement states nothing to this regard. Lastly, the agreement also requires that it be reviewed every two years; however, none of the other clubs were ever made aware of this opportunity for review. In conclusion, he stated that the District is in violation of its contract, as well as the law, and that AUSC is requesting what the contract states they have a legal right to: fair and equitable access to the fields.

Jason McMillen, 888 NW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening as the Head Coach for Milltown United Soccer Club (MUSC). Jason distributed a copy of Addendum #2 of the Operational and Use Agreement for Synthetic Turf Field #2, a copy of which was entered into the record, stating that MUSC simply wants to know how the District's field allocation process works. As they understand it, the District distributes field time to Tualatin Hills Junior Soccer League (THJSL), which then allots that time to the teams. This process has never been transparent and MUSC has struggled to get information regarding it. The current President of MUSC studied where the fields were being allocated and, to the best of his ability, found that the allocations did not appear fair and equitable. MUSC was told by District staff to request such information from the other clubs and every club cooperated except

for Westside, which will not respond to their emails either. A Freedom of Information Act request was required in order to get a copy of the contract he distributed this evening, which is an indication of how difficult this process has become. In conclusion, MUSC believes it is the District's responsibility to see that the fields are allocated fairly and equitably.

John Griffiths asked for confirmation that there have recently been a series of meetings held explaining how the field allocation process works.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed this, noting that staff has attended two of the past THJSL meetings for this reason, but he cannot confirm which clubs were in attendance. He believes MUSC may have missed one of the meetings, but staff has, and continues to, offer to meet with any club or representative on this topic outside of those meetings to review the process.

John asked if there are any plans for staff to attend additional meetings.

- ✓ Doug confirmed that staff would attend any meeting at which their attendance is desired.

Eberhard Jaeckh, 10164 SW Windwood Way, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening as a member of the Friends of John Quincy Adams Young (JQAY) House. Eberhard provided some background information on the JQAY House, noting that approximately five years ago, the District spent \$100,000 to develop a master plan for the house and then an additional \$10,000 to update it. He expressed concern that this funding would go to waste unless the District also allocates funding toward the restoration of the house. He urges the Board to set aside funds in order to carry out the plans.

John Griffiths asked for additional information from District staff on this topic.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed that the numbers referenced are accurate, noting that the District's agreement with the Friends group was that the District would be a party to the restoration, but that the desire was a leveraged approach in how the restoration is managed. Unfortunately, the Friends group has not come together easily. The Chair of the group has requested a presentation to the Board regarding future fundraising efforts and plans, which he will work with President Scott on scheduling.

Eric Ufer, 8450 NW Ash Street, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening representing Milltown United Soccer Club (MUSC). Eric stated that this is the third month in a row that he has testified on the same issues. He believes that sports are a great asset the community has to offer its children and that this asset should be available to all children. Due to the scope of the Board's purview, he is not surprised that they are unaware of the details on the topic of field allocation, but MUSC is here this evening asking for help in making the field allocation process as fair and transparent as possible. As President of MUSC for three years, he was not aware that the Operational and Use Agreement for Synthetic Turf Field #2 is amendable and up for review every two years. Throughout all of the years he has asked for this information, he has not received it and has been told that the field is for the Classic clubs to use. He stated that it is not fair to ask a question and not to receive the answer. In addition, he believes that all of THJSL should have been made aware that Bill Kanable is also on the Board of Westside Metros Soccer Club, which he did not know until recently. He feels that there could be a conflict of interest in such a situation. In conclusion, MUSC is asking for the Board's help in resolving the two issues of field allocation process transparency and conflict of interest.

Larry Pelatt reiterated that staff is willing to meet with anyone on this topic and has attended all of the THJSL Board meetings.

Bill Kanable explained that the field time that he was guaranteed in 2004 within the contract was in order to get time in the spring, which is shared with the teams. During the fall league time

period, the only time offered is on Saturdays for games. Beyond that, he does not have access to any other times and he gave back any field time that he was not able to use. The field time that has been allocated under the contract is not used for his, or anyone else's, personal benefit, and is within the confines of how the contract was written.

#### **Agenda Item #6 – Board Time**

There were no Board member comments made during Board Time.

#### **Agenda Item #7 – Consent Agenda**

**Larry Pelatt moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of March 5, 2012 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Resolution Appointing Aquatics and Stuhr Center Advisory Committees Members, and (E) Proclamation of National Water Safety Month. Joe Blowers seconded the motion.**

**Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

#### **Agenda Item #8 – Unfinished Business**

##### **A. System Development Charge Fund Five Year Capital Improvement Program**

Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a System Development Charge (SDC) fund prioritized project list for consideration of Board approval as an updated five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP), noting that the prioritized list being presented this evening is based on a project list and ranking criteria that were provided to the Board at the January 9, 2012 Regular Board meeting, and on project rankings by individual Board members. Staff compiled the individual Board member rankings into a project list, which is also included within the Board of Directors information packet.

Keith noted that, as was the process for the 2007 CIP, the project listing provides a cost range giving high and low cost estimates for each project. Staff is not requesting SDC funding for any of the projects at this time, but instead will use the approved list in preparing the proposed FY 2012/13 Budget. Since the list contains a range of cost estimates for each project, this means that there is not a definitive funded/unfunded line within the available funding for the next five years and staff is not recommending that projects below the funding level be eliminated since the available cash is only an estimate and actual SDC revenues could exceed the estimate. However, several of the projects on the list are carryover projects from the prior CIP that now score very low due to changing circumstances or new information, such as the Aging Facilities Study. It may be appropriate for the Board to determine to drop such projects from the list, and while this would not preclude these projects from ever being funded by SDCs in the future, it would mean that the projects would be removed from the list and not carried over to the next CIP. If such a line were drawn, staff would recommend it be drawn below the NE Community Park Plan line item.

Keith stated that it should also be noted that the priority order does not assure the order in which projects would be proposed for funding within the budget. For example, many of the higher priority projects scored well due to a potential for leveraging of outside funds. Given this leverage, the timing of the availability of the outside funding will drive the year in which these projects are proposed in the budget. Keith noted that the action requested this evening is Board

approval of the prioritized project list as presented for the SDC five-year CIP and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

John Griffiths described his reasoning behind ranking the Garden Home Recreation Center (GHRC) Expansion Project as his top priority, noting that the facility serves a very densely populated area of the District. He stated that it is not just the age of the building that is detracting from its usefulness, but that it has also become obsolete in terms of the activities that can be offered versus what the public wants. There is no funding set aside to address the facility and the longer the District puts off addressing it, the more expensive it will ultimately become. There was no funding included within the 2008 Bond Measure to support the District's older facilities and the District needs to begin putting some effort and resources toward either upgrading, replacing, or moving such facilities. He ranked the GHRC Expansion Project as his top priority as a way to bring attention to this issue.

Larry Pelatt explained that although he supports the CIP list as proposed, he prefers that projects are not dropped off the list. He explained that items that get dropped are eventually forgotten and none of the projects on the list are deserving of being dropped arbitrarily. He agrees with John's comments that the District needs to begin setting aside funding in order to address its aging facilities and that the District needs to begin seriously considering the issue.

Bill Kanable expressed agreement with the previous comments, noting that he looks at the GHRC Expansion Project in the same manner as how the District handled the expansion of the Elsie Stuhr Center. GHRC needs to be addressed at some point in the future, whether through SDCs or a future bond measure, and the District cannot lose sight of that need. He noted that it does not hurt anything to keep the project on the list and it provides recognition that the center will eventually need attention.

Joe Blowers commented that although he does not disagree with the previous comments about keeping GHRC in the forefront of the Board's thoughts, he does not believe that expanding the existing facility is the best way to address the problem. On the other hand, he is fine with leaving the list as-is if the GHRC project is a representation of the fact that the District has aging facilities that it needs to address in the future.

John described how the District inherited many of its recreation facilities as older buildings that no longer fit their intended use as schools. He commented that the District does not have a lot of experience in building facilities from scratch and has never had to face the cost associated with building a facility from the ground up, with the exception of Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center (CRAC). He questioned when the aging facilities would be addressed or replaced if they are not included in the SDC CIP or bond measures.

- ✓ Keith referenced the District's Aging Facilities Study, noting that the study clearly showed that the District could keep GHRC functionally operational for over 20 more years in its current state. Although it would not be a state-of-the-art recreation facility, it is no greater in operating costs to maintain these buildings on a net cost basis than it would be for constructing a new facility. In addition, the District is investing, via the 2008 Bond Measure, fairly significant funding into seismic upgrades at these facilities.

John replied that the seismic upgrades do not affect the programming capability of the facility. CRAC is currently being expanded via the 2008 Bond Measure to move it forward, but GHRC does not have any such amenities and there are no plans for future functional upgrades. The question on the table is whether the District should upgrade such an old facility at all or tear it down and start over. But, at some point, the facility is going to become too limited in terms of the programming it can offer as well as serving the dense population that surrounds it.

Joe asked whether the District could begin setting aside a nominal amount of funding each year for this purpose, such as what is done for the Contingency Fund, that could at least mitigate some of the funding impact such large projects would have.

✓ John agreed, noting that putting aside any funding would be a step in the right direction.

President, Bob Scott, expressed agreement with previous comments, noting that he, too, does not want to see projects dropped from the CIP project list.

Joe noted that some projects on the list simply cannot be justified, such as the Raleigh Swim Center Pool Cover. He is familiar with that center and its location and has a hard time seeing it as a justifiable project from a parking and access perspective. The location is not going to change and he is not sure that turning it into a year-round facility is justifiable. He believes that the projects on the bottom of the list are there for a reason.

**Joe Blowers moved the Board of Directors approve the prioritized project list for the System Development Charge Five-year Capital Improvement Program. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

## **B. Comprehensive Plan Update**

Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, introduced Ann Mackiernan, Operations Analysis Manager, to provide an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding proposed changes to the process in updating the District's 2006 Comprehensive Plan, which has been underway since fall 2011.

Ann noted that the intent of the Comprehensive Plan update is to examine the effect of updated population projections, completed projects, park reclassifications, and completed goals in order to refine future needs and the steps to achieve them. However, the following unanticipated issues have come to light that affect the planned process and scope of the update:

- The use of Proximity Standards
  - National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) no longer endorses the use of the long-standing population and proximity standards for determining service level needs. Instead, NPRA is now advocating the use of a Geographic Information System (GIS) based data model. While NRPA has their own model that allows each agency to look at the conditions within its jurisdiction and craft standards to meet desired service levels specific to its needs rather than applying arbitrary standards, it is pertinent to point out that other GIS-based models are also available to complete such a needs assessment.
- Advisory Committee concern regarding Comprehensive Plan goals
  - Some Advisory Committee members have expressed concern that goals established in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan may be altered or removed during the update. Although it is not the intent of the update to delete goals developed in 2006, due to economic changes resulting in static revenues for the District, these goals from five years ago may need to be amended.
- Preparation of the proposed Functional Plans
  - There has been some difficulty in planning for the proposed Functional Plans and estimating the preparation cost of such plans. This became apparent as the

business plan was prepared for the development of the Programs Functional Plan to be included in the FY 2012/13 proposed budget. Without a model of what the Programs Functional Plan might include, the budget and project time estimates varied greatly with no clear basis for estimate.

Ann continued that staff is recommending a modification in the direction of the Comprehensive Plan update to include additional consultant-led steps that would assist in addressing some of these issues and development of more meaningful results:

- Because service standards are moving to a GIS-based assessment, the District needs to develop its own GIS-based standards which would provide a more accurate picture of current and future service level needs specific to the District. Since GIS is extremely technical in nature, this analysis needs to be performed by experts in the field, as opposed to in-house staff.
- Completion of the Fee Study fee increases in January 2012, coupled with reduced real estate values, have resulted in a flattening of overall revenue for the District, which makes the revenue aspects of the various functional plans even more critical. Staff has investigated the opportunity to have a consultant assist with the development of a cost recovery prioritization model, and an assessment of all services offered by the District to help define core services. Having an objective review and prioritization of the services offered by the District along with an understanding of the associated cost recovery is another consulting project that would provide critical information that can then be used as a basis, or template, to develop the functional plans.

Ann noted that the use of these consultants would increase the original cost projections for the update by approximately \$100,000, as well as the timeline from an August 2012 completion date to approximately January 2013, with functional plan development beginning shortly thereafter. Ann noted that while no formal Board action is being requested this evening, staff is requesting Board concurrence on the new direction being proposed for the Comprehensive Plan update, as well as the resulting budgetary impacts, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt asked for clarification regarding how many consultants would be used.

- ✓ Ann replied that it is not known yet whether the work would be covered by one consultant or a group. Either way, there would need to be the right combination of skills provided and not those that could be provided in-house.
- ✓ Keith noted that staff has done some research and found a consultant that looks like a good fit, but due to purchasing rules staff cannot commit at this point. This particular firm could do it all, but that is not to say that the District would want to place everything with one firm. A proper procurement process would be used.

Joe Blowers asked for additional information regarding proximity standards versus GIS standards. What would the District be getting with GIS standards that it is not already getting through proximity standards?

- ✓ Ann explained that the issue is more that the proximity standards are being abandoned. NRPA is attempting to move the entire park and recreation field to GIS. The main issue with population and proximity standards is that such standards are totally generic. A standard of one swimming pool for every 50,000 residents does not help in locating where exactly that pool should go.

Joe asked whether GIS standards would take into account major geographical barriers, such as Highway 26.

- ✓ Ann confirmed this.

- ✓ Keith noted that the main difference between this type of GIS study versus a proximity standard is that GIS is qualitatively based. Areas are scored based on the comprehensive level of service from all of the facilities that serve that area. It is a recognition that not all parks are created equal. Some parks are A-level parks, some are B-level parks, and so on. This came from the recognition that, in many cases, agencies could not build their way into improving their service levels, but instead are having to enhance the existing amenities in order to enhance that service level. It moves into a numerical scoring basis that is then applied based on the proximity to a facility.

Joe asked who decides what an A-level park is versus a B-level park.

- ✓ Keith replied that, although there may be other methods to establish this, there are some benchmark standards that are applied looking at types of amenities, size, quality, etc.

Larry questioned whether the District has already addressed these standards via the designation of Community Parks versus Neighborhood Parks and the determinations that have been made regarding what each of those facilities should include. He stated that he is troubled by the shifting thought process that could come as part of the GIS process. If he understands GIS properly, it is a series of layered maps. Today there may be a very dense population in a particular area, but things change. For example, his neighborhood used to consist of a majority of young families, which likely would desire access to play equipment over other amenities, but the neighborhood now has older residents. How would GIS accommodate for the changing demographics of the areas?

- ✓ Keith replied that he does not believe the process is intended to be so specific where the District would focus on providing specific amenities for a park based on the GIS data. It would look more at the overall community, in that a park with a play area probably by and large is going to score higher than a park without. But, a park with a play area and a picnic shelter would score higher than either. To some degree, however, staff is a little new at this and will continue to explore the concept.

President, Bob Scott, questioned why a consultant is needed for the development of a cost recovery prioritization model and an assessment of the District's services.

- ✓ Ann replied that the Long-term Financial Plan would help quite nicely with the cost recovery aspect, but that it would be beneficial to have someone from the outside look at it. The service assessment would include a more objective review of what services the District should or should not be offering based on the community.

Bob questioned whether staff should already know what services should or should not be provided.

- ✓ Keith replied that the service assessment includes an analysis of the District's relative strengths and weaknesses in the market and the District does not have the staff expertise to conduct this analysis.

Bob commented that although he understands the Advisory Committees' desire not to drop goals within the Comprehensive Plan, it may be needed if those goals are no longer relevant.

- ✓ Ann noted that it would sound more palpable to the Advisory Committees coming from an outside consultant versus District staff; however, the intent is not to become cavalier in dropping goals.

Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the request this evening is a general consensus that the redirect in this process is beneficial, noting that the core message is that the best comprehensive plan is built with the best tools. District staff felt that the information that came to light regarding some more progressive tools would assist the District in gauging how well it is doing on multiple levels.



Larry expressed concern with not knowing exactly how much the consultant work is going to cost, noting that this type of project can snowball to a higher cost than initially planned.

- ✓ Doug replied that staff could do some additional research regarding what consultants provide this type of work, as well as some cost estimate ranges that could be brought back to the Board.

The Board of Directors expressed support for this suggestion.

### **C. 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:

- Ben Graf Greenway Trail Connection
- Elsie Stuhr Center Expansion
- THJSL Soccer Update
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

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

- ✓ President, Bob Scott, opened the floor for public testimony.

Jeffrey Petrillo, 16965 NW Bernietta Court, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening as the President of Graf Meadows Homeowners Association Tract #1 regarding the Ben Graf Greenway trail connection project. He asks for the Board's continued support of this project and thanks the Board and staff for their responsiveness to the neighborhood's concerns regarding this trail. He stated that it is encouraging to work with a public agency that listens to the concerns of its residents.

### **Agenda Item #9 – New Business**

#### **A. Tualatin Valley Water District Proposed Reservoir Project**

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that the Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) has approached the Park District regarding their needs to build a new reservoir and pump station in the vicinity of Ridgewood View Park in order to replace two reservoirs that have been closed due to structural failure: one at the north end of Ridgewood View Park and the other at Reservoir Park. TVWD is considering placing a single, expanded capacity reservoir and pump station in another part of Ridgewood View Park and needs approval from the Park District to begin on-site investigation to further examine the feasibility of such a project. If the project is deemed to be feasible, TVWD will work with the Park District and other government partners to design the reservoir and pump station, as well as the redevelopments of Ridgewood View Park and Reservoir Park. Hal introduced Mark Knudson, Chief Engineer with TVWD, to present an overview of the proposed project and to offer any questions the Board may have.

Mark provided a detailed overview of the proposed conceptual plans for the project via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, and which included information regarding why the reservoirs failed, preliminary renderings of a new reservoir at Ridgewood View Park, as well as an outline of initial steps and a potential schedule. Mark offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

John Griffiths asked why the new reservoir is proposed to be above-ground.

- ✓ Mark replied that the hydraulics of the water system dictates the elevation of the water in the tank and that it needs to be at the same height as the old tank for it to work. He noted that theoretically the water could be pumped out, but currently the tank works on gravity from the Portland system. Pumping the water out would dramatically increase the operating cost of the facility.

Some Board members commented that it appeared that much more of Ridgewood View Park would be lost than with the current reservoir location.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the concept when considering moving forward with this process is that, at a bare minimum, the District would regain property square foot by square foot and hopefully at a more usable square footage. The existing park site has grade issues, which is challenging in terms of utilization for a sports field or other amenities. The hope is that through this partnership the District would end up with a more usable site overall.
- ✓ Larry Pelatt noted that it appears that the District would be losing the tennis courts and giving up some park space for the tank, but receiving in return flat, easily accessible park area, along with the entirety of Reservoir Park.
- ✓ John noted that both sites have tennis courts that would be lost, although the courts have not been usable as of late. The District will need to be creative in how it uses the top of the new reservoir, if it can be used at all.
- ✓ Hal replied that the top of the new reservoir would not be allowed for recreational use due to safety and security measures.

President, Bob Scott, asked whether it would be TVWD's responsibility to clean graffiti off the exposed walls of the reservoir.

- ✓ Mark confirmed this, noting that the concepts being presented this evening are very preliminary and that the potential park amenities were purposefully left out because TVWD wants to work with District staff to figure out what makes sense. The key question right now is whether it is geotechnically feasible to place a reservoir in that vicinity.

Bill Kanable asked whether another possibility would be to demolish the existing reservoir and reconstruct a new one in the same location. He commented that an above-ground reservoir is going to be an eyesore and that the public may be more receptive to the new reservoir going into the same location.

- ✓ Mark replied that it is a possibility, but the challenge is that the existing location does not provide the increased capacity needed, which would then require a new reservoir to be constructed at Reservoir Park as well.

Joe Blowers asked for additional information regarding the benefits to the Park District for allowing this project to proceed and asked how much TVWD is prepared to contribute to park amenities.

- ✓ Mark replied that TVWD is anticipating spending at least \$15 million on the water facilities and that he does not see much of an issue if TVWD were to contribute approximately \$500,000 to park amenities.
- ✓ Hal noted that funding would be discussed in greater detail once the geotechnical work establishes whether or not the project is feasible.

Joe asked what needs to be done in order to determine the feasibility of the current plans.

- ✓ Mark replied mainly a land survey and geotechnical exploration, which is essentially drilling three or four holes at the site where the reservoir is likely to be.

Joe noted that he is having a similar reaction as other Board members regarding the aesthetics of the new reservoir and suggested that this issue be addressed.

Bill reiterated the idea that TVWD explore reconstructing the reservoir in its current location.

✓ Mark replied that constructability is a concern due to the constrained nature of the site. Larry expressed agreement with Bill's suggestion, noting that the footprint could be expanded slightly to increase the capacity as needed.

- ✓ Mark replied that they looked at this option, but it is challenging due to site constraints. However, if the reservoir was moved south by about 100 feet, it is more feasible.

Larry asked that this idea at least be further explored.

- ✓ Bill agreed and expressed concern for the public reaction to an above-ground reservoir and how this might impact the Park District's public perception, as well as TVWD's.

Mark noted that TVWD recognizes that they have their work cut out for them and will have a significant public outreach process for both the reservoir and park amenities.

- ✓ Hal noted that public outreach will begin prior to the exploration work so that the public is aware of why the site is being marked.

Larry suggested asking the public for input via conceptual plans for the park amenities, noting that such outreach would be one way to get buy-off from the community.

- ✓ Hal described the potential planning process, noting that the District would end up with complete master plans for both sites.

Joe asked TVWD to explore the possibility of a sound abatement wall at Ridgewood View Park similar to what has been installed at Ridgewood Park as one of the potential park improvements. He noted that it could make the site much more usable.

John asked whether TVWD is exploring any other options than those being presented this evening.

- ✓ Mark replied that TVWD is looking at other options, but the current site is a key part of the supply infrastructure and there will need to be something done at that location, one way or another. He explained that the most valuable part of the water supply infrastructure are the pipelines that connect the reservoirs, some which run under major highways. To make any major changes to the route of those pipelines requires a tremendous investment.

John asked for confirmation that, conceivably, TVWD could just rebuild the two current tanks.

- ✓ Mark confirmed this, noting that another challenge in this would be that Reservoir Park sits atop a significant slope that has failed in the past and leakage has occurred out of the reservoir because of it. It is not a particularly desirable site for a reservoir, but if TVWD becomes constrained to building at that site, they would spend a lot of money on geotechnical improvements in order to reinforce the existing, unstable slope.

John stated that he is not opposed to the exploratory work, but will be opposed to any plan that comes back to the Board with a net loss of park space.

- ✓ Mark replied that when the plan comes back to the Board, they will have done a much more thorough job of having those details and options available for the Board's review.

Bill asked for confirmation that the motion requested does not commit the District to anything more than the exploratory work.

- ✓ Hal confirmed this.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Tualatin Valley Water District's request to explore the possibility of locating a new reservoir and pump station at Ridgewood View Park. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

#### **B. Resolution Appointing Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee Members**

Doug Menke, General Manager, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that there are currently six positions available on

the Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee for appointment. At the request of Board President, Bob Scott, a scoring matrix was distributed to the Board members in order to assist with the discussion regarding the applicants. The completed scoring matrix has been provided to the Board, a copy of which was entered into the record. Doug offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Bob Scott, stated that he is open to any Board discussion on the scoring matrix or would also entertain a motion to appoint the six best scoring applicants.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Resolution 2012-09, appointing Wink Brooks, Kahler Martinson, Anthony Mills, Stephen Pearson, Jack Platten, and Sue Rimkeit, to the Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee, each for a term of two years.**

**Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

**John Griffiths            Yes**

**Joe Blowers             Yes**

**Larry Pelatt             Yes**

**Bill Kanable             Yes**

**Bob Scott                Yes**

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**Agenda Item #10 - Adjourn**

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

---

Bob Scott, President

---

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

Recording Secretary,  
Jessica Collins