



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

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, May 5, 2014. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Joseph Blowers	President/Director
Bob Scott	Secretary/Director
Larry Pelatt	Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
John Griffiths (<i>via telephone</i>)	Director
Jerry Jones Jr.	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

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

President, Joe Blowers, called Executive Session to order for the following purposes:

- To consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection,
- To consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed, and
- To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

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

President, Joe Blowers, 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, Joe Blowers, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

There was no action resulting from Executive Session.

Agenda Item #4 – Audience Time

Barbara Wilson, 12820 SW 20th Court, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the 2008 Bond Measure. She thanked the Board for approving the natural area land purchase from the Beaverton Nazarene Church with 2008 bond funds and described the abundant bird life that has been observed there. She reminded the Board that the 2008 Bond Measure was promoted to the public as primarily for the purchase of natural areas. She

referenced the 2008 voter's pamphlet for the election, noting that the first objective listed for the District's bond measure was natural area preservation through land acquisition and restoration. In addition, Barbara referenced the recent discussions regarding the usage of the Elsie Stuhr Center and stated that the 1975 Bond Measure that funded the Elsie Stuhr Center specifically stated that the funding was to be used for a senior center.

Agenda Item #5 – Board Time

Jerry Jones Jr. commented that his children are currently taking swimming lessons at Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center and that the staff there, in particular the lifeguards and instructors, do a wonderful job.

President, Joe Blowers, referenced the recent grand opening event for Vista Brook Park, noting that he was impressed by District staff's positive attitude amidst the inclement weather experienced during the event.

Agenda Item #6 – Consent Agenda

Larry Pelatt moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of April 14, 2014 Regular Board Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Westside Trail Roadway and Crossing Improvements Intergovernmental Agreement, (E) Resolution Acknowledging the Westside Trail Master Plan, (F) Joinder to Trust Agreement for Initial Membership with Special Districts Insurance Services Trust, (G) Ben Graf Greenway Trail Project, and (H) Cedar Mill Park Project. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Bob Scott	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #7 – Unfinished Business

A. General Manager's Report

Doug Menke, General Manager, provided an overview of his General Manager's Report included within the Board of Directors information packet:

- Washington County Visitors Association Passport
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

Doug offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

- ✓ Hearing none, President Blowers continued to the next agenda item.

Agenda Item #8 – New Business

A. Non-resident Fees, and

B. Patron Discounts

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports, and Sharon Hoffmeister, Superintendent of Aquatics, to provide an overview of the memos included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding the current policy discussions relating to the District's assessment of non-resident fees and patron discounts. With the adoption of the District's Comprehensive Plan Update in late 2013, the recommendation was made that the District evaluate certain policies and practices in order to either control costs or increase participation and cost recovery.

Scott described the review of the District's non-resident fee policy currently underway, noting that the desired outcome of this process will be the development of potential alternatives to ensure an

equitable fee structure for all users that could also increase non-resident participation. Scott described the public outreach that has occurred to-date regarding the non-resident fee policy, which has included two joint advisory committee meetings, as well as a survey requesting patron feedback. Scott noted that an internal project team has been reviewing the current non-resident policy and has focused on the following areas:

1. Options for assessments
 - a. Option A: A flat-rate assessment that provides the entire household with in-District pricing for all programs activities (current practice).
 - b. Option B: An additional 20-30% premium is charged, with no flat-rate assessment, for each program and/or activity.
 - c. Option C: Allow the non-resident patron to choose either Option A or Option B depending on their level of activity.
 - d. Assessment periods are also being evaluated: quarterly (currently 98% of assessments purchased), annually, or either.
2. Registration schedules
 - a. Being reviewed to determine if moving the non-resident registration date up would increase registration rates.
3. Impacts to District operations
 - a. Classes, camps, clinics, and workshops
 - b. Drop-in activities
 - c. Sports leagues
 - d. Affiliated users
 - e. Rentals

Scott offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Larry Pelatt inquired whether it is possible to determine how many non-residents currently purchasing quarterly assessments end up purchasing all four quarters.

- ✓ Scott replied that although staff is unable to definitively answer this question, they did randomly choose a sampling of non-resident patrons in order to evaluate how many quarterly assessments a typical non-resident patron purchases. He described the complexity of the results in that the answers varied based on the types of assessments purchased (individual vs. family), the programs these patrons were interested in, and at which centers they typically participated.

Jerry Jones Jr. asked for additional information regarding the outreach to non-district residents notifying them that a survey is available.

- ✓ Scott replied that the surveys are being distributed via email, social media, as handouts at classes, and at the centers' front desks. He noted that social media has been the biggest attractor for respondents.

Jerry inquired whether the District has considered a social media sponsored ad so that the survey may reach those who have not "liked" the District's Facebook page. He expressed concern regarding whether the survey is reaching the intended non-resident audience, noting that it would be especially helpful to hear from non-residents who are currently not using District programs and what this group would be willing to pay in order to participate.

- ✓ Scott described that there has been a strong return in surveys from non-residents.

Jerry asked if there is a way to market to former non-resident patrons that no longer participate in District programs to inquire as to why they are no longer participating.

- ✓ Scott replied that although the information could be sorted to that level of detail, the follow-up would be done on an individual basis. As a percentage of use, the District has held steady at between 10-15% of registrations occurring from non-residents.
- ✓ Doug reiterated that the primary purpose of these policy discussions is about enhancing in-District usage. While the District does not want to significantly impact the revenue

being received from non-residents, the challenge is in finding a balance that also sufficiently motivates the non-resident patron to engage in programs, thereby enabling more opportunities for in-District residents via reducing the chances that the programs will not meet minimum enrollment requirements. As staff move forward in the development of a recommendation for the Board's consideration sometime this summer, it will likely acknowledge the need for flexibility in order to adjust and monitor, with the intent to provide the Board an update within a year or two of implementation. Doug reiterated that the goal in this policy change is not to displace in-District activity, but to enhance it.

Jerry expressed agreement with Doug's comments, noting that he and his family have experienced firsthand the disappointment of not being able to participate in a program due to low enrollment. He reiterated the need for the District to hear from non-residents who have registered for District programs before, but are no longer participating, and those who are near District boundaries, but have not yet participated with the District and what would motivate them to do so.

Bob Scott questioned whether the current options under consideration are still too rigid and whether consideration has been given to a lower premium percentage or even a flat rate.

- ✓ Scott described the research that was conducted in arriving at the 20-30% premium level, noting that this range was determined to be a point at which the District could still retain some level of similar non-resident funding as what is currently received. If the premium is assessed at a lower level, there could be a negative financial impact to the District for a number of years until non-resident participation increases to the point that it would make up the difference. Scott noted that there is still some modeling that needs to be completed as the recommendation becomes more defined and focused, and that the premium range noted is purely investigational.
- ✓ Jerry commented that he believes a premium of 20-30% is a good starting point and referenced some conversations he has had with non-residents that are paying much higher rates for private offerings, some as high as 50-70% above District rates.

Larry asked whether different fees for different sports or users (adult vs. child) have been considered.

- ✓ Scott replied that it has not, noting that the league fees are already set at the cost recovery level. He described how the fees are determined within the teams, including assessment fees to non-resident players, noting that there is some room for discussion in this area.

Larry elaborated that certain sports lend themselves to participation by different groups (age, economic strata, etc.) and provided softball and baseball as an example, noting that the participation figures for these particular sports have been in decline. He questioned whether a fee structure could be developed that might encourage some past participants to return. In addition, he questioned why it would matter if some of these teams' participants are non-residents as long as the desired cost recovery is met.

- ✓ Scott replied that this concept has been piloted for two years at this point and participation numbers for softball and baseball have stabilized. He described that the model that seems to be of most interest to the leagues is that of a flat fee for all players, but within that fee a percentage is built in to accommodate for the non-resident players.

President, Joe Blowers, opened the floor to public testimony.

Lianna Smith, 15140 SW Daphne Court, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the District's Non-resident Fee Policy. She described how the programs offered at the Elsie Stuhr Center are listed within the activities guide with an in-District program fee and a higher out-of-District program fee, along with the quarterly or annual assessments for non-residents. She theorized that this is the reason the Elsie Stuhr Center has low non-resident participation.

President, Joe Blowers, asked for clarification from District staff regarding this testimony.

- ✓ Doug replied that the testimony is accurate in that in-District senior residents are offered a discounted program fee. The class fees reflected in the activities guide for the Elsie Stuhr Center include one fee for in-District residents, which is the discounted fee, and a higher fee for non-residents, which is calculated at the 100% cost recovery rate. In addition, the non-resident would be expected to purchase a quarterly or annual assessment.
- ✓ Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, confirmed this, noting that all program fee discounts are offered to in-District residents only. The discrepancy is more prominently featured in the activities guide for the Elsie Stuhr Center as this is the only center that advertises the senior rates, although the senior discount is offered at all centers.
- ✓ Lianna provided an example of a non-resident patron paying over \$100 for a \$30 class at the Elsie Stuhr Center, once the quarterly assessment is taken into consideration, and that this price differential discourages non-resident participation.

Linda Brown, 7470 SW Kimberly Court, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening regarding the District's Non-resident Fee Policy. She expressed support for dissolution of the District's assessment fee. She reiterated Lianna's example regarding the steep discrepancy in class prices for an in-District versus non-resident senior when factoring in the assessment fee. In addition to encouraging non-resident participation, removing the assessment fee would assist in bringing the Silver Sneakers program to the District. She noted that an informal count taken in the Elsie Stuhr Center's fitness room on a recent morning noted that one-third of the patrons there also belonged to Silver Sneakers, but were paying to use the Elsie Stuhr Center in addition because the other fitness centers that offer Silver Sneakers do not offer senior programming. She described how once patrons are in the door, they are more likely to be persuaded to sign up for additional classes. In addition, a suggestion box has been added at the Elsie Stuhr Center asking what types of evening classes the patrons there would like to see offered.

Larry commented that he will likely be reluctant to remove the assessment fee altogether. He recalled the history behind the assessment fee, noting that in-District residents vocalized the inequity of a non-resident paying the same class fee. He noted that he does not want to remove the assessment fee or disguise it as something else, either.

- ✓ Linda replied that one of the options listed on the survey is increasing the class fees in lieu of having an assessment fee, which is the option she supports.

Larry described how the assessment fee should encourage greater participation overall in that the average cost per class is reduced with the more classes taken.

- ✓ Linda replied that the opposite is true for the non-resident patron interested in taking only one class and that sometimes it is necessary to entice a patron with a single class before they sign up for more.
- ✓ President, Joe Blowers, commented that he believes the non-residents would be surprised at how high the class fees would be if the assessment is removed and the fee is based on what it costs to run the program, plus a 20-30% premium. However, he also acknowledges that having an additional assessment fee on top of the 100% cost recovery class fee could also be discouraging.

Larry calculated that if a non-resident took multiple classes utilizing the 20-30% premium rather than the flat rate assessment, they could ultimately be paying more than the assessment.

- ✓ Bob agreed, but stated that he could also understand that a non-resident interested in taking only one class may desire to pay the 20-30% premium rather than the assessment.
- ✓ Jerry added that most of the non-resident households he has spoken with on this topic are more concerned with how they should be budgeting for these programs. They are reluctant to purchase a yearly assessment without knowing what programs will be offered in the future quarters.

Larry noted that the quarterly assessment would be an option for these families.

Linda suggested that it would be helpful for front desk staff to remind non-residents that their quarterly or annual assessments are applicable to as many classes as they desire to take in the allotted amount of time.

Doug reminded the Board that this discussion has many other facets than that of the Elsie Stuhr Center, noting that there is a large discrepancy when comparing the revenue at the Elsie Stuhr Center to that of some of the District's other recreation centers. The challenge is in finding a balance and simplicity in addressing this issue.

- ✓ Jerry expressed agreement that simplicity will be a key factor in successfully addressing this issue.

Sharon described the review of the District's patron discounts policy currently underway, noting that the current policy identifies accommodations for senior users and disabled patrons. Through the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update, the following areas relative to patron discounts were identified for review:

- Raising the senior age
- Standardizing discount rates
- Reviewing the special needs discount
- Adding a military discount
- Considering different fees for peak hours versus non-peak hours

Sharon described the public outreach that has occurred to date regarding the patron discounts policy, which has included two joint advisory committee meetings, a survey of other agencies and their practices regarding discounts, as well as a survey requesting patron feedback. Sharon noted that an internal project team has been reviewing the current patron discount policy and has focused on the following areas:

1. Narrowing the senior discount age of eligibility, currently at 55.
2. Defining military discount eligibility
 - a. Active
 - b. Families of deployed military personnel
 - c. Veterans
 - d. Retired military personnel
 - e. National Guard or reserves
3. Discounts for patrons with special needs
 - a. Programs developed specifically for patrons with special needs are currently discounted.
 - b. Should the District offer a discount for individual drop-in activities or classes as well and how should that be defined?
4. Align the proposed recommended discounts with the District's cost recovery goals.
 - a. If the eligibility for discount is very broad-based, the level of discount needs to be reduced.

Sharon offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Bob commented that both policy matters discussed this evening are important and that he looks forward to the recommendations this summer.

Larry thanked District staff for their work so far, noting that this effort is being driven by the District's desire for financial sustainability.

Jerry commented that he is happy that the District reached out to other agencies regarding their discount policies in order to learn from their experiences.

C. Bethany Creek Falls Park Master Plan

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet requesting approval of the Bethany Creek Falls Park Master Plan, a project being developed by Polygon Northwest Company in partnership with the District for System Development Charge (SDC) credits. Steve provided an overview of the District's successful partnership with Polygon over the years on past projects and introduced Stacy Connery, planning manager at Pacific Community Design, the project consultant, to provide an overview of the proposed master plan.

Stacy provided a detailed overview of the components of the Bethany Creek Falls Park Master Plan via a PowerPoint presentation of the site plans contained within the Board of Directors information packet.

Steve provided an overview of the riparian corridor that runs through the site, noting that although the District will not be assuming ownership of the corridor, Polygon will be enhancing the area working with Clean Water Services.

- ✓ Doug commented that not only will the proposed trail enhance connectivity, but will also facilitate nice views of the wetlands.

Larry Pelatt and Bob Scott expressed support for the proposed master plan, noting that the proposed amenities will nicely complement the wetlands.

Jerry Jones Jr. moved the Board of Directors approve the Bethany Creek Falls Master Plan. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

Bob Scott	Yes
John Griffiths	Yes
Larry Pelatt	Yes
Jerry Jones Jr.	Yes
Joe Blowers	Yes

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #9 – Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Joe Blowers, President

Bob Scott, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins