



**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 Monday, February 1, 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 Kavarianian	Director
Bob Scott	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

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

President 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 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)(d)(e)and(h), which allows the board to meet in executive session to discuss the aforementioned issues.

President Pelatt 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

The Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was called to order by President Larry Pelatt on Monday, February 1, 2016, at 7:20 pm.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

There was no action resulting from executive session.

Agenda Item #4 – Audit Report on District Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2014/15

Heidi Starks, deputy chief administrative officer, introduced Kathy Leader, audit committee member, to make a presentation on the Audit Report on the district's Comprehensive Annual

Financial Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. In addition, Heidi acknowledged and thanked board member Bob Scott for his service on the Audit Committee as the board liaison.

Kathy noted that the district Audit Committee met on January 20, 2016, to review and approve the Draft Comprehensive Annual Financial Report as presented by district staff and Talbot, Korvola and Warwick, LLP, the district's auditors. The audit resulted in an unmodified, clean opinion on the district's financial statements, and there were no findings, recommendations or adjustments. In addition, Kathy announced that the district has again been awarded the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting from the Government Finance Officers Association. It is the tenth consecutive year the district has been honored with the award. The Certificate of Achievement is the highest form of recognition in the area of governmental accounting and financial reporting, and reflects the high level of competency and commitment to the spirit of full disclosure by district staff.

✓ The board congratulated district staff on receiving the award.

Jerry Jones Jr. moved that the board of directors accept the Audit Report on the Park District's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015. Bob Scott 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.

Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time

There was no public testimony during audience time.

Agenda Item #6 – Board Time

Ali Kavianian commented that he recently attended the joint advisory committee meeting that kicked off the new advisory committee structure adopted by the board in late 2015. He encouraged the board members to attend these meetings as their schedules allow, noting that the initial meeting was educational and well facilitated.

Jerry Jones Jr. referenced the district's newly increased outreach to the local area Neighborhood Association Committees in partnership with the City of Beaverton and requested a comprehensive update on this effort at a future board meeting.

Bob Scott referenced the management report included within the board of directors' information packet and congratulated maintenance staff on the reduction in fuel consumed for 2015.

Agenda Item #7 – Consent Agenda

Bob Scott moved that the board of directors approve consent agenda items (A) Minutes of January 12, 2016 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, and (C) Monthly Financial Statement, and (D) Washington County Public Agency Intergovernmental Agreement.

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

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #8 – Unfinished Business

A. System Development Charge Methodology & Implementation Plan Update

Steve Gulgren, superintendent of Design & Development, provided a brief overview of the memo contained within the board of directors' information packet, noting that at the January 12, 2016 board meeting a public hearing was held regarding the proposed update to the district's System Development Charge (SDC) methodology. At the public hearing, the board discussed the proposal and directed staff to meet with the Homebuilders Association of Metropolitan Portland (HBA) and return at the February 1, 2016 board meeting with additional information.

Steve noted that district staff met with representatives from the HBA on January 21, 2016 as directed by the board. He provided an overview of additional documentation and calculations pertaining to the land values and development costs within the proposed methodology, including additional detailed analysis of development costs for three specific areas: neighborhood parks, community parks and trails. Steve noted that while the additional analysis resulted in a reduction to the value per acre for community park development, it resulted in an increase in the value per acre/mile for neighborhood park and trail development.

Steve noted that while no formal action is requested this evening, district staff is requesting board guidance on SDC methodology calculations, unit costs of land and development, and inclusion of urban reserve area projects and population. Staff is also requesting guidance on what the implementation strategy should be (phase-in, deferral, or immediate implementation). Steve offered to answer any questions the board may have.

President Pelatt asked whether district staff is anticipating additional meetings with the HBA.

- ✓ Steve replied that another meeting was scheduled for earlier today; however, the HBA's consultant has not had time to review the information provided by district staff, so the meeting has been postponed.

Larry encouraged district staff and the HBA to meet again before the March regular meeting.

Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, asked Jeannine Rustad, superintendent of Planning, to comment on the additional analysis conducted on the land values.

- ✓ Jeannine referenced the North Bethany subarea land value proposed for \$950,000/acre. She noted that the district has had property appraisals that would justify a value of \$900,000/acre but those appraisals are over six months old and land values have since risen. She noted that the district is in discussions with a developer who has claimed that the land value could now be \$1 million/acre or more; therefore, district staff believes that the \$950,000/acre value proposed is justified.

President Pelatt inquired whether there is any formal documentation in the district's possession confirming the valuation of \$1 million/acre or more.

- ✓ Jeannine replied that there is not.

President Pelatt opened the floor for public testimony.

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 stated that the HBA thanks the board for the opportunity granted to meet with district staff. He commented that the discussion with district staff was robust and that a lot of additional information was requested. Unfortunately, the HBA's consultant was unable to review the information provided in time for a scheduled meeting with district staff earlier this afternoon. He noted that in particular the basic cost assumptions need further review by the HBA, but that they are confident a shared understanding can be achieved between the district and HBA.

B. Trails Functional Plan

Steve Gulgren, superintendent of Design & Development, provided an overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet regarding the draft Trails Functional Plan (TFP) being presented to the board for review and approval this evening. This functional plan was recommended for development within the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update and provides a vision and set of tools to help staff prioritize and measure the success of trail planning, development and maintenance in the district. An initial outline for the TFP was presented to the board at their March 2, 2015 regular meeting, followed by a draft plan presentation at the August 10, 2015 and December 7, 2015 regular meetings. After receiving public testimony at the December regular meeting, the board directed staff to return at the February regular meeting with additional information.

Steve provided an overview of the additional information requested as outlined within the memo:

1. The cost differential to complete the Waterhouse Trail as a community trail versus a regional trail.
2. The potential opportunities to receive additional funding from Washington County if the Waterhouse Trail was designated a regional trail.

Steve noted that district staff's recommendation is to retain the Waterhouse Trail designation as a community trail and that staff is requesting board adoption of the Trails Functional Plan as presented this evening.

President Pelatt opened the floor for public testimony.

Sam Scheerens, 980 SW 191st Court, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening as a member of the former Trails Advisory Committee (TAC). He participated in the process of prioritizing the district's trails for the draft Trails Functional Plan (TFP) and believes that the Waterhouse Trail should retain its community trail designation. He noted that if the Waterhouse Trail is re-designated a regional trail, it would compete for funding with all of the area's regional trails, such as the Westside Trail, which has been discussed in previous testimony on this topic, but also the Beaverton Creek Trail. Several segments of the Beaverton Creek Trail were rated very highly in the priorities for the draft TFP and he is concerned that those segments may lose emphasis if the Waterhouse Trail were re-designated, thereby increasing competition for regional trail funding. He noted that participants in the prioritization process were given a fair amount of latitude in terms of how to rate the trail segments and the factors he considered were number of users generated and percentage of households nearby without a vehicle. The Beaverton Creek Trail segment from Hocken Avenue to the Tualatin Hills Nature Park scored by far the highest in that regard because it connects downtown Beaverton with the rest of the trail system. Other factors that rated highly for the Beaverton Creek Trail were geographic and social equity. He urged the board of directors to adopt the draft TFP as presented.

Hal Bergsma, 16811 NW Yorktown Drive, Beaverton, is before the board of directors this evening regarding the draft Trails Functional Plan (TFP) proposed for board adoption. Hal thanked the board for delaying their decision to adopt the draft TFP until further research could be conducted. He stated that his main objective is to see the Waterhouse Trail completed to a reasonable width in a reasonable amount of time and that this was an expectation put forth by the district leading up to the passage of the 2008 Bond Measure. He believes that this is more likely to happen if the Waterhouse Trail is given a regional classification because regional trails receive a higher priority for funding. He referenced the public testimony at the December regular meeting regarding how trail designation plays into consideration for funding from Washington County. He disagreed with district staff's statement that in order for a trail to be considered for Washington County Transportation Development Tax funding it must connect to high-capacity

public transit, noting that the trail only needs to connect to a standard bus line, which would apply to Waterhouse Trail segment #4. He described the past effort by the district which resulted in the 10-foot wide sidewalks on the Bethany Boulevard overpass above Highway 26, which indicates that the expectation was always that the Waterhouse Trail would be a regional trail. Lastly, the Waterhouse Trail connects to regional trails in both the south and north ends of the district, and it makes sense to be a regional trail as well. While he hopes that the Westside Trail will also be completed someday, it will take a lot more time and money and he believes it is sensible to have the Waterhouse Trail designated as a regional trail, as well.

Board discussion occurred regarding the cost of just under \$2 million in order to upgrade the Waterhouse Trail to regional trail standards throughout.

- ✓ President Pelatt commented that while it is a lot of money, if an additional \$2 million would complete the trail to regional standards from north to south, it seems like it would be a good investment.
- ✓ Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, noted that the additional \$2 million would require funding from the General Fund as such improvements are not eligible for SDC funds and the feedback staff has received is that trail upgrades do not typically score well for grant applications.

Jerry Jones Jr. commented that he believes that the overall reaction of the board to the draft TFP presented at the December regular meeting was that the plan was well vetted and the appropriate advisory committee was very involved; however, the board wanted to pause in order to conduct additional research on testimony that a change in trail designation would increase outside funding potential for the Waterhouse Trail. Staff has confirmed that although there may be some additional funding potential, it would be very difficult to receive for upgrading a trail since typically completion of new segments score higher than upgrades of existing segments. With the completion of this additional research requested, he is in favor of adopting the draft TFP as presented.

John Griffiths stated that if the district is unlikely to secure the additional \$2 million to upgrade the Waterhouse Trail from other sources, such as through grants, then the Waterhouse Trail should retain the community trail designation.

Bob Scott expressed agreement with Jerry's comments, noting that he believes the extra cost to upgrade the Waterhouse Trail would be better spent elsewhere. In addition, he referenced previous testimony expressing concern that having two regional trails so close to each other may result in those trails competing with one another for funding.

Board discussion occurred regarding trail width standards, including how much of a difference in the user experience there is when an extra two feet of width is added to a trail.

President Pelatt expressed support for upgrading the Waterhouse Trail from the community trail designation to regional, noting that the \$2 million required to do so would not need to be funded all at once and could be budgeted for through a multi-year process. He likes the ideas of completing the Waterhouse Trail significantly faster and having a completed regional trail from the north to south of the district. The district could approach the upgrade very intentionally and has succeeded at similar challenges in the past. But overall, the draft TFP is very well written.

Jerry reflected on the district's former Trails Advisory Committee's evaluation of this issue, noting that he supports the committee's recommendation to retain the community trail designation for the Waterhouse Trail. He stated that he puts a lot of weight and value into the committee's recommendation.

Jerry Jones Jr. moved that the board of directors approve the Trails Functional Plan as submitted. Ali Kavianian seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

C. Synthetic Turf Infill

General Manager Doug Menke introduced Gery Keck, facilities & project manager, to answer any questions the board may have on this topic, noting that there is no formal additional information to present to the board at this time. He noted that the action requested this evening is a board consensus on which synthetic turf infill product the district should specify for future projects, especially for the Conestoga Middle School synthetic turf field project, which will start construction this summer. Shortly thereafter, a choice will need to be made for the Southwest Quadrant Community Park, which will have three synthetic turf fields, followed by replacement of Field #2 at the HMT Recreation Complex. This topic was initially presented to the board for discussion at the November 2, 2015 regular meeting, during which the board requested additional information. Additional information was presented at the January 12, 2016 regular meeting, at which the topic was delayed to this evening's meeting.

John Griffiths commented that since the last board meeting, he was able to meet with Jerry Jones Jr. for additional discussion on this topic and that he also conducted extensive research on the topic. He provided the following overview of the research he reviewed:

- This is not the first time a health concern has arisen regarding synthetic turf; there was a concern in the early 2000's regarding lead in the paint used to color artificial grass, which was resolved when the industry began using low-lead paint for this purpose.
- Although there are confirmed carcinogens in crumb rubber infill, various studies from industry, as well as public health departments and regulatory agencies, generally did not find an elevated health risk associated with playing on synthetic turf. The studies were looking for two things: water contamination from the breakdown of the crumb rubber and inhalation of the gasses released by the crumb rubber.
- He described a study in Connecticut concluding that there was no concern regarding the inhalation of crumb rubber off-gassing on outdoor fields, but that there was a slightly elevated contamination reading for the use of crumb rubber on indoor fields. This study was conducted in 2010 and reconfirmed in 2015.
- He provided detailed information regarding the vulcanization process used during the making of tires that keeps the chemicals in crumb rubber from leaching out. He learned that the vulcanization process renders the carcinogens nonreactive, which makes sense since it is not leaching into ground water or into the air as a gas.
- He provided a detailed overview of his interpretation of the validity of the statistics being collected by a women's soccer coach in Washington of the cancer rate for youth players on synthetic turf fields. In order to determine whether these incidents of cancer are statistically valid and represent a departure from cancer rates that have been measured over decades by the health industry, her collection of players with cancer would need to be counted against the total number of youth players who have played on synthetic turf in order to execute a rate to compare against the general population to determine if there is indeed a spike in youth cancer rates for those who have played on synthetic turf. Unfortunately, such a study has not yet been completed but is currently underway and should be released this year.

- In conclusion, while he did not find any evidence of an increase in cancer risk via inhalation of crumb rubber, there is no study available regarding health risks associated with ingesting crumb rubber or contact with abrasions. If the case against using crumb rubber is based on the theory of a health risk via inhalation, it has not been proven. However, that does not mean there are not any other ways that crumb rubber could be having a harmful impact, but to know that requires additional study.
- In the meantime, he questions whether there are other infill materials the district could evaluate that may have superior reuse characteristics to crumb rubber. Would there be a way to reuse the infill material in order to mitigate the cost differential? And is there a more responsible way to dispose of the infill material once it can no longer be used?

Jerry Jones Jr. stated that he appreciated John's willingness to meet on this topic and provided the following comments:

- Regarding the study conducted in Connecticut, what was being tested was the effect of the carcinogens in the crumb rubber on the ambient air above the field. Of all of the studies that both he and John reviewed, there was no study regarding the health risks associated with ingesting crumb rubber infill, inhaling the crumb rubber pieces, or its contact with abrasions. However, the State of California has a study in process on this topic that is due to be released in 2018.
- He does not believe that the Pacific Northwest has a climate conducive to heating the crumb rubber to the point of hazardous off-gassing; his main concern is the effects of crumb rubber when ingested, inhaled or contact with abrasions, especially for youth players whose bodies are rapidly developing.
- He referenced John's chemistry research and questioned why old tires are no longer allowed in landfills if the dangerous chemicals within do not pose a danger of leaching out. He questioned whether ingesting crumb rubber might impact the vulcanization process. He believes it is telling that the installation of synthetic turf materials requires the use of a respirator.
- He referenced the list of young players with cancer being compiled by a women's soccer coach in Washington, noting that approximately 60% on the list are goalies. He theorized that goalies have more physical impact on the turf than other players and therefore may inhale more crumbs.
- In his opinion, absent the actual data needed from the upcoming research, the board has two options for next steps: wait until the next studies are released in order to make a decision, or use an alternative infill material now as a precaution and review the topic again when the next studies are available.
- He referenced the board's adopted goal outcomes, specifically:
 - Incorporate principles of environmental and financial sustainability into the design, operation, improvement, maintenance and funding of park district programs and facilities.
 - Consider the environmental impacts of maintenance and operational activities and standards.
 - Operate and maintain parks in an efficient, safe and cost effective manner, while maintaining high standards.

He believes using an alternative synthetic turf infill material now, even while awaiting conclusive evidence, would meet these goals.

Ali Kavarianian and Bob Scott expressed agreement with Jerry's recommendation to err on the side of caution by using an alternative synthetic turf infill material now and to reevaluate that decision once the next studies are available.

President Pelatt provided the following comments:

- He had asked district staff to evaluate the total carbon footprint of crumb rubber versus Nike Grind and the results were that the Nike Grind has a worse carbon footprint than what the district is currently using. Switching products essentially detrimentally impacts the entire planet in exchange for a remote possibility of being slightly safer for its users.
- He referenced the “cost effective” directive of the goal outcome noted by Jerry, noting that switching to an alternative infill material would cost the district over twice the amount of the traditional crumb rubber infill. He questions the decision of the board not to upgrade the Waterhouse Trail for \$2 million as discussed in the previous agenda item, but considering an alternative infill material that will cost an additional \$2 million for only five synthetic turf fields.
- He questioned the cost-effective thought process of providing a more expensive infill material when no study has proven crumb rubber infill to be harmful. He asked why the board should not just wait to see if a study proves otherwise, especially given the fact that synthetic turf fields have a continual replacement cycle that would allow for a new infill material to be easily integrated.
- In the interest of remaining fiscally conservative, as well as considering the detrimental environmental impacts and lack of scientific evidence, his recommendation is that the district continues to use crumb rubber infill while monitoring any additional studies released regarding potential health impacts.

Jerry commented that the carbon footprint for Nike Grind is the second best and is only higher than crumb rubber because it is shipped from Asia. The carbon footprint would be drastically reduced if the product was someday produced in the USA. Sand infill has the worst footprint.

- ✓ Gery confirmed this and provided an overview of how product shipment impacts the carbon footprint.
- ✓ Larry replied that regardless of why, crumb rubber still has the lowest carbon footprint.

Jerry noted that the carbon footprint for Nike Grind as compared to crumb rubber is only very slightly higher.

- ✓ Larry replied that the same thought process could be applied to the cancer rates of those playing on crumb rubber infill, noting that the increase is not statistically noticeable or supported by scientific study.

Jerry referenced the community benefit improvements and programs that the district has purchased or participated in as outlined within the handout provided to the board this evening, a copy of which was entered into the record. He stated that if the district does not make a change in its infill material now, and a few years from now studies confirm that there is a definite health risk associated with crumb rubber, the district would then need to replace the brand new fields that are slated for construction soon in order to install a cleaner infill material. This would be a much greater overall cost impact to the district versus initially using the alternative infill material.

- ✓ Larry replied that there has been no indication so far that there is huge number of youth negatively affected by crumb rubber. If the number of players affected were driving toward an obvious, undeniable health hazard, he would be more agreeable to acting now before studies officially confirmed the risk. If the studies eventually do define a risk, even a small one, then the district could reassess its specific situation. To arbitrarily lock the district into this decision in advance is not fiscally responsible. Additionally, he doubts whether the board would ever redact its decision to use an alternative infill material, even if the studies eventually prove that there is no elevated health risks associated with the use of crumb rubber.

Jerry expressed disagreement with Larry’s comments, specifically that the board would not redact its decision if studies proved that there is no elevated health risks associated with the use of crumb rubber infill.

John inquired about the reuse or recyclability differences between the various infill materials.

- ✓ Jerry replied that page 2 of the staff report notes that each variety can be repurposed.
- ✓ Gery described a machine recently purchased by FieldTurf that will pick out the crumb rubber and sand infill, clean and reuse it. It is relatively new technology and would work with either crumb rubber, Nike Grind, or coated sand.
- ✓ Doug noted that there is no difference between the products in terms of recyclability. Each has a short enough lifespan that the long-term capability of actually degrading is unknown. However, the good news is that there is an ability to reuse the material, although there will be a cost associated with extracting the material from the turf. The hope is that the cost of reusing the material will be less than purchasing brand new infill.

John proposed that the district test the playing ability of other types of infill material on the district's newest synthetic turf field planned for Conestoga Middle School. Meanwhile, the district could await additional study results prior to making a decision on any other fields.

- ✓ Jerry noted that within the next year and a half, the district will be constructing or replacing five synthetic turf fields. He asked if the district would receive a price break on Nike Grind if the district committed to using it on the next five synthetic turf field projects.
- ✓ Doug replied that there would be no guarantee due to the product availability issue, but assumes that committing to five fields would give the district additional bargaining power.
- ✓ John suggested the district negotiate a lower price based on the option to bring additional fields as opposed to committing the additional fields.

John commented that the test run of the new infill material could be promoted under an environmental and/or playability basis. And the district will be seen as leaders if a study reveals that crumb rubber is harmful. If not, the district will have more information for future decisions in terms of the playability of different infill materials.

- ✓ Bob stated that he is willing to review the type of infill used on a field-by-field basis.
- ✓ Ali agreed, noting that he also likes the option of committing to additional fields.
- ✓ President Pelatt expressed concern with the availability of Nike Grind, noting that the district committing to five fields might not necessarily work in our favor due to limited supply. However, he could agree to try an alternative infill for one field for now.
- ✓ Jerry commented that it would be helpful for the board to make a policy decision on this topic that would help staff do their jobs and wouldn't require the board to debate this issue every time.

John replied to Jerry that there is not enough information right now to make a policy-level decision. The board would continue to monitor the research and make the most prudent decision based on information as it becomes available.

General Manager Doug Menke asked for confirmation that the consensus of the board is to use Nike Grind on the Conestoga Middle School synthetic turf field project.

- ✓ The board confirmed this.

D. 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 Receives Distinguished Budget Presentation Award
 - Heidi Starks, deputy chief administrative officer, announced that the Government Finance Officers Association has awarded the district with the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for the fiscal year 2015/16 annual budget document.
- New Advisory Committee Structure Update
 - Bruce Barbarasch, superintendent of Natural Resources & Trails Management, provided a recap of the advisory committee kick-off meeting held January 19.
- 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. System Development Charge Capital Improvement Plan

Heidi Starks, deputy chief administrative officer, provided an overview of the memo included within the board of directors' information packet regarding a proposed System Development Charge (SDC) five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) project list for the board's review. Heidi noted that following board review and input on the project list this evening staff will present a prioritized SDC CIP project list for board approval at the March regular meeting.

Heidi provided a detailed overview of the public outreach and survey results compiled for the SDC CIP project list via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record. Also provided to the board as handouts was a complete compilation of the SDC CIP public survey results, as well as written testimony from Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation staff and CPO #7, copies of which were entered into the record. The board provided feedback in order of category as noted below.

General Manager Doug Menke explained that the context of the information provided this evening is attempting to show the amount of public input provided on the SDC CIP via the online survey and public meetings; however, as critical are the functional plans, which were developed with much public input, time and effort. District staff is leaning heavily on the functional plans, but wanted to reveal the additional public input received, as well.

Infill Land Acquisition

- Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, noted that these are the areas based on the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update GRASP analysis that fell below the desired walkable level of service, and where the district does not have land holdings available to be developed.
- President Pelatt noted that the challenge for these areas is the extremely limited amount of park land available for acquisition.

Natural Area Land Acquisition

- Discussion occurred wondering why the Cooper Mountain area would rate last in terms of the survey and neighborhood meeting. Theories ranged from the limited existing population to the fact that there is already the Cooper Mountain Nature Park in the area.
- John Griffiths noted that it is not unusual for a densely populated area to desire natural areas nearby, but the opportunity has usually passed at that point. He encourages the district to look at areas that are not yet populated in order to acquire natural area land.
- Jerry Jones Jr. and President Pelatt expressed agreement with John in needing to acquire natural area land on Cooper Mountain while there is still such land undeveloped.

Neighborhood Park Development

- President Pelatt commented that the location of the neighborhood meetings may be reflected in the overall rankings for this category.
- Bob Scott suggested listing the Parks Master Project List sites on the corresponding map according to the priority rankings.
 - Keith Hobson, director of Business & Facilities, clarified that in reviewing this project list, the board should keep in mind that the total amount of available SDC funds is not enough to address all of the park development projects. However, it would be helpful for the board to gauge whether the top two or three priority sites are listed appropriately.

- John questioned whether the second phase of a park project should be developed, such as for Roger Tilbury Park, when other parks have not yet had phase one developed.
 - Keith replied that this is a valid question, although there are benefits in that the master planning process for Roger Tilbury Park has already been completed.
 - John referenced the opening of Barsotti Park and how well-received that particular park was by the surrounding community, which had lacked a neighborhood park site. President Pelatt expressed agreement.
- Jerry and Bob asked how these projects rate against the GRASP analysis that was conducted via the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update.
 - Aisha Panas, director of Park & Recreation Services, explained that this was already factored into the sites' rankings within the functional plan.
- Bob expressed agreement with the functional plan rankings for sites C (SW 175th/SW Marty Ln) and D (SW 187th/SW Bonnie Meadow) when considering the lack of parks in those particular neighborhoods. In addition, he agrees with John's insinuation that perhaps completing phase two for Roger Tilbury Park may not be a priority when there are other sites totally undeveloped.
 - Heidi expressed the concern heard that a master plan might become stale if too long passes before a phase two is developed.
- Jerry Jones Jr. commented that sites B (SW Miller Hill Rd/SW Georgene Ct) and D (SW 187th/SW Bonnie Meadow) are located in economically challenged areas.
- General Manager Doug Menke asked for confirmation that sites B, C and D are the board's priorities.
 - Jerry expressed agreement, noting that he also agrees with the previous comments regarding holding on development of a second phase.

Community Park Development

- General Manager Doug Menke asked if the board feels the same philosophically regarding phase two for Winkelman Park as they do for Roger Tilbury Park.
 - John replied that while he does feel the same philosophically, he hears more from the public regarding Winkelman Park than any other district site.
- Bob noted that site J (NW Miller Rd/NW Barnes Rd) is simply too large to develop with the available SDCs, which should move it down in priority.
 - Keith commented that the district could invest in the master planning for the site so that it is ready for development when funding becomes available.
 - Doug noted that the site lends itself well to a phased approach.
- Jerry referenced site L (NW Kaiser Rd/NW Brugger Rd) noting that there are not many park amenities available in that area.
- Doug noted that site K (SW David Rd/SW 160th Ave) has some unknown conditions in regards to a City of Beaverton reservoir possibly being located at that site. He provided a brief overview of the two sites under consideration by the city for an additional reservoir.

Trail Development

- The board expressed agreement with the top two ranked trail segments, Waterhouse Trail Segment #4 and Beaverton Creek Trail Segment #3-4.

Athletic Field Development

- The board expressed agreement with the top two ranked fields, Youth Multipurpose Fields – Natural Turf and Multipurpose Fields – Synthetic Turf.

Natural Area Public Access

- Jerry commented that the low survey ranking for Winkelman Park/Cooper Mountain may be due to the limited number of residents in that area to participate in the survey.

- President Pelatt asked for additional information regarding the Bannister Creek Corridor.
 - Bruce Barbarasch, superintendent of Natural Resources & Trails Management, provided an overview of all three areas under consideration.
- President Pelatt commented that although all three areas are at different stages, he sees an advantage to being able to collaborate with Metro in the Winkelman Park/Cooper Mountain area, as well as the potential for eventually connecting Winkelman Park with the Cooper Mountain Nature Park, which moves this up in priority to the top.

Heidi thanked the board of directors for their feedback this evening, noting that district staff would return to the board to confirm the prioritized list at the March regular meeting.

Agenda Item #10 – Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Larry Pelatt, President

Jerry Jones Jr., Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins