



# Meeting Minutes - DRAFT

## 07/29/2010 - Meeting of the Bond Oversight Committee

### Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District

15707 SW Walker Rd, Beaverton, OR 97006  
503/645-6433

The fourth meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Thursday, July 29, 2010, beginning at 6:00 p.m.

#### Present:

##### Committee Members

Marc San Soucie, Chair  
Wink Brooks  
Deanna Mueller-Crispin  
Wendy Kroger  
Fred Meyer  
Anthony Mills  
Stephen Pearson  
Jack Platten  
Paul Waldram

##### Ex-Officio Members

Bob Scott  
Hal Bergsma  
Keith Hobson

##### THPRD Staff

Doug Menke  
Bob Wayt  
Bruce Barbarasch  
Gery Keck  
Cathi Ellis  
Nicole Paulsen

#### Absent:

##### Committee Members

Rob Massar  
Dan Plaza  
Barbara Wilson

#### Agenda Item #1 – Opening Comments

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m., thanked Committee members for attending, and gave an overview of the evening's session.

#### Agenda Item #2 – Self-Introductions

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked members to introduce themselves and provide their background as it pertains to the Bond Oversight Committee/Park District.
- **Fred Meyer:** Corporate transportation; current member of THPRD Budget and SDC Task Force Committees.
  - **Marc San Soucie:** Beaverton City Council member.
  - **Deanna Mueller-Crispin:** Former Manager of Environmental Programs for State Agencies; Past member of THPRD Board of Directors, past Budget and Park Foundation Committee member.
  - **Wendy Kroger:** THPRD Trails Advisory Committee member.
  - **Stephen Pearson:** Portland Parks & Recreation Capital Budget member.
  - **Jack Platten:** Former Beaverton Planning Commission member and an attorney.

- **Anthony Mills:** Associate Director, Tualatin Soil & Water Conservation District.
- **Paul Waldram:** CPA for Moss Adams LLP; Trustee for Tualatin Hills Park Foundation.
- **Wink Brooks:** Former Planning Director for City of Hillsboro.

#### **Agenda Item #3 – Approve Minutes of April 29, 2010**

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, moved the Bond Oversight Committee to approve consent Agenda Item #3, Minutes of April 29, 2010.
  - ***Anthony Mills noted that the minutes were from the third Bond Oversight Committee Meeting, not the second meeting as noted.***  
*Recording Secretary, Cathi Ellis, made note.*
  - ***Wendy Kroger noticed a typo in the word ‘accrued’ on page #6.***  
*Recording Secretary, Cathi Ellis, made note.*
  - Stephen Pearson and Wendy Kroger both seconded Marc’s motion to approve.
  - Committee members Wink Brooks and Deanna Mueller-Crispin choose to abstain, as they did not attend the previous meeting.

#### **Agenda Item #4 – Review Staff Responses to Committee Questions**

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked Wendy Kroger and Stephen Pearson to review how and why these questions were submitted to THPRD staff.
  - ***Wendy Kroger shared that while she and Stephen were reviewing material to include in the Bond Oversight Committee’s (BOC) 1<sup>st</sup> annual report to the THPRD Board of Directors (BOD), some questions came up that they could not answer through the provided past documents or meeting minutes.***
  - ***Stephen Pearson added that some questions were also generated from the last BOC meeting, as well as general questions from newer members who were not present in past meetings.***
  - Doug Menke, General Manager, asked the Committee members to review each question, and to make sure all members were satisfied with THPRD’s provided answers.
- B. Keith Hobson, Director of Business and Facilities, started with question #1:
  1. **What is THPRD’s response to the Auditor’s Internal Controls Report made as part of the Comprehensive Audit for the year ended June 30, 2009, as specifically related to Bond projects?**
    - Keith reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
      - ***Wendy Kroger asked whether THPRD management reviews these types of reports before they are presented to the BOD, and is this the same procedure for all Bond reports as well?***  
*Keith answered: Yes, THPRD management reviews all documents and reports before they are presented to the BOD. It is the same for any matters pertaining to the Bond.*
      - ***Wendy Kroger asked if an inventory of THPRD assets at the individual centers is being taken?***  
*Keith answered: A procedure is being put into place, and will be applied yearly.*
  2. **What is THPRD’s approach to leveraging Metro, Trust for Public Lands, and other funds to assist with purchase of land and land rights? What is the track record of your chosen approach?**
    - Hal, Director of Planning, reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
      - ***Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked if THPRD plans to apply for any of TIGER grants?***

*Hal answered: Yes, THPRD does apply for grants when relevant. The last TIGER grant application was collaborative with the Cities of Beaverton and Durham. It was not selected, but THPRD intends to apply for future grants.*

3. **Project numbers, names, and categories seem to be fluid and not altogether consistent. Would it be possible to get a definitive project list with beginning budget, scope, and time estimates along with the latest update by project? (See #15 below for specific examples.)**
  - Keith reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
  - Keith acknowledged that past reports and time charts did have some inconsistencies with project names, numbers and budget dollars. This was attributed to different departments (Natural Resource, Planning & Development, Maintenance, and Accounting) each using their own system to keep track of their specific projects. A standard reporting system is being put in place from here on out across all departments to help resolve this problem.
  - *Deanna Mueller-Crispin asked if the Committee could be provided with a chart of cumulative expenditures to date for each of the Bond projects?*

*Keith answered: Yes this was possible and that staff would start working on getting the information pulled together.*
  - *Jack Platten asked if in addition, staff could provide a list of promises to voters that were made when levying the Bond, and where to date the District is in meeting those promises.*

*Doug answered: The brochures and pamphlets that went out to voters to advertise for the 2008 Bond spelled out by site what each of the projects would be. The Bond web page shows timelines of when planning for each project is expected to start and finish.*
4. **How does the District plan to achieve and report geographical distribution of improvement projects throughout the District? What performance measure do you recommend for tracking progress?**
  - Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
  - Hal asked Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources & Trails Management, if the list of soft surface trails has been broken down per quadrant.

*Bruce answered: A list has been started, but not all trail sites have been identified yet.*
  - *Chair, Marc San Soucie, felt the quadrant breakdown report would be very useful to the Committee once it is ready.*
5. **What are the results to date using the Bond Implementation Communications Plan to adequately inform the BOD/public in a timely fashion regarding Bond Measure activities and projects? Please include information on hits on your website.**
  - Bob Wayt, Director of Communications, reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
6. **THPRD adopted a streamlined project design review process for the bond projects. What role does THPRD believe its advisory committees have in this process? How is the District ensuring that bond measure acquisitions and projects meet the public's desires and expectations?**
  - Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
  - *Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked if the BOC would get a separate update when land is acquired using Bond funds?*

*Doug answered: THPRD will send out an e-mail to BOC members at the same time the press release goes to the public.*

- ***Stephen Pearson asked if there is an advisory committee for land acquisition.***

*Hal answered: Due to the confidentiality needed for proper negotiations no advisory committee for land acquisition exists, but the BOD is kept informed of all potential priorities, and guides District staff's decisions.*

**7. Review of the project schedule shows a significant number of projects going through the same phase at the same or similar time. What is THPRD doing to assure quality as well as timeliness?**

- Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.

- ***Chair, Marc San Soucie, echoed that the additional hiring of three park planners and one office tech has assured that all projects are getting the attention they deserve in order to make them successful.***

*Doug shared that a professional consultant was hired to create the project timeline and determine the amount of staff needed to successfully complete the Bond projects.*

- ***Stephen Pearson voiced concern that so many projects were going through the design and development stage at the same time, noting that mistakes to plans are easy to make and result in a lot of change orders down the road.***

*Hal answered: THPRD has different consultants working on each project. No consulting firm is over booked. The consultants were all pre-approved as reputable and competent before the Bond projects began. THPRD project managers have their specific projects staggered to ensure they can monitor their consultants and projects properly.*

**8. Please help us develop numerical values for these statements, and check them for accuracy as appropriate.**

- Keith reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.

- ***Wendy Kroger noticed that the first report started more than a year ago. Are the seventeen projects quoted in the memo's answer the only seventeen currently in motion?***

*Gery Keck, Bond Planning Manager, answered that Planning & Development currently has 24 projects active. The timeline included in tonight's materials compared the original schedule of 17 projects kicking off in the first year to the "on hold and moved up" projects that have flexed over the past year. This brings the number up to 24. Although 17 initially started, 24 are currently underway and the newest timeline dated June 16, 2010 reflects this.*

*Bruce Barbarasch, Superintendent of Natural Resources & Trails Management, asked Wendy to clarify what her idea of a project "starting" was to ensure staff is using the same definition when answering.*

- ***Wendy Kroger replied that once money was being charged to the projects budget (i.e., staff time, consultant contract, etc.) it is considered underway if only in the planning stages.***
- ***Chair, Marc San Soucie, felt that the per quadrant breakdown of expenditures on all projects as requested by Deanna Mueller-Crispin would be a good document to reflect the answer to this question.***

**9. In December 2009, Metro was determining the capacity for additional development within the regional growth boundary. In conjunction with that process, Washington County and the City of Beaverton were assessing urban development and redevelopment**

**opportunities within their jurisdictions, including the District's service area. What are the ramifications of their findings for Bond Measure projects?**

- Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
- ***Jack Platten asked what the legal restrictions are to buying property outside the District's boundaries, and did the verbiage in the Bond materials sent to voters claim we would only acquire land in-District?***

*Hal answered: There are no legal restrictions to buying property with bond dollars outside of the District's boundaries, and materials to voters did not specify that land acquisition would only happen within THPRD.*

*Doug added that THPRD would double check with their attorney, but that they are sure of their ability to purchase land even if it is not in-District.*
- ***Wink Brooks asked: If property is purchased by the District using bond dollars, would it automatically become "in-District" or would it remain outside the boundaries even though THPRD retains ownership?***

*Hal answered: Under Washington County Ordinance 624, THPRD can extend its border only as far as the Urban Growth Boundary. They can purchase land anywhere, but only properties lying within the ultimate service area of the Urban Growth Boundary can be considered in-District. Hal also added that the future North Bethany Planning Area would be considered in-District once it is established.*

*Doug gave the example of a potential property the District may purchase for mitigation purposes. It lies significantly outside THPRD boundaries and would not be considered in-District even though it would be owned by THPRD.*

*Hal shared at this time, a comment that had been forwarded from Committee member, Barbara Wilson, who was not able to attend tonight's meeting.*
- ***Is the District currently pursuing acquisitions outside their boundaries?***

*Hal answers yes. However, with the exceptions of Doug's aforementioned mitigation property, and some potential extensions of THPRD parks that are already straddling the District boundary line, all other properties that are being pursued are still within the ultimate service boundary and would all qualify for annexation if they were purchased.*

**10. The District has reported that it has a Sustainability Program, as well as ADA access, prioritization and sustainability criteria to determine which facilities/structures would be upgraded or expanded and what deferred maintenance would be completed with Bond Measure funds. Please describe how these various models, programs, standards, criteria and policies are working together to support Bond Measure projects.**

- Keith reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.

**11. THPRD has adopted a Wetland Mitigation Strategy, which includes purchasing acres of wetland outside the current District boundary. What is the status of this purchase? What steps are in place to assure that, as capital projects are planned, the cost of wetland mitigation attributable to this land acquisition cost will be charged to each project and the funds credited back to the natural areas land acquisition account? What basis do you recommend for the charge back?**

- Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.

12. **Structural Upgrade Projects included the evaluation of 16 buildings and facilities. Of those, 15 facilities were included in subsequent recommendations and reports. The Nature Park Interpretive Center was not. Why not?**
- Keith reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
13. **Cedar Hills Community Park was one of the first planned projects to get started. However, by the last of 2009, the project had been placed on hold. What happened? What is the current status?**
- Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
14. **Please check the following statement for accuracy and update as appropriate. “There are 11 play equipment replacement projects. Vendors have been selected after public input on style. Seven play equipment projects have been completed with an average savings of approximately \$7,000-\$8,000 per project. Two projects are currently underway, Summercrest Park and Harman Swim Center Park, and the remaining two, Lost Park and Waterhouse Park, will be completed by Fall 2010.”**
- Hal reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.
15. **Problems of consistency and transparency make it difficult to track specific projects on the schedules and reports provided to the Committee. The schedules often do not indicate reporting dates. Names, item numbers, and item locations are not always consistent. Realizing refinements are being made as more current information becomes available, it still is difficult to track a specific project and determine timeline modifications and changes in dollars over time.**
- Keith reviewed the answer provided in the memo included within the BOC meeting materials packet titled Staff Response to Committee Questions.

#### **Agenda Item #5 – Review Bond Oversight Committee Draft of Annual Report**

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked Committee members for comments on the draft annual report, and also began a discussion on how to format the report for its presentation to the BOD.
- *Marc asked if the Committee wanted to meet in person to ratify the final report before it is presented.*
  - *Wink Brooks suggested the final report be shared and reviewed over e-mail.*
  - *Jack Platten agreed that as long as a stalemate issue did not occur, reviewing the report electronically seems like the best option.*
  - *Deanna Mueller-Crispin also agreed and asked that all Committee members copy everyone in on all comments and questions back and forth.*
  - *Jack Platten thought that THPRD staff should be kept out of the communications until the final report is approved by all Committee members, but to allow them to review it before it goes in front of the Board. This will ensure that the report is truly Committee directed, and cannot be skewed as having been influenced by the District along the way.*
  - *Marc asked if the draft report was covering the correct material? Were the style, detail and outline beginning to look like Committee members envisioned it? Does it cover a Committee consensus?*
  - *Jack Platten felt the amount of detail in the draft was well organized. However, the question came up: What audiences was this meant for? For a technical audience it is*

*great, for a broader audience it may need to be streamlined or a summary should accompany it.*

- *Stephen Pearson felt that the general public paying for the bond in their taxes should be the target audience. He liked Jack's idea of a summary.*
- *Wendy Kroger asked the Committee if they felt enough content was included in the draft?*
- *The consensus was yes.*
- *Wendy Kroger asked staff: What did the bond literature to the public actually promise?*  
*Doug answered that THPRD had a task force of public citizens who guided THPRD as they researched which projects to include. The information that was advertised and officially voted on spelled out specific projects in specific areas.*
- *Wink Brooks felt the report should include the history of how the projects were picked.*
- *Paul Waldram agreed with this.*
- *Wendy Kroger also liked the idea and felt the report should include the fact that a task force made up of the public was involved.*
- *Deanna Mueller-Crispin asked if the bond measure required THPRD to complete specific projects outlined, or if there was availability to do projects that were not advertised?*
- *Marc followed up that question with a request to remind the Committee what campaign advertisement materials went to the public, and what projects were politically and morally promised to voters?*  
*Doug directed Committee members to review the first BOC meeting's section in their binder, and part of the review documents provided was a fold out of the District map on one side, and a comprehensive list of all bond projects on the other. THPRD is obligated to use bond money to complete each of these.*
- *Wink Brooks thought a copy of these materials should be included in the report.*
- *Paul Waldram liked the idea of highlighting early on in the report that the Bond Oversight Committee is charged with watching and reporting on these promised projects, not on picking the projects themselves.*
- *Jack Platten gave the suggestion that the words "ensure" and "authority" be removed from the draft. The BOC cannot not ensure, only recommend, and has no authority to make their recommendations stick.*
- *Anthony Mills gave the viewpoint that few readers of the report would be interested in a report that is as detailed as the draft. He likes the idea of a summary for the public.*
- *Marc felt that Metro's Bond Oversight Committee report looked good with "high level basics" even though it was 15 pages long.*
- *Wink Brooks gave the caution that the press would be viewing the report, and this should be kept in mind when drafting any report or summary.*
- *Stephen Pearson felt that regardless of a summary being written, a longer more detailed report should still be written for the sake of properly covering all matters thoroughly.*
- *Deanna Mueller-Crispin thought a smaller summary could still contain a lot of information, but not in such detail. Someone interested in more detail could review the complete report.*
- *Jack Platten cautioned that the BOC does not want to appear to be "hiding" details by offering a summary.*
- *Fred Meyer reminded the Committee that those who will take the time to seek out and review the report are either interested in what is happening in their neighborhood specifically, or will be looking for detail.*
- *Wendy Kroger felt that with careful editing and formatting like sidebars or headlines, a report could be detailed, but easily navigated and skimmed if readers want only a summary.*

- *Paul Waldram echoed this idea.*  
Doug asked Bob Scott for his thoughts as a Board member.
- *Ex-officio Bob Scott felt torn. As a Board member, he wants a full report. As a member of the community, he feels it would be better to have a summary for the average person.*
- *Marc felt a BOC member who was not on the subcommittee who developed the draft should do the editing and prepare the executive summary if there is to be one. A fresh pair of eyes may be needed in order to ensure a good report.*
- *Anthony Mills added that if the Committee decided to go in the direction of a summary, it should choose to highlight what is important. He referred to the comment about the press being an audience, noting a highlighted summary is an opportunity to set a positive tone.*
- *Jack Platten offered to edit and draft a summary based off the final report. Deanna Mueller-Crispin offered to help with editing.*
- *Deanna Mueller-Crispin asked if the draft report could be passed around electronically with the track changes feature on. This way members can see each other's changes and comments.*
- *Marc agreed that this was a good idea.*
- *Deanna Mueller-Crispin also gave the suggestion of changing verbiage in the draft report form "concerns" to "recommendations".*
- *Marc thought "questions for the future" could also be substituted.*
- *Marc took a vote to table the discussion of the official report being detailed vs. a summary for tonight due to time constraints. He offered to start an e-mail conversation between members to nail down how the group wants to present the info.*
- *Group consensus: Yes.*
- *Marc reviewed with staff that questions three and fifteen would be reevaluated by staff again, and that new timelines and a spreadsheet of funds spent on every project to date would be provided to the Committee.*  
Keith asked for clarification of what "the most recent" information should be.
- *Marc replied that the most recent reports that have been generated are fine.*

#### **Agenda Item #6 – Review Staff Updates on Meeting Performance Measures**

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked the Committee and staff if Agenda Item #6 could be tabled due to time constraints.
- *Group consensus: Yes.*

#### **Agenda Item #7 – Committee Discussion of Process for Doing Subsequent Work**

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, asked the Committee to turn their attention toward the discussion of subcommittee's within the BOC. Does the Committee wish to form subcommittees as specific areas of interest come up? This may allow for more in-depth details to report on.
- *Fred Meyer reminded the group that the BOC agreed to stay at a 30,000 ft level with reporting.*
- *Jack Platten is concerned that multiple subcommittees may have a hard time streamlining their reporting and meetings to function the same.*
- *Paul Waldram likes the idea of having subcommittees or task forces, but that they should only be formed when needed and not as a preset function of the BOC.*
- *Wink Brooks agreed with Paul and thought staff did an excellent job of bringing forth detailed information. If a topic comes up and the group decides they want to explore it deeper, subcommittees may be appropriate to form at that time.*
- *Wendy Kroger thought that meeting more regularly throughout the year may help the BOC feel more informed and up-to-date. Wendy suggested quarterly meetings.*



*Keith asked the Committee to give specific questions or subjects they would like more detail on, and staff is happy to draft performance reports that would give more in-depth feedback for that specific topic.*

- *Jack Platten brought up the question again: Did the Committee agree to finalize the annual report through e-mail correspondence, or does another meeting need to be set?*
- *Anthony Mills thought that the majority of the group supported electronically reviewing and approving the report.*
- *Jack Platten reminded the BOC that these e-mail correspondences would be considered public record and that one central person within the Committee should always be copied in order to keep the communications legally binding.*

#### **Agenda Item #8 – Next Meeting Date**

- A. Chair, Marc San Soucie, suggested October for the next meeting in order to keep with the quarterly schedule.
  - *Anthony Mills asked the Committee if Mondays would work as a better meeting day. Doug shared that THPRD has both their regular Board of Director and Budget Committee meetings on Mondays.*
  - *Anthony agreed with keeping the meetings on Thursdays.*
  - *Chair, Marc San Soucie, tentatively scheduled the next meeting for Thursday, October 28.*

#### **Agenda Item #9 - Adjourn**

- A. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Recording Secretary,  
Cathi Ellis