



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

A regular meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, January 12, 2016, at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton. Executive Session 6 pm; Regular Meeting 7 pm.

Present:

Larry Pelatt	President/Director
Jerry Jones Jr.	Secretary/Director
John Griffiths	Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
Ali Kavianian	Director
Bob Scott	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

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

Secretary Jones called executive session to order for the following purposes:

- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry out labor negotiations, 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)(d) & (e), which allows the board to meet in executive session to discuss the aforementioned issues.

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

Agenda Item #2 – Call Regular Meeting to Order

President Pelatt called the regular meeting to order at 7:15 pm.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

Bob Scott moved that the board of directors authorize staff to accept a pedestrian access easement in the northwest quadrant, subject to standard due diligence review and approval by the general manager. Jerry Jones Jr. seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Ali Kavianian	Yes
Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Ali Kavianian moved that the board of directors accept the donation of two tracts in the northwest quadrant of the district for future open space, subject to appropriate due diligence review and approval by the general manager. Jerry Jones Jr. seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Bob Scott	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
Ali Kavianian	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #4 – System Development Charge Methodology Update

A. Open Hearing

President Pelatt opened the public hearing.

B. Staff Report

Steve Gulgren, superintendent of Design & Development, introduced Doug Gabbard with FCS Group, the project consultant used for the district's update of its System Development Charge (SDC) methodology. Steve provided a brief overview of why the district is seeking to revise the current methodology, noting that it was last updated in November 2007 and since that time new urbanization areas within the district's boundaries have been added and begun development. Doug provided an overview of the SDC methodology update, as included within the board of directors' information packet, via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record and which highlighted the following information:

- Analysis Overview
- Growth and Allocation to Residential and Non-Residential Growth Areas
- Identified Needs and Capital Improvements
- Improvement Fees and Overlay Areas
- Implementation and Potential SDC Rates

Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, noted that the action requested this evening is to adopt the SDC methodology; however, staff is not requesting action to raise the SDC rates based on this methodology at this time. Staff has deliberately separated the adoption of the SDC methodology from the establishment of new SDC rates in order to provide flexibility on how the new methodology is implemented. To that end, there are four possible outcomes from this evening's public hearing depending on the board's comfort level with the information provided:

1. As noted by the action requested within the informational materials provided, the board could approve the SDC methodology and provide guidance to staff on the terms of the fee adjustments to then be brought back at the February board meeting for approval.
2. If additional information is needed before providing direction on the implementation of the fee adjustments, the board could approve the methodology but request additional information from staff prior to giving direction on the terms of the fee adjustments. This information would be brought back at either the February or March board meetings, leading to a fee adjustment adoption at either the March or April board meetings.
3. If the board is not comfortable adopting the methodology this evening, but can provide direction on the changes to be made, the methodology could be modified and brought back for approval at either the February or March board meetings, depending on the complexity of the changes. The action approving the fee adjustments could either be brought back at the time of the methodology approval or at a later meeting.
4. If the board is not comfortable adopting the methodology and needs additional information before determining what adjustments are to be made to the methodology, this additional information could be brought back at either the February or March board

meetings for direction, then the methodology brought back at either the March or April board meetings for approval. The action approving the fee adjustments could either be brought back at the time of the methodology approval or at a later meeting.

C. Public Comment

Paul Grove, 15555 SW Bangy Road, Lake Oswego, is before the board of directors this evening representing the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland (HBA). Paul submitted a letter into the record, which included an attached letter from ECONorthwest, a consultant hired by the HBA to assist them in evaluating the district's proposed SDC methodology update. The HBA asks the board to consider delaying the adoption and implementation of the SDC methodology in order to address their consultant's questions as outlined within the letter. Paul stated that the 60-day window provided was not enough time to thoroughly review the methodology and address the outlined concerns. The HBA suggests that the district consider convening a collaborative stakeholder working group, including HBA representatives, in order to work through the issues outlined together. He briefly described the main areas of concern as outlined within the letter: timing allowed for review; consultant findings; housing affordability; development costs; and resolution of land values. He concluded by stating that the HBA is requesting this consideration in the spirit of partnership, not to delay the process, but to get a better understanding of the issues and an opportunity to properly engage in the process.

D. Board Discussion

Bob Scott asked for clarification regarding how SDC fee collection might differ for areas outside versus within the urban growth boundary.

- ✓ Keith noted that this particular concern relates to the areas of South Cooper Mountain that are currently outside of the urban growth boundary. He explained that the methodology includes the entire concept planning area of South Cooper Mountain, including the areas within the urban reserve, because the South Cooper Mountain concept plan identified the park amenities to be included for the entire area. The capital improvements project list includes projects within the urban reserve area, but also includes population growth projections for that area, as well. In terms of the actual fee impact, because the projects are being spread over a larger population base, there is minimal to any impact to the fee itself.
- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke further explained that if the urban reserve area was isolated and the park amenities removed from the concept plan and proposed methodology update, the population would also need to be removed, which would nullify any potential decrease to the fee.

Jerry Jones Jr. questioned if it should be included in the methodology if the end result is a wash.

- ✓ Doug Gabbard explained that an SDC methodology is a plan that represents the district's best understanding of what is going to happen in the future. While unforeseen circumstances can convene, as long as the district is making a good-faith effort to forecast that it will be able to develop a particular area within a particular amount of time, it is entirely reasonable to include the area in the plan.
- ✓ President Pelatt noted that the city and county are also looking at these areas as holistic plans, not specifically related to what is inside the urban growth boundary versus urban reserve. The district's methodology would follow those other agencies' leads.

John Griffiths asked for clarification of why only 43% of trail costs will be eligible for SDCs.

- ✓ Doug Gabbard explained in detail that the district's capital improvement plan that the SDC is based on is aggressive for trails in particular in that it achieves a level of service at the conclusion of the plan that is higher than what the district achieves today relative to the rest of the district. Because SDC law exists to protect developers, the district is not

allowed to improve a level of service through SDCs alone, so a percentage must be isolated that represents the fair share for new development to fund.

- ✓ Keith commented that the reason the district's capital improvement plan is aggressive in relation to trails is that it reflects all of the trail development prescribed for the new urban areas, which include extensive trail networks.
- ✓ President Pelatt noted that providing trails has moved from a recreational amenity to a matter of transportation.

Jerry inquired whether the project costs used in the development of the methodology were calculated using today's dollars and whether an escalation was included.

- ✓ Doug Gabbard confirmed that the costs used are in today's dollars and that the costs were not escalated to the estimated date of construction. However, one of the last sections of the methodology is about indexing. Each year, a resolution would be brought before the board to update the SDC fees based on the index, which is how inflation would be addressed. He noted that it is more beneficial to update SDC fees based on real time inflation rather than an estimated inflation contained within the methodology.

Jerry inquired where the opportunity for SDC credit projects is noted within the methodology.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke replied that this is noted within the procedural guidelines. There has been active discussion with the HBA who requested consideration of making some modifications to the current model, which district staff is open to discussing.

Jerry inquired how the land value used in the development of the methodology was calculated.

- ✓ Keith replied that appraisal information available at the time of development was used.

Bob Scott asked for confirmation that the district's original SDC fee was discounted instead of phased.

- ✓ Keith confirmed this, noting that the original SDC fee in 2000 was discounted while the SDC fee in 2007 was fully implemented without phase-in.

Jerry questioned whether the district is moving too quickly in adoption of a methodology if the land value is still being analyzed.

- ✓ President Pelatt expressed agreement, noting that he does not doubt the methodology, but believes adoption at this point may be premature. He believes that the district is better off being cautious in such an important decision due to the far-reaching impacts the SDC methodology has to the district and others.

Jerry noted that if the land value issue could be clarified, it is possible that both the SDC methodology and implementation could be addressed at the same board meeting.

- ✓ Bob Scott expressed agreement on delaying the decision as well, noting that he would prefer to be comfortable with the numbers before adoption.

Keith recounted the board's discussion that the desire this evening is for staff to return to the board with additional information at the February meeting in order to receive board direction, followed by adoption of the SDC methodology and implementation at the March board meeting.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke clarified the understanding that if the HBA wishes to work with the district through this process, it will need to meet the district's timeline in order to meet the February board meeting deadlines.
- ✓ President Pelatt agreed, noting that it is the board's desire that this topic move forward at a quick pace.

John Griffiths commented that he supports the logic of the methodology, but that there is a question remaining about a value within the methodology.

- ✓ Paul Elsner with Beery Elsner & Hammond, district legal counsel, noted that the board is attempting to ascertain one data point as opposed to the holistic view of how the analysis was conducted for the methodology.

John referenced the written testimony submitted by HBA noting that although a few issues are identified, what appears to be of the most importance is that the SDC fee outside of overlay areas will be increasing from \$6,450 to \$10,800 per single family home. While he agrees that this is a substantial increase, he does not believe it is being driven by the public sector, but by the private sector's price increases. While the questions of affordability are valid, he is not interested in a co-governance decision on this topic with the HBA. Although he is willing for the district to meet with the HBA to further clarify the methodology, he is otherwise ready to adopt the methodology as-is this evening, save for the one remaining question on land value.

President Pelatt reconfirmed his stance that he supports the overall methodology as proposed, but would like to clarify the land value before adoption.

- ✓ John agreed, noting that he does not wish to see this topic delayed much longer.

General Manager Doug Menke suggested that, in the interest of time, the board may wish to have some discussion this evening on the concept of phasing the implementation of the new SDC fee so that district staff can request legal to draft the appropriate resolution for adoption.

- ✓ John doubted that such a discussion could take place without knowing the final fee.
- ✓ Jerry asked if there is a general consensus of whether the board is willing to phase.
- ✓ President Pelatt commented that he does not believe the board should make any firm decision this evening regarding phasing, but instead he encourages each board member to come to the next board meeting ready to have focused discussion on that topic.

General Manager Doug Menke noted that the different phasing options and estimates have been provided to the board and commented that, while further evidence could be found that could change the land value, it would take a very significant difference in order to drop the estimates on the final numbers. The land value will not move the numbers dramatically.

- ✓ President Pelatt confirmed this noting that the board will be prepared to review the information provided in the February board packet to have final discussions on the topic.

E. Close Hearing

President Pelatt closed the public hearing.

F. Board Action

There was no board action.

Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time

Tom Hjort, 15715 SW Division, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening in support of the designation for the Waterhouse Trail as a community trail versus a regional trail. He stated that he served on the district's former Trails Advisory Committee for ten years, having served as chair for the past three. During this time, completion of the Westside Regional Trail has been a priority for the district and although much progress has been made, several uncompleted segments remain, especially north and south of Highway 26. He explained that designating the Waterhouse Trail as a regional trail would reduce momentum for completing the Westside Regional Trail, which would then have to compete for funding with a relatively close, north-south regional trail serving the same general area. In addition, opponents of the Westside Regional Trail would argue against completion of that trail due to the close proximity of another regional trail. In conclusion, he urges the district not to make any changes that might detract from the district finally completing the Westside Regional Trail.

Agenda Item #6 – Board Time

Jerry Jones Jr. commented that he has received positive feedback from district patrons regarding the newly revamped website, as well as the changes to the out-of-district fee structure, which has made the anticipated program fees for participation easier to understand.

President Pelatt congratulated district staff on how they handled the recent inclement weather.

Agenda Item #7 – Consent Agenda

Jerry Jones Jr. moved that the board of directors approve consent agenda items (A) Minutes of December 7, 2015 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, and (C) Monthly Financial Statement. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Ali Kavianian	Yes
Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #8 – Unfinished Business

A. Bond Program

Steve Gulgren, superintendent of Design & Development, provided an overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet regarding implementation of the bond program via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, detailing the budget status of the three remaining large bond projects (Southwest Quadrant Community Park, Somerset West Park, and Cedar Hills Park). Steve offered to answer any questions the board may have.

Bob Scott inquired about the attendance at the Somerset West Park project neighborhood meetings.

- ✓ Steve replied that approximately 10 to 13 people have been at each meeting with some repeat attendees, in addition to about 10 to 15 responses to the online questionnaire.

President Pelatt questioned the proposal to route traffic for William Walker Elementary School through Cedar Hills Park.

- ✓ Steve noted that the signed IGA indicates a route as such; however, it would not connect to Lynnridge Street, which was a concern expressed by the neighbors. The design is still in process to see ultimately how the traffic flow is going to work. Once this is settled, the district can start working through the master plan public outreach process again.

Jerry Jones Jr. suggested that the terminology of Total Project Budget be changed when referring to the Southwest Quadrant Community Park (SWQCP) project, noting that the scope of that particular project has grown dramatically since the 2008 Bond Measure was formulated.

- ✓ Steve noted that the original budget as reflected in the 2008 Bond Measure was for a 10-acre park and that the SWQCP project is currently 21.5 acres.
- ✓ Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, agreed that a better term to use may be Available Funding.
- ✓ Larry agreed, noting that the original \$8 million designated within the bond fund could never have funded what is being proposed today, both in size of the park and amenities.

John asked if the original 2008 Bond Measure budget for a new community park took into consideration the additional land owned by Beaverton School District to be developed in this project.

- ✓ Doug replied that it did not and provided background information regarding how the site at Mountain View Middle School became the focus for this project.

John asked for confirmation that the end product that will be delivered for the new community park will be greater than what was originally promised via the 2008 Bond Measure.

- ✓ Doug and Steve confirmed this, noting that there will be three synthetic turf fields instead of one and many more amenities.

Bob requested some budget itemization details for this project reflecting the growth in the project's scope for the Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee.

- ✓ Keith agreed and provided a brief overview of the escalation in project costs, noting that there have been budget milestone adjustments as this project has moved through the design process, including master plan approval.
- ✓ Steve reminded the board that there is \$1.3 million being carried in project contingency.

John questioned whether the district is treating the Somerset West Park and SWQCP projects equally in terms of addressing cost overages and scope increases.

- ✓ Doug replied that by isolating the growth in scope for the SWQCP project, staff will be able to better understand what cost escalation is attributable to the scope increase. There will be options for the Somerset West Park project for the board's consideration as part of the master planning process which would describe the different amenities that could be considered for the site and where additional funding might come from, such as system development charge funds. Staff does not wish to deprive the Somerset West Park project; however, the bond measure promise for this site was also on a smaller scale than what was promised for the community park.

John suggested staff research the potential for a Nature in Neighborhoods grant for day-lighting the creek at Somerset West Park.

- ✓ Jerry noted that the more options the board has to evaluate, the more informed a decision the board can make.
- ✓ Larry agreed, noting that staff has a history of providing the board with a variety of options for consideration, but even though there is justification for the cost escalation due to scope increase, the bottom line is that the district will need to find more funding.
- ✓ Doug noted that more clarity will come once the project goes to bid.

B. Rescind Resolution 2015-15 Renaming Hideaway Park to Babette Horenstein Memorial Park

Bob Wayt, director of Communications & Outreach, provided an overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet requesting that the board consider rescinding the resolution approved at the August board meeting renaming Hideaway Park to Babette Horenstein Memorial Park. Bob noted that in the days and weeks following the board's decision, park neighbors mounted a campaign against the renaming effort, including a petition signed by more than 150 residents, emphasizing that they wanted the park name to remain the same because of its historical and geographical importance to the area. Since that time, Mrs. Horenstein's family has stated that they would rather Mrs. Horenstein's name be considered for a different THPRD facility where it may be more positively received. Bob offered to answer any questions the board may have.

John Griffiths commented on the relatively small percentage of the district's total population that responded to the public outreach during this renaming process; however, in hindsight perhaps the outreach process should have also included a neighborhood meeting at the site in order to get a better understanding of neighborhood support.

- ✓ Jerry Jones Jr. expressed agreement with this suggestion, noting that he does not take rescindment lightly and wants the district to evaluate its actions that led to this and how it can be used as a learning experience in order to move forward.

- ✓ Ali Kavianian commented that since this process transpired, staff has also become more involved in the local Neighborhood Association Committees and Citizen Participation Organizations, which would have also been an ideal place for such outreach.
- ✓ Bob Wayt agreed with these recommendations, noting that this was the district's first attempt at utilizing the new naming policy and that it has been a learning experience.

President Pelatt asked for confirmation that Mrs. Horenstein's family supports this evening's recommendation.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke confirmed this, noting that the family submitted a formal letter requesting as such.

Bob Scott moved that the board of directors rescind Resolution 2015-15, Renaming Hideaway Park to Babette Horenstein Memorial Park. Ali Kavianian seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Ali Kavianian	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

C. Synthetic Turf Infill

General Manager Doug Menke introduced Gery Keck, facilities & project manager, to present research compiled on the different types of infill available for use with synthetic turf fields.

Gery provided an overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet noting that the information provided to the board at the November 2015 meeting consisted of the different types of infill material available for use with synthetic turf fields, including cost, composition and compatibility; research regarding the reported health concerns stemming from the use of crumb rubber infill; and research regarding reported environmental concerns stemming from the use of crumb rubber infill. At the November meeting, the board asked staff to expand the report with additional characteristics to the infill alternatives, including the carbon footprint and recycled rubber composition, and to research if there is any indication of public agencies trending away from the use of traditional crumb rubber infill. Gery provided an overview of this new information, noting that the action requested of the board this evening is direction on which synthetic turf infill product the district should specify for future projects. Gery offered to answer any questions the board may have.

Jerry Jones Jr. asked for clarification regarding whether any public agencies are moving toward the use of alternative infill materials.

- ✓ Gery replied that staff posted an inquiry on the National Recreation & Park Association online forum asking if any agencies had moved away from traditional crumb rubber infill and received six responses. Five of the six respondents are using alternative infill materials, such as coated sand and organic products, which would not work for our climate, and one used Nike Grind.

Jerry noted that these results indicate to him that there is a trend toward using alternative infill materials.

Jerry commented that his stance on this issue has not changed from the November meeting. Although he acknowledges that the medical research has been inconclusive, in his opinion, if the district has a safer, purer product available, it should move toward that product. He noted that at one time in history, smoking was considered safe as well until research proved

otherwise. He believes that history may tell that using crumb rubber is a safety hazard. He inquired what the cost increase would be for using an alternative infill product per turf field.

- ✓ Gery replied that cryogenic rubber infill on the new synthetic turf field at Conestoga Middle School would cost approximately \$42,000. Upgrading to Nike Grind would raise that price to approximately \$113,000 if provided by the district.

Jerry noted that this is a nominal cost when considering that the capital project cost is \$2 million.

President Pelatt commented that although he understands the emotional response on this topic, he believes that the district has better uses for the funds that it would take to upgrade to this type of product, especially when multiplying that additional cost by the number of fields the district currently has or will have in the future. In addition, the research available about the health hazards of crumb rubber infill is completely inconclusive.

Bob Scott expressed agreement with Jerry's comments, noting that he believes in this case it is better to be safe than sorry. His main concern with the Nike Grind product is that it is not readily available and that early procurement is recommended. That concerns him because the district will need to have the product accessible based on demand.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke replied that the district will manage that issue by having an understanding with the board that if the choice is to use an alternative infill material, staff will define the worst-case cost with Field Turf providing the material, but the intent will be to get a better price by procuring it ourselves. The infill material will not be needed for the Conestoga Middle School synthetic turf field project until this fall, and at least 18 months for the fields at Southwest Quadrant Community Park.

President Pelatt asked how the district can be sure that the price will not go even higher if there is scarce availability and how the district could be guaranteed that the product would be available within the noted timeframes.

- ✓ Doug replied that the cost will not be more than what FieldTurf has quoted the district.
- ✓ Gery confirmed that FieldTurf is one of the main purchasers of Nike Grind and that it is within the district's sole source agreement that they would provide it if it is specified.

Jerry asked for confirmation that the district would not be specifying the particular brand of infill, but that an alternative product to cryogenic rubber is used. This would give the district flexibility to move to a new product coming on the market that may be a better fit.

John Griffiths commented that his thoughts on this topic stem from causation versus correlation. He noted that the incidences of cancer in children being theorized as having been caused by the crumb rubber used in synthetic turf fields have occurred in the Seattle, Washington, area and to his knowledge, nothing yet has happened here. He stated that it reminds him of the concerns from a few years ago that living near power lines caused an increased risk of cancer, but exhaustive research did not find any causation. The tobacco companies were eventually exposed by independent, third-party research. At this point, he does not believe that there is evidence to state one way or the other regarding the health hazards of crumb rubber infill. If the differential in cost between the cryogenic rubber infill and alternative materials was manageable, he would support use of the alternative infill as an insurance policy. But given that the district is facing funding shortages on some of its other projects, he wonders whether an additional \$80,000 per field is justifiable. He continues to have questions on this topic and has not yet settled on a decision.

Ali Kavarianian expressed agreement with Jerry's comments, noting that he believes an additional \$80,000 per field for the safety of the district's patrons is well worth the expense, at least until there is verification that crumb rubber infill does not cause an increase in cancer risk.

Board discussion continued regarding whether there will ever be the ability to determine whether crumb rubber infill causes an increase in cancer given that it is an unregulated industry; the lack of third-party, national testing; and whether there has been enough public interest to compel such testing.

Jerry reiterated that he will always err on the side of caution on issues with a potential impact to the health of the district's patrons.

- ✓ John questioned how a particular cancer case could be traced back to any one particular field or set of fields when participants typically use a variety of fields throughout the metro area. He also questions what cost threshold the district is willing to go to in order to protect the health of its patrons. Is it any dollar amount? And should that dollar amount be taken into consideration in determining whether the underlying sport is now cost prohibitive? He guessed that using an alternative infill material for the district's synthetic turf fields over the course of ten years would equal an incremental cost of \$2 million. He asks if that is where the district wishes to allocate those funds over the next decade in order to address an inconclusive health matter.

Jerry provided examples of the district's sustainability program, such as the use of LED lights, noting that the district regularly pays for higher-cost items in the interest of protecting the environment.

- ✓ John replied that the increased upfront costs for such items are eventually mitigated due to lower usage costs over the life of the asset.
- ✓ Larry agreed with John, noting that such assets have identified payouts. He does not want to be seen as uncaring about the health of the district's patrons; however, use of an alternative infill material is a \$2 million investment for which a benefit cannot be qualitatively proven.

Bob Scott disputed whether the true cost over ten years would be as high as \$2 million, noting that as alternative infill materials become more used and available, the price will go down.

- ✓ John replied that due to the amount of material being produced, used car tires will always be more available and plentiful than the soles of tennis shoes. Assuming that the amount of labor that goes into the conversion of each is equivalent, there will always be a lower price for the crumb rubber, although it may narrow over time.
- ✓ Larry disagreed whether the price would narrow over time, noting that the manufacturers of crumb rubber would want to maintain a market differential in order to continue to sell their product.

Board discussion continued regarding the merits of designating an alternative infill material and whether such a designation would be based on an emotional response versus trending information.

- ✓ Jerry referenced the research materials he compiled that were provided to the board, noting that the potential health hazards of crumb rubber is an issue that has come up across the nation, not just in Seattle.
- ✓ Jerry and John agreed to meet outside of the board meeting for further discussion on this topic.
- ✓ The board agreed to table this topic to the February board meeting with the understanding that the Conestoga Middle School synthetic turf field project would have a bid alternate for alternative infill material and that if this alternate is ultimately selected, the alternative infill material would be provided by FieldTurf rather than owner-provided due to the project timeline.

John Griffiths was excused from the meeting.

Bill Kanable, 8130 SW Sorrento Road, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the district's selection of a synthetic turf infill product. He stated that, as a soccer coach, he has been heavily involved with synthetic turf fields for many years. He asked the board to keep in mind that once the district sets this standard, every synthetic turf field coming up for replacement could go through the same type of analysis. The positive aspect to this is that if the board does not make a change in the district's infill type now, it is not a permanent decision. The life expectancy of synthetic turf fields are between 8 to 12 years based on usage. Having children that have played on synthetic turf fields for most of their childhoods means that he is sensitive to this topic, but the desire to act now seems to be based on the desire to do better for the district's patrons rather than to address something that is actually wrong. In the meantime, there will always be synthetic turf fields coming up for replacement and if more concrete information or evidence is discovered, the board could make a decision to change the infill material type at that time.

D. Athletic Facilities Functional Plan

General Manager Doug Menke introduced Scott Brucker, superintendent of Sports; Julie Rocha, Athletic Center supervisor; and Katherine Stokke, operations analyst, to provide an overview of the draft Athletic Facilities Functional Plan (AFFP) included within the board of directors' information packet for review this evening. This functional plan was recommended for development within the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update and provides direction and guidance for facility development, service levels, Access for All programming, and cost recovery and identifies methods to monitor success. An initial outline for the AFFP was presented to the board at their March 2, 2015 regular meeting. After the board's review and comments this evening, staff will return to the board to request consideration of adoption of the AFFP at the March meeting.

Scott, Julie, and Katherine provided a detailed overview of the draft AFFP via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, and which included the following information:

- Current Conditions
- Future Conditions
- Standards
- Measuring Success
- Recommendations

Scott, Julie, and Katherine offered to answer any questions the board may have.

President Pelatt commented that the draft AFFP is well thought out and organized. He asked for clarification regarding the fluctuation in participant numbers for soccer between fiscal years 2012/13 and 2014/15.

- ✓ Scott noted that a number of factors can cause a fluctuation in participation numbers, including changing demographics, a large group that has been aged out of that level of soccer play, or a change in clubs.
- ✓ Julie noted that in 2014/15 an internal select soccer program was operated in order to address participants who were in between the recreational and competitive programs, which could have affected the participation numbers.

Bob Scott noted that after reviewing the draft report, he feels comfortable with the district's current conditions and the methods outlined to address future conditions.

- ✓ Scott agreed, noting that the draft AFFP proved out that the number of field hours currently available is meeting the demand quite well for the district's existing population centers. The crux of the recommendations made within the plan are around the three newly urbanized areas that will be developed but are absent of any facilities at this time.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke noted that, while some user groups may disagree that they are getting the needed field hours, this is because the most desired time for every group is the early evening hours, Monday through Thursday, and on specific fields.

Jerry Jones Jr. commented that he looks forward to hearing the feedback resulting from the advisory committees' review of the draft AFFP.

- ✓ Scott replied that the draft AFFP will also be presented to the affiliated sports groups for their feedback.

E. General Manager's Report

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

- THPRD/Beaverton School District (BSD) Parent Reunification Plan
 - Mike Janin, superintendent of Security Operations, reported on a partnership with BSD for a reunification plan that would reunite parents and children at the HMT Complex if a dire emergency caused the evacuation of a BSD site.
- District's Unemployment Insurance Fund Contribution Reduced
 - Nancy Hartman-Noye, Human Resources manager, reported on a recently implemented reduction to the district's unemployment insurance fund contributions, as well as a \$60,000 refund that will be received.
- FY 2016/17 Budget Process
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Doug offered to answer any questions the board may have.

- ✓ Hearing none, President Pelatt requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

Agenda Item #9 – New Business

A. Resolution Appointing Budget Committee Members

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

Bob Scott moved that the board of directors approve Resolution 2016-02 appointing Miles Glowacki and Stephen Pearson to the budget committee for a term of three years.

Jerry Jones Jr. seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Ali Kavianian	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #10 – Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Larry Pelatt, President

Jerry Jones Jr., Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins