



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, January 11, 2010. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

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

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

President, Larry Pelatt, called Executive Session to order for the following purposes:

- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry out labor negotiations,
- To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection, and
- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

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

President, Larry Pelatt, noted that representatives of the news media and designated staff may attend the Executive Session; however, media will be excused during discussions regarding labor negotiations. 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

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors concur with the staff recommended options for acquisition of a maintenance facility site and authorize the General Manager to enter into a Letter of Intent with identified property owners to begin non-binding negotiations. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Bob Scott **Yes**
John Griffiths **Yes**
Joe Blowers **Yes**
Bill Kanable **Yes**
Larry Pelatt **Yes**

The motion was **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**.

Agenda Item #4 – Presentation

A. Audit Report on Park District Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2008-09

Cathy Brucker, Finance Manager, introduced Rob Moody, from Talbot, Korvola and Warwick (TKW), the Park District’s Auditor, and Kathy Leader, Audit Committee member, to present the audit report on the Park District’s financial statements for FY 2008-09, noting that this is the first year of engagement with TKW and that the financial operations of the Park District have been thoroughly reviewed with all internal controls documented and verified through the process.

Kathy Leader commented that the Audit Committee met with Park District staff and representatives from TKW in December to review the financial statements being presented to the Board this evening and that the Committee unanimously approved the acceptance of the report.

Rob Moody provided a brief overview of the audit report, noting that it resulted in a clean opinion of the financial statements, which is the highest level of assurance that an auditor can give. He noted that there were some findings that merited further attention, including a restatement of the prior year’s financial statements involving revenue recognition for tuition received in one year versus the other, recognition of costs related to post employment benefits other than pension, as well as some issues regarding segregation of duties. He stated that Park District staff was professional and cooperative throughout the audit process and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked for clarification regarding the staff response to the finding regarding segregation of duties within the Accounting Department.

- ✓ Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, replied that generally the Park District wants to have the strongest system of internal controls possible that can be afforded by an agency of like size, but there are limitations as to the size of the Accounting staff that the Park District can maintain. While it may not be possible to completely segregate some duties, there will be a mitigating review process implemented, where possible, to provide a higher level of review of those activities.

Larry expressed concern with Keith and Cathy’s workloads as a result of assuming that additional level of review.

- ✓ Keith replied that although they appreciate the concern, providing that level of oversight is an essential part of their jobs.

John Griffiths asked for clarification regarding the finding that the Park District was not following policy for revenue recognition at the government-wide level.

- ✓ Rob explained that there are different levels of reporting: the budgetary level for day-to-day and fund statements, and entity-wide statements. Accounting rules are slightly different on a full accrual basis at the entity-wide level than they are at the

budgetary level. The restatement occurred at the entity-wide level, where revenue recognition should tie in with when the services are provided. The finding was that revenue was being documented prior to those services being provided.

John asked if that practice resulted in an overstatement of revenue in a prior period.

✓ Rob confirmed this.

John asked if the finding will result in higher revenue this year due to the deferral.

✓ Rob replied only at the entity-wide level.

John asked where the offsetting obligation is held when the Park District takes in revenue for a succeeding period of programming.

✓ Rob replied that on a day-to-day basis, it is appropriate to recognize the revenue when it is available and measurable. In terms of entity-wide accounting, it is simply an adjustment to debit the revenue and credit the liability.

John restated his question as, if the Park District is receiving revenue for a purpose not yet fulfilled, how is it recognized within the accounting statements that there is an outstanding obligation or liability for that purpose?

✓ Rob replied that it would be within the deferred revenue line item.

Larry commented that Park District staff would address the finding, which would result in a one-year restatement. Going forward, the Park District would adhere to the correct accounting practice, which is essentially a complete net wash with no significant change even at the entity-wide level.

✓ Keith confirmed this, noting that the Park District did not have entity-wide statements until implementing Governmental Accounting Standards Board 34 in 2003. When this was implemented, it was effectively implemented with too high of a beginning fund balance and that balance has been carried forward since and is now being corrected.

✓ Rob confirmed that there is no operational impact because of this adjustment.

Bob Scott moved the Board of Directors accept the Audit Report on the Park District's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. Bill Kanable seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time

There was no testimony during Audience Time.

Agenda Item #6 – Board Time

There were no comments during Board Time.

Agenda Item #7 –Consent Agenda

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of December 7, 2009 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Intergovernmental Agreement with Beaverton School District for Fanno Creek Trail, and (E)

Temporary Easement Request at Ridgewood View Park. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Joe Blowers	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #8 – Unfinished Business

A. General Manager’s Report

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

- Partners for a Sustainable Washington County Community Sustainability Panel
- Government Finance Officers Association Distinguished Budget Presentation Award
- Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife Grant Award
- National Recreation & Park Association “Sticks for Kids” Grant Award
- Conflict Management & Negotiation Skills Training Session
- Fiscal Year 2010-11 Budget Process & Meeting Schedule
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

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

- ✓ Hearing no questions, President, Larry Pelatt, requested the staff report for the next agenda item.

Agenda Item #9 – New Business

A. Bureau of Environmental Services Sewer Line Replacement Project at Garden Home Recreation Center/Fanno Creek Trail

Jim McElhinny, Director of Park & Recreation Services, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) project that would impact the Garden Home Recreation Center open space and a section of the Fanno Creek Trail east of Vista Brook Park. Jim introduced Bill Ryan, Chief Engineer with BES, and Dan Hubert, Project Manager with BES, to provide an overview of the project, including impacts to Park District property, and to answer any questions the Board may have. Jim noted that BES staff would return to the Board of Directors at a future date to make a second presentation to the Board, including the details as to the proposed compensation to the Park District for the project impacts, and would request approval of the project and easements at that time.

Dan provided a detailed overview of the sewer line replacement project, including the proposed impacts to Park District property, via a PowerPoint presentation of the drawings included within the Board of Directors information packet, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Bob Scott asked for clarification regarding the proposed alignment of the pipe at the Garden Home Recreation Center.

- ✓ Dan replied that the current proposal is to follow the alignment of the existing sewer line around the perimeter of the property. The alternative alignment was proposed to minimize construction time on the property; however, the downside to the Park District would be the sewer easement for that portion of property.

Bob asked for confirmation that the alternative alignment was no longer being discussed.

- ✓ Dan confirmed this.

John Griffiths asked for additional information regarding the pit shown on the site plan.

- ✓ Dan replied that the pit is needed in order to install the sewer line under Oleson Road and that there will be another pit on the other side of the road as well. Both pits would be filled in after the project is completed and there would not be any surface features on Park District property.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked whether BES explored how much more it would cost to bore the entire route along Park District property rather than digging a trench.

- ✓ Bill Ryan replied that boring only works well in a straight line. The current alignment has five segments which would require five pits in order to get around the park in that alignment. Digging five pits would cause more of a disturbance to the property than the trenching method, and would take longer as well.

John asked how much faster the project could be completed using the alternate alignment.

- ✓ Dan replied that using the alternate alignment could possibly save a month or so, but until a contractor is hired and they present their schedule, timelines are only guesses at this point. He noted that BES is currently estimating that the project would take about two months, excluding the jack and bore project.
- ✓ Bill Ryan noted that in addition to the difference in the length of the two alignments, each bend in the alignment is very tight so matching up the pipes with the joint alignments could take some time.

John asked for confirmation that if the alternate alignment was used, the project could be done in half the time.

- ✓ Larry noted that BES would still need to dig out the old pipe from the original alignment.

Joe Blowers expressed concern with the plan to detour Fanno Creek Trail users to Garden Home Road, noting that he does not believe that is a safe route for bicycle or pedestrian traffic. He asked whether BES would make changes to the road in order to accommodate that use or improvements to the de facto trail that runs alongside the road in the ditch.

- ✓ Dan replied that BES staff have discussed the issue internally and do not have any current plans to make improvements to Garden Home Road, but it is an active topic.

Joe requested that BES give the issue more thought, stating that he does not believe the current proposal is adequate.

- ✓ Larry asked whether there is enough of a shoulder along the road to be fenced off.

Joe replied that there is a problematic ditch with asphalt in it alongside the road and that it is not a very good option.

- ✓ Larry suggested safety fencing with some caution lights.

Joe reiterated that he does not believe it is appropriate to detour trail users onto Garden Home Road.

- ✓ Larry noted that anything to mitigate the potential danger would be a good idea.

John asked whether it would make sense to use the alternate alignment in terms of lessening the construction time on Park District property and the long-term reliability of the product. He suggested two crews could come in, one to rip out the existing pipe and the other to bore the new pipe.

- ✓ Joe noted that the major drawback to the alternate alignment is that the permanent easement would preclude any future construction on that area of the property.
- ✓ Larry noted that while he understands the temptation of shortening the duration of construction, he does not believe it would be in the Park District's best interest.

Jim noted that Park District staff has requested that BES consider starting the project on the west end at the pump station, rather than on the east end. By the time the project progresses toward Garden Home Recreation Center, the Center's summer programs would be winding down and the impact on programming would be far less.

- ✓ Larry asked for confirmation that this would mean that construction would not start on the Garden Home Recreation Center property until September or early October.

Jim confirmed this, noting that BES would be doing the pit work earlier in the project, but the actual trenching work would come later.

- ✓ Larry commented that this timing sequence could be very beneficial. He expressed confidence in staff working out such details with BES in the best interest of the Park District.

Bill Kanable asked why the overall alignment of the sewer line does not follow Fanno Creek Trail all the way to Oleson Road, rather than the current alignment that cuts into the neighborhoods.

- ✓ Dan replied that the difficulty is the area along the path between 77th Avenue and Garden Home Recreation Center gets very narrow, with apartment buildings on one side, as well as a number of mature trees that would need to be removed.

President, Larry Pelatt, thanked Bill Ryan and Dan Hubert for the informative presentation.

B. Meadow Waye Park Master Plan

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, introduced David Lewis, Project Manager, and provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding the proposed master plan for Meadow Waye Park, funded via the 2008 Bond Measure. Steve noted that a neighborhood meeting was held on November 3, 2009 to review the conceptual plan and was attended by about 25 people. He noted that there were concerns raised about the plan at the meeting, which staff took into account and worked closely with the designated neighborhood representative to make revisions to the plan. Steve noted that the action requested of the Board this evening is approval of the Meadow Waye Park Master Plan and acknowledgement of the limitations on park use listed in the attachment.

David provided a detailed overview of the proposed master plan for Meadow Waye Park via a PowerPoint presentation of the drawing included within the Board of Directors information packet and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked whether including a retaining wall at the southern end of the park would enable the athletic field to be moved further south, thereby creating additional greenspace at the northern end of the property.

- ✓ David replied that a retaining wall would only gain about 5 to 10 feet of additional space and that the wall would be fairly expensive.
- ✓ Bill Kanable noted that the long-term opportunity for expanding the open area would be the acquisition of the adjacent property.

John Griffiths referenced the property adjacent to the park that the Park District has a right-of-first-refusal agreement for the purchase and asked whether this property would be the location for play equipment in the future.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, replied that it is one possibility, the other being installing play equipment in the greenspace to the northern end of the current site with funds from a future budget cycle. He noted that the bond project budget did not include funds for play equipment.

John commented that the current proposed master plan focuses the site mainly on one use, which is the athletic field.

- ✓ Bill noted that the athletic field would only be programmed a small percentage of the time and that the area would be open for general neighborhood use otherwise.

John expressed the benefit play equipment would provide to the park.

- ✓ Larry agreed, noting that he would like to see some play equipment blended into the project, even if it is initially limited in size and expanded later.
- ✓ Bill noted that the project budget is already tight with the additional parking spaces that were added to the master plan, noting that he would prefer that funds be identified through the capital budget process for play equipment. He commented that the site is not too far from Hiteon Park, which has play equipment.

Doug noted that the project will be brought back to the Board of Directors in order to award the construction contract and that options and costs regarding play equipment could be discussed at that time.

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the floor for public comment.

Richard Stephens, 8157 SW Campion Court, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the proposed master plan for Meadow Waye Park. Richard expressed that there were three significant missteps in the development of the Meadow Waye Park master plan:

- Lack of a public process. He pointed out that prior to the first neighborhood meeting, the decision had already been made as to the elements of the proposed master plan, specifically the athletic field, and in his opinion, that does not constitute public involvement.
- The size of Meadow Waye Park is not appropriate for an athletic field. He described how a one-acre site is not suited for an athletic field, which only serves a small portion of the population, and that almost the entire site is restricted to that use.
- The current master plan does not address neighborhood needs. He stated that Meadow Waye Park should mainly serve residents that live within ¼ to ½ mile from the site and that those neighbors unanimously did not ask for an athletic field. The proposed master plan nearly excludes the entire population segment, instead focusing on U-9 soccer participants. There are no proposed play structures, picnic areas, or informal areas for neighbors to gather together. He described the irony in providing additional parking spaces for a park that should be serving residents close enough to walk to the site.

Richard expressed frustration in the impression that a decision has already been made by the Board of Directors as to the master plan. Richard provided written testimony, a copy of which was entered into the record.

President, Larry Pelatt, reassured Richard that a final decision has not been made, noting that the Board is being asked to approve the master plan and that in any master planning process there is room to make modifications. However, the Park District needs to serve a significant area and, unfortunately, cannot provide a small park for every fifty people.

Bill Kanable explained that while it may appear that the athletic field would only serve a small segment of the Park District's population, there would be ample time when the field is not programmed and could then be used by all residents. He noted that the field would most likely be programmed from around 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Wednesday in the fall, possibly in the spring as well, for one team of children under 9 years of age. At all other times, the field would be available for open use. He described how the Park District has significant deficiencies in athletic field space and that this site presented a good opportunity to address some of that deficiency, while also providing significant availability for neighborhood use. He expressed the need for park sites to be multi-use in order to address the needs of the entire Park District.

Larry commented that once the site is graded and replanted, he believes it is going to be a significantly improved park area in terms of overall usage as compared to the site's current condition, noting that the field is not going to be used for programmed games.

- ✓ Richard stated that the vast majority of neighborhood residents do not want an athletic field at the site and that if it were a true public participation process, the neighborhood would not have chosen an athletic field for the site.

Doug Menke, General Manager, agreed that it is fair to say that there was some opposition to an athletic field in the beginning of the process. However, with the adjustments that have been made to the master plan and the parameters by which the field could be permitted for use, the lead individual that was representing a large portion of the neighborhood was satisfied with the master plan being presented this evening.

- ✓ Richard replied that he believes this is because the neighbors did not feel as though they had a voice to choose something else for the site. He stated that there is only one significant difference between the first proposed plan presented to the neighborhood and the master plan being presented this evening, and that is additional parking. He questioned whether additional parking is a benefit to the immediate neighborhood, who are close enough to walk to the site.

Doug replied that this is not a fair representation of the discussion in that the neighborhood liaison spoke rather directly early on in the process and took the initiative to formulate a petition, so it would be surprising if the conversations that occurred later were not as equally direct. In addition, the athletic field footprint was decreased significantly due to input from the neighborhood.

Joe Blowers commented that he does not view Meadow Waye Park as only a one-acre site in that the Park District has a right-of-first-refusal to the property adjacent to the site. The proposed master plan could almost be viewed as a "Phase 1" and hopefully the site will end up being more than double its current size with significantly more amenities and uses.

- ✓ Richard replied, in that case, it is premature to design the park and that it would be more efficient to do so as a whole, including the adjacent property. He suggested that the neighborhood be engaged in planning the entire site, which would constitute a public process.

Joe reiterated an earlier comment that there is currently a significant shortage of practice fields. He expressed puzzlement as to the level of Richard's opposition to the plan, noting that the plan is not calling for a lighted mega field, but a small practice field with removable goals that can be utilized for general use a majority of the time.

- ✓ Richard replied that there are no other parks of a similar size in the region that have such a field.

Joe and Bob Scott described similarly sized parks with fields within the Park District.

- ✓ Richard questioned whether a \$500,000 investment is appropriate for such a small segment of the Park District's population.

Doug replied that he does not think it is fair to capitalize on the very minimal soccer usage and capture that as the exclusive use of the site. He offered assurance that neighbors would use the site as well.

- ✓ Richard agreed that the site would not be unusable, only that it is not the preference of the neighborhood.

President, Larry Pelatt, responded that the Park District welcomes public participation and he believes that it was received. He stated that there is room for additional participation and that he has never known anyone on staff or the Board who has been unwilling to listen to real ideas and real participation, but that not everyone gets what they want. He reiterated that the Board sees this master plan as the first phase for the entire park site and he does not believe the Park District is wasting \$500,000 on the project, but is creating something that is significantly more usable for the neighborhood. He noted that when the site develops to its full potential, it would likely be even more multi-use which would involve people driving to the site and in that case the additional parking would be beneficial. He described the quandary the Park District faces in regard to parking, noting that residents voice a desire as well as a distaste for it. He asked Richard to stay in touch with Park District staff and to stay engaged in the Meadow Way Park planning process.

John Griffiths commented that when the Park District was initially considering purchasing the site, it was for two reasons: as a practice field space and because the neighborhood was deficient in other park sites. He explained that the Board needs to be considerate of two issues when planning a park site; what the neighborhood around the property needs, as well as the greater needs of the entire District. Sometimes the two clash, which has happened in the past with other Park District sites as well. He noted that this particular site holds a dual obligation to both the neighborhood and the greater public use and though the Park District hopes that it will be doubled in size someday, at this point the Park District can address the first two goals of creating the park and a practice field. His only concern at this point is that the current master plan does seem to lack other activities that the neighborhood might want. He would like to see a play structure and picnic tables sited in the northern area of the property included within the master plan to give the site more dual use.

Joe asked whether there is room for a play structure.

- ✓ Steve confirmed this.

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, asked for confirmation that the Board is directing staff to amend the master plan presented this evening to indicate that there would be a play structure at the northern end of the property. He noted that if the Park District succeeds in acquiring the adjacent property, the play structure could be relocated to a different area of the park and possibly expanded.

✓ Larry confirmed this, noting that picnic tables should be included as well.

Richard thanked the Board of Directors for entertaining his testimony this evening.

President, Larry Pelatt, stated that he would entertain a motion.

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the Meadow Way Park Master Plan and acknowledge the limitations on park use listed in the attachment and provide for a potential play structure and picnic tables at the site as capable. Bob Scott seconded the motion.

Discussion followed:

John suggested that staff present the modified master plan to the neighborhood.

✓ Doug confirmed that this would be done, noting that the Park District has a public process to follow regarding play equipment.

Bill noted that when the project returns to the Board to award the construction contract, details should be available as to how the additional amenities would be funded.

John Griffiths offered an amendment to the motion on the floor to remove the word potential and instead state, "provide for playground equipment and picnic tables as specified by staff."

Bill Kanable accepted the amendment to the motion. Bob Scott seconded the amended motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Joe Blowers	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

C. Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center Expansion Master Plan

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, introduced Peter Foster, Project Manager, and Jim Kalvelage, of Opsis Architecture, the Project Consultant, and provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding the proposed master plan for the Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center expansion project, funded via the 2008 Bond Measure. Steve noted that the Master Plan presented by Opsis Architecture is very creative and can be accomplished without closing the facility. He noted that the the public open house for the project was held on November 5, 2009 and had low attendance, but those who attended were supportive of the plan.

Steve noted that the action requested of the Board this evening is approval of the Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center Expansion Master Plan.

Jim Kalvelage provided a detailed overview of the Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center Expansion project via a PowerPoint presentation of the drawings and site plans included within the Board of Directors information packet and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

The Board members expressed support for not having to close the facility during construction.

John Griffiths referenced past discussion of installing a combination indoor/outdoor wading pool at Conestoga in roughly the same location as the proposed splash pad. He asked for confirmation that the public's preference is for a splash pad over a wading pool.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the bond measure effort was centered around two splash pads in the Park District, with one being located at Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center. The original design prior to the construction of Conestoga was for an outdoor wading pool, but it became apparent over the past few years that splash pads are much more attractive to the public and support a variety of age groups. The other splash pad is planned for Cedar Hills Park and the intent is to design the two splash pads similarly in that the elements could be swapped with each site to add an element of variety.

John asked if the splash pad would operate only during the summer months.

- ✓ Doug confirmed that operation of the splash pad would be based on weather, but not necessarily limited to the summer months.

President, Larry Pelatt, commented that Portland Parks & Recreation is shutting down many of its wading pools due to maintenance and other issues.

- ✓ Bill Kanable noted that people can come and go at a splash pad and that there are less safety issues than a wading pool.

Larry commented on the popularity of the splash pad in Downtown Beaverton next to the library.

Bob Scott moved the Board of Directors approve the Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center Expansion Master Plan. Bill Kanable seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

D. Wetland Mitigation Strategy

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Gery Keck, Bond Program Manager, and Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources & Trails Management, to provide an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a proposed Wetland Mitigation Implementation Strategy.

Gery provided a detailed overview of the memo, noting that staff contracted with Pacific Habitat Services (PHS) to assess the potential mitigation needs that may occur as a result of the 2008 Bond Program projects and to create a wetland mitigation strategy. After a careful review of the Park District's land inventory, PHS found no undeveloped property that met the Department of State Lands or Army Corps of Engineers requirements. Therefore, staff recommends the Board authorize the Bond Land Acquisition Specialist to look for property that meets the wetland mitigation criteria outlined within the strategy report. Funding for acquisition of a wetland mitigation site would initially come from bond land acquisition funds reserved for acquisition of natural areas (\$8.4 million) with the understanding that as capital projects are planned, the cost of wetland mitigation based on acreage required attributable to this land acquisition cost would be charged to the project and the funds credited back to the natural areas land acquisition account. Gery offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked for the Natural Resources Department's opinion on the recommendation.

- ✓ Bruce replied that it is the most logical way to administer the goal and if done right, the Park District would purchase a piece of property that was historically wetland, return the property to wetland, and hopefully end up with a natural area that is both functional and has some patron benefit, along with the funds back to purchase property as detailed within the 2008 Bond Measure for natural area land acquisition.

Larry asked if the Park District should purchase beyond the 2.3 acres initially needed for mitigation purposes.

- ✓ Gery replied that the first step is to determine what is available.

Larry asked whether the Park District could purchase land outside its boundaries for this purpose.

- ✓ Gery confirmed this.
- ✓ Doug commented that the Park District could also become someone else's mitigation bank for the future. The intent is that each project would reimburse the natural area land acquisition funds so that there would be no shortfall in that area.
- ✓ Bruce noted there would be an economy of scale in purchasing a larger parcel of property, as well as the possibility of restoring more than necessary in order to have credits banked for future projects.

Bill Kanable asked for confirmation that funds have been built into each bond project for wetland mitigation where that need was foreseen.

- ✓ Doug confirmed this, noting that each project budget was designed to carry itself.

Bill asked if there is the potential to partner with another agency on this topic.

- ✓ Doug cautioned that, depending on the size of the property, the Park District might lose flexibility in partnering with another agency if it was determined that more land was needed for mitigation than initially anticipated.

Bob Scott questioned whether there is cause for concern in purchasing land outside Park District boundaries for this purpose if its patrons would not directly benefit from the land.

- ✓ Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, replied that Park District staff is doing their best to find sites within Park District boundaries.
- ✓ Doug noted that the challenge is that land within Park District boundaries would cost significantly more.
- ✓ Larry commented that creating wetlands even outside Park District boundaries benefits our residents by allowing the bond projects to move forward.

Bob noted that he still questions spending Park District funds outside of its boundaries, although he is clear as to why it would be beneficial to do so.

- ✓ Larry suggested that hopefully the land would not be too far outside Park District boundaries.
- ✓ Doug commented that the consultant believes that this is the way all agencies will need to operate because there is little other choice.

John asked for confirmation that the Park District would be required to mitigate 2.35 acres in response to the bond projects.

- ✓ Gery replied that it depends on the type of acreage that is purchased for mitigation. If buildable land is purchased for mitigation, less acreage is required, but the land costs more.

John stated that the Park District should attempt to purchase the land for mitigation within the Park District's ultimate service boundary.

- ✓ Bill and Larry expressed the need for staff to look everywhere, including outside the Park District's ultimate service boundary.

John asked for confirmation that the acreage required does not need to be all at one site.

- ✓ Bruce confirmed this, noting however that the cost increases when working with multiple sites since each site would need a plan, construction and maintenance.
- ✓ Doug noted that the value of the mitigation in terms of a natural resource site is also better when kept to one site.

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the Wetland Mitigation Implementation Strategy and authorize the Bond Program Land Acquisition Specialist to pursue property for the use of wetland mitigation using bond funds designated for acquisition of natural areas.

Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

John Griffiths	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes
Bill Kanable	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

E. FY 2010-11 Park District Goals & Objectives

Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that using the Strategic Plan contained within the Park District's Comprehensive Plan, as well as items carried forward from the FY 2009-10 Goals & Objectives, staff has identified some priority objectives and action steps for FY 2010-11, which are intended to serve as a starting point for the development of the Park District's Goals and Objectives by the Board of Directors. Doug noted that the redline document distributed to the Board of Directors this evening, a copy of which was entered into the record, reflects the proposed changes from the prior year's Goals & Objectives, as well as some input received from Wendy Kroger, Chair of the Trails Advisory Committee,

which was received this morning (noted in blue in the document). Doug called out that Goal 6 includes implementation of the revised planning and budget process that the Board is familiar with through various agenda items over the past few months. Doug stated that after the Board's comments are received this evening, staff will bring back a final document for the Board's adoption at the February Board meeting.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked the Board of Directors to review the redline document distributed this evening and to provide suggested edits to Doug prior to the February Regular meeting. He requested that a document including all of those suggested edits be provided to the Board for review prior to the Board of Directors information packet for the February Regular meeting.

Agenda Item #10 – Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Larry Pelatt, President

Bob Scott, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins