

# TUALATIN HILLS PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT



*Serving Beaverton and the west side since 1955.*

## Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the Elsie Stuhr Center, Manzanita Room, 5550 SW Hall Boulevard, Beaverton, on Monday, April 7, 2008. Executive Session 6:00 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

### Present:

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

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

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

- 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.

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

Secretary, Larry Pelatt, noted that representatives of the news media and designated staff may attend the Executive Session. 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, Joe Blowers, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

### **Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session**

**John Griffiths moved the Board of Directors approve the purchase of property in the northeast quadrant of the Park District and authorize the General Manager or his designee to enter into a sales agreement. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

## **Agenda Item #4 – Presentations**

### **A. Washington County Project Homeless Connect**

Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports, introduced Kim Krohn, of Good Neighbor Center, to recognize the Park District for its role in the 2008 Washington County Project Homeless Connect event. The event was held in the Athletic Center on Wednesday, January 30, 2008, as part of National Homeless Awareness Week. Kim thanked the Park District for its participation in this event, which included various Washington County social services agencies and corporate sponsors providing free services and service access assistance to the area homeless.

Bob Scott asked what is being planned for next year's Washington County Project Homeless Connect event.

- ✓ Kim replied that they are in the process of determining the location of next year's event and could possibly request the use of the Athletic Center again, noting that Park District staff were a pleasure to work with.

### **B. Trails Advisory Committee**

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, introduced Wendy Kroger, Trails Advisory Committee Chair, to provide the Advisory Committee's annual presentation to the Board of Directors.

Wendy provided a detailed overview of a handout titled *Trails Advisory Committee 2008 Annual Report*. Wendy described the need to convey the importance of multidimensional transportation systems, which includes regional trails, to the engineers designing area roads, as well as the issue of trail users being forced to cross major intersections. She shared information from two studies, one regarding intersection improvements along the Springwater Trail and the other regarding improving pedestrian safety at unsignalized crossings. In addition, Wendy provided a brief overview of a map outlining the Park District's completed trail segments and offered to answer any questions the Board may have. A copy of the handout was entered into the record.

President, Joe Blowers, asked if Washington County includes a discussion about trail crossings of major intersections in their 2008 Washington County Transportation Work Plan, would that discussion come too late for the Westside Trail crossing at Farmington Road?

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed this, noting that Washington County Transportation would still need to consider policy adjustments that would impact future plans and would enable the Park District to revisit the issue with the County at such times that road improvements trigger a review of the area. He noted that Wendy and Park District staff have met with Washington County Transportation staff and that it has been helpful to have Wendy's involvement as she assists in conveying that this is not an issue only staff is interested in, but that County residents are concerned as well.
- ✓ Wendy noted that there are many other roads that this would be a future concern, too.

President, Joe Blowers, thanked Wendy on behalf of the Board of Directors for the informative presentation.

### **C. Affiliated Groups – Lacrosse**

Scott Brucker, Superintendent of Sports, introduced Alan Hodgson, Unified Fields Steering Committee Youth Lacrosse representative, to provide a presentation to the Board of Directors regarding the local affiliated youth lacrosse association, Beaverton Youth Lacrosse.

Alan Hodgson provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation regarding Beaverton Youth Lacrosse and offered to answer any questions the Board of Directors may have. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was entered into the record.

- ✓ Hearing no questions, President, Joe Blowers, thanked Alan on behalf of the Board of Directors for the informative presentation.

### **Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time**

Doug Bergmann, 11835 NW South Drive, Portland, is before the Board of Directors this evening in support of the Park District acquiring a 2-acre parcel of property adjacent to the Beaverton School District's new Bonny Slope Elementary School site. He expressed the neighborhood effort that has taken place to persuade the Beaverton School District to transfer the property to the Park District and described the benefit the property would have to the surrounding neighborhood if it were acquired by the Park District, noting that the area needs additional parks and that the site could include a trail providing access to the new school.

### **Agenda Item #6 – Consent Agenda**

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of March 3, 2008 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, (D) Aquatics Advisory Committee Members, (E) Resolution Authorizing Creation of Park District Audit Committee, (F) Westside Trail Bid & Construction Funding for ODOT Bid Let, (G) Spyglass Pond Enhancement Project Easement, (H) Elizabeth Meadows Park Sanitary Sewer Upgrade Project Easement, (I) PCC Rock Creek Recreation Facility Project Request for Additional Consulting Funds, (J) Proclamation of National Aquatic Month, and (K) Proclamation of Bike Month. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

<b>John Griffiths</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bob Scott</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Larry Pelatt</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Bill Kanable</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Joe Blowers</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

### **Agenda Item #7 – Unfinished Business**

#### **A. Future Funding Measure Recommendation**

Doug Menke, General Manager, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that to date, a number of important steps have been taken in researching the feasibility of, and seeking public input regarding, a future funding measure for the Park District. Following the completion of an initial public outreach process approved by the Board, staff is returning to request consensus to undertake the necessary steps to submit a capital bond measure proposal to Park District voters in the November 2008 General Election, and authorization to continue the public outreach process using the proposed bond package as discussed this evening. Staff will return to the Board of Directors at a later date with a recommendation and request to adopt a final bond project package and levy amount.

Doug noted that this evening's discussion will focus on the opportunity for the Park District to continue forward in taking the steps necessary to move to a new level for the future. The Board of Directors has adopted the planning tools necessary to provide the foundation and guidance for this decision making process through the Long-term Financial Plan and Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Board asked staff to begin to lay the groundwork in fact finding and information gathering by endorsing the Park District's partnership with The Trust for Public Land (TPL), as well as convening a task force of Park District residents to make a recommendation to the Board as to a future funding measure, which is included within the Board of Directors information packet. Lastly, the Board agreed to have staff implement community outreach, including open houses, and provide web and facility based surveys to learn what Park District residents, including park, facility, and program users, feel is important, and that input has been provided.

Doug noted that once the Bond Measure Conceptual Package is reviewed by the Board of Directors this evening, and if the determination is made to move forward with the action requested, three more open houses would be held in late April/early May, in addition to a secondary survey with the assistance of TPL, to occur in late May. This survey would be considered a tracking survey with the intent of confirming the findings from the survey conducted in January. In addition, staff would continue to fine-tune the Conceptual Package, identifying specific projects and sites where appropriate, as well as finalizing component costs and the total bond package cost. A final recommended package and bond measure amount would be brought back to the Board of Directors for consideration in June. He noted that, as the Board of Directors is well aware, the Park District is nearing a decision making time that would match other like crossroads the Park District has faced in the past. It is an exciting time, but one that also must be contemplated with great thought and open minded consideration.

Doug introduced Spence Benfield, Chair of the Bond Measure Task Force, to provide comments on behalf of the Task Force.

- ✓ Spence stated that working with the Bond Measure Task Force has been a gratifying experience and that this particular Task Force was stellar in its engagement and discussion of the topic at hand. The Task Force represented a wide variety of interests and had a diverse membership, including high school students, as well as Board members. The Task Force is proud of its recommendation and is happy to present it to the Board for consideration. The Task Force considered all of the public input received, as well as the survey results, in developing its recommendation, in addition to attending the open houses and taking into account the interest group efforts that came forward, including the expansion of the Stuhr Center Fitness Room and the Aloha neighborhood's desire for more sports fields. In addition, the Task Force took into consideration the need to make a balanced recommendation. Spence described an exercise the Task Force engaged in during one of their meetings that assisted in developing the recommendation being presented this evening, noting that it was a highlight of the Task Force's experience. At their final meeting, the Task Force discussed the results of the exercise and took into consideration additional staff recommendations and adopted what the Board has before them this evening for consideration. Spence noted that the Task Force did discuss the proposed multigenerational, recreation/aquatic center, but did not include it; not because the Task Force did not feel that it met needs in the Comprehensive Plan, but because the Task Force felt that the cost of such a facility was too large to add to that of which the Task Force had already chosen. Spence thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve on the Task Force, noting that it was a rewarding experience.

Doug introduced Josh Alpert, Northwest Conservation Services Director for TPL, to comment on the survey results presented to the Board of Directors at the February 4, 2008 Regular Board meeting, as well as TPL's continuing efforts regarding a Park District funding measure.

- ✓ Josh commended the Bond Measure Task Force for its efforts, noting that it has been a remarkable process. He stated that the exercise conducted by the Task Force was very innovative and that he has described it to other communities for their potential use as well. In addition, Park District staff has been very helpful in the process thus far. He provided a brief overview of the survey results presented in February, noting that he believes that the Task Force recommendation is inline with those results, as well as the Park District's Comprehensive Plan. He noted that TPL is interested in conducting a secondary survey for tracking purposes and to define some of the nuances from the initial survey, as well as to determine how the economy may impact support levels. He stated that other surveys that have been coming back from different areas around the country have not yet shown any repercussions regarding the recent news on the economy, which is not to say that it will not happen eventually. However, at this point, the opinion is that the proposed record turnout forecasted for November 2008 may offset some of the negative economic news. He described the uncertainty of the current environment, but noted that the measures TPL has worked on over the past ten years have weathered economic hardships and that TPL is comfortable that this particular issue is one that seems to weather such times. He stressed that TPL is aware of the economic news and is taking steps to minimize the risks and at this point is still recommending that November 2008 is the right time for the Park District to move forward. He is currently working with the pollsters to develop questions to pinpoint areas within the economy that will be telltale signs in order to provide an even more accurate forecast for November.

Doug thanked the Bond Measure Task Force and TPL for their efforts and support, noting that both groups have been a tremendous help as the Park District has moved through this process.

Larry Pelatt asked, given the uncertainty of the economy, would it be beneficial for the Park District to conduct another survey in August in addition to the secondary survey anticipated for late May?

- ✓ Josh confirmed this, noting that he anticipates conducting the secondary survey in late May in order to give the Board of Directors enough time to make whatever changes necessary to meet the timeline to place the measure on the ballot. Once the campaign efforts begin, funds for a third tracking survey would be included within the fundraising efforts. At that point, the measure would be on the ballot, but the information from the third survey would help shape the campaign.

Larry asked what the deadline is for the measure to be submitted.

- ✓ Doug replied that he believes the deadline is early September, but that there is a great deal of legal work that must be done prior to the submittal.

Larry suggested that if the legal work was complete and the measure was ready to be submitted, but the tracking survey in August shows that the economy has worsened to the point of the measure being in jeopardy, the Park District would be able to pull the measure to avoid a loss.

- ✓ Doug replied that one of the challenges is that in order to package and present the informational campaign, a decision would be needed from the Board by early July. TPL would need time for their political campaign efforts as well.

Larry stated that he is not suggesting that the Park District wait until then to begin those efforts; only that in a worst-case scenario the measure could still be pulled off the ballot.

- ✓ Josh noted that the advantage of doing a tracking survey is that it is considerably less expensive than the initial survey, which provides the option of doing more than one over the course of the summer.

Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that included within the Board of Directors information packet is the Bond Measure Conceptual Package provided using two different formats. The first format notes the project type with example sites, while the second format notes the project type and the corresponding need being addressed by the project based on the Comprehensive Plan. An important feature of the Conceptual Package is that some proposed projects are site specific, such as the Stuhr Center Fitness Room Expansion, which is a staff recommendation, while other sites are listed as examples only.

Doug provided a detailed overview of the Bond Measure Conceptual Base Package, which is the package that the Bond Measure Task Force approved for the Board's consideration. An Expanded Package is also included for the Board's consideration should the tracking survey results continue to show strong support as the first survey did. The Expanded Package consists of staff recommendations only as the Task Force did not come to a conclusion on the Expanded Package components.

Doug provided a detailed overview of the Bond Measure Conceptual Expanded Package, which includes three key component areas, including the development of a new recreation/aquatic center. Staff is recommending partial funding of a new center via the bond measure in the amount of \$30 million. The remainder of the funding for the project could be secured through a variety of methods, including sponsorships, naming rights, advance System Development Charge funding, partnerships, and phased construction. The total project cost is currently estimated between \$42 and \$47 million for a 80,000 square foot facility, which is almost twice the size of the Park District's Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center. In addition to the new center, additional funding for natural resources preservation and active use land acquisition is proposed.

In addition, Doug provided an overview of the Base and Expanded Packages via pie charts, which breaks out the information into allocated project categories and enables a different view of the overall balance of the project areas.

Doug noted that in closing, the Board has been provided with the results of the public comment, Task Force and staff recommendations, and the observations from TPL. The Park District's public, the Task Force, and TPL are to be commended for their thoughtful and reasoned consideration of the information presented this evening. Staff feels that with the input received to date from these sources, the Board has a good foundation upon which to continue discussions.

President, Joe Blowers, opened the floor for Board of Directors discussion.

John Griffiths asked how the proposed new recreation/aquatic center is aligned against the magnitude of support for the highest ranked items in the survey.

- ✓ Doug replied that the Task Force had discussed the recreation/aquatic center and that the point was made that the tool of the bond measure provides a unique opportunity to pursue large and expensive projects that may have no other way of being funded. There was a

component within the survey where the recreation/aquatic center was specifically named and scored a support level of approximately 35%. However, when considered under the category of fulfilling recreation opportunities, it scored a support level of 52%. There has been much discussion about it and TPL's experience is an 80% success rate when they confirm that there is a quality package.

- ✓ Josh agreed, noting that it is a challenging part of the process and after having significant discussions with the pollster, he also felt comfortable that having the recreation/aquatic center in the package would neither help nor hurt the chances of the measure's passage.

John asked for confirmation that Doug was referring to the survey question regarding the "multi-use aquatic and recreation center" that scored at 31% for the extremely important and very important designations combined.

- ✓ Doug confirmed this, noting that in the communication process with the public, there will be a transition from more technical planning terms to expressing what needs are being fulfilled. He described how the category of building a "multi-use aquatic and recreation center" would also fit within the category of "providing facilities for more youth and adult recreational programs", which scored at 52% for the extremely important and very important designations combined.
- ✓ Larry expressed the need to discontinue using the term "recreation/aquatic center" as it implies a center such as Conestoga Recreation & Aquatic Center, while the new center would incorporate facilities for all ages and provide greater opportunities for the public.

John asked whether consideration has been given to expanding existing centers with the funding that would be required to construct a new center.

- ✓ Doug replied that although it would be worth a discussion, one of the challenges is that there are areas within the Park District that are deficient of that type of service and while expanding an existing center would enable greater capacity, it would not resolve the issue of lacking a center in a particular area.

John theorized whether the Park District providing a "gold standard" center in a particular area would imply a policy commitment by the Park District that ultimately all of the centers would be brought up to that standard or result in a disparity.

- ✓ Bill Kanable replied that he is not sure that would qualify as a policy decision, but is more of a matter of what is available at the time. He noted that the Park District constructed Conestoga based on the funding available at that time.
- ✓ Larry commented that the Park District did not build Garden Home or Cedar Hills Recreation Centers, but purchased old schools.

John noted that he is asking the question because design and technology expertise has advanced greatly since the last centers were built and much more can be realized out of such designs today. He wonders to what extent the Park District would be thinking about trying to spread the wealth relative to center quality in that a resident living near Conestoga is going to have access to a different level of experience than a resident living near Garden Home.

- ✓ Doug noted that the Comprehensive Plan leads the Park District in both directions on that topic in that it identifies the deficient areas and need for multi-use, multi-generational facilities when the Park District is constructing new centers, but it also provides the opportunity of reexamining existing assets. He stated that he believes that is part of the balance included within the Base Package in that there is some opportunity for expansion where capacity exists, such as the Stuhr Center Fitness Room.

Bob Scott expressed concern with the increased amount of the bond package when including a recreation/aquatic center, noting that such a large portion of the total package would be going to one center in one area of the Park District. In addition, he is concerned with only partially funding the center and questions what message the Park District would be sending if the center is not fully funded within the bond measure because it would too greatly increase the amount of the overall package.

President, Joe Blowers, asked for clarification regarding Josh's discussion with the pollster regarding how a recreation/aquatic center may affect support for the overall measure.

- ✓ Josh replied that the sentiment was that having a center as part of the package would neither help nor hurt the overall success of the measure, even though the center will be in one area of the Park District.

Bill noted that Conestoga was funded via a bond measure and is located in one area of the Park District. He noted that whenever the Park District is discussing providing needed facilities, there would always be some level of competition between the quadrants for the asset. He expressed the importance of allocating bond measure funds over a large scale of the Park District so that it is a District-wide improvement process and that all residents would see an impact.

- ✓ Josh noted that one benefit of identifying a quadrant for the new center is that it would relieve pressure at other existing centers, so that even though residents in the other quadrants may not have the direct benefit of the new center, they would still see an impact via increased capacity.

Larry expressed agreement with Josh's comment; however, he is very hesitant regarding the fact that the center would not be fully funded via the bond measure. He described the questions that may arise from the public regarding where the balance of the funding would come from and what would be done with the \$30 million if the balance of funding could not be secured.

- ✓ Joe noted that he believes the situation could be packaged in a more positive light, such as noting that the Park District has banked the land for the center, that it is a phased development, and/or other funds would be leveraged.

Larry replied that it still would not be a definite situation and he believes the support level for the overall measure would be hurt by this.

Bill asked for confirmation that the Board agrees that the Base Package is acceptable and reasonable, and that the point of contention is regarding the recreation/aquatic center.

- ✓ Bob and Larry agreed.

Bill noted that there will be further discussion on the recreation/aquatic center, as the secondary survey still needs to be conducted. If the Board is accepting of the Base Package, then further discussion would need to occur prior to acceptance of the Expanded Package.

- ✓ Josh agreed with Bill's comments, noting that in the secondary survey a question can be included regarding partial funding of a center, which may provide some clarification.

Bob asked if more pointed questions could also be asked regarding the public support level for a new center to fine-tune that information because he is not feeling that Park District residents are currently telling him that they definitely want a new center.

- ✓ Joe noted that even if 10% of the Park District's voters used the new center, although that number would result in a well-used center, it is not a great enough number for an overwhelming impact to the bond measure's passage.
- ✓ Larry noted that most of the Park District's facilities are like that in one way or another.



- ✓ Doug noted that the secondary survey would be helpful in the discussion of the new recreation/aquatic center. He noted that the survey results regarding that particular item may be more related to the economy or the actual tone of the voters in what interests them, or a combination of the two. Doug stated that he is emphatic that the bond package the Park District does pursue needs to be a win, even if it does not include funding for a recreation/aquatic center, noting that the Park District should allow some of the more scientific tools to help drive that decision.

Joe questioned whether there has been enough focus on the items that received the greatest amount of public support in the survey. He acknowledged that although the Park District may be able to acquire more natural area space per dollar than other items, a dollar-for-dollar comparison should not be the sole focus when considering items such as purchasing buildable land for fields versus wetland acreage. Nevertheless, the current total for trails and natural area acquisition is only approximately \$10-12 million and those items are the top six rated in the survey. He asked whether a question could be added in the secondary survey to see if that funding level is enough.

- ✓ Bill expressed the need to be able to communicate a wide range of bond measure projects across the Park District, especially if \$30 million is focused on a new center.

Joe expressed agreement with Bill's comments, noting that he believes that the Base Package, without the recreation/aquatic center component, would succeed as-is because it is spread broadly. In his opinion, adding the center to the bond package would be a matter of not being able to fund it any other way.

- ✓ Josh noted that the package itself could be tested in the next survey.

John stated that the Park District does not attempt funding measures very often and currently has favorable survey results. He understands the other Board members' positions on the recreation/aquatic center; however, he also believes that the bond measure amount could be increased from what is being proposed, as the initial survey showed support for a \$100 million bond measure amount. At that level, the recreation/aquatic center could be fully funded, as well as additional funds being allocated toward the items that tested highly.

- ✓ Josh commented that, from his vantage point, if the economy does continue to descend, because the Park District tested so well at such a high amount initially, it provides a cushion in terms of lowering that amount. He would agree that as of today, there is still potential for a higher bond amount than the current package outlines, but this may change due to the results of the secondary survey. If the Board does deem that the center is appropriate, there is still, as of today, the extra room to fully fund it, although he believes that would present more of a challenge in terms of messaging the campaign, as it would constitute a large portion of the total bond amount. However, that just means that TPL would need to develop the right kind of messaging and incorporate that with the rest of the package that tested highly.

Larry expressed the need to determine the appropriate term for "recreation/aquatic center" prior to developing the questions for the secondary survey. He noted that the term needs to communicate that the new center is going to be much more than a swimming pool and that the Park District should not limit itself in thinking of ways the center could be named, or even what the center would consist of.

- ✓ Doug noted that perhaps TPL can tap into how other areas across the nation are describing such centers, noting that a local area agency also recently had a survey done on this topic.

John asked whether there is any information regarding other park districts trending toward smaller, more widespread facilities.

- ✓ Doug replied that there are some agencies considering building very large facilities, but it has been challenging in that such large facilities absorb a lot of resources in operations. He noted that the Park District has some significant transportation challenges, such as Highway 217 and the Sunset Highway, that can serve as roadblocks. However, there is no question that meeting the recreational needs defined within the Comprehensive Plan through multi-use, multi-generational facilities is much more efficient.

John asked for confirmation that Doug is suggesting that the trend is toward larger, multi-use facilities rather than smaller, individually dedicated facilities.

- ✓ Bill offered Garden Home Recreation Center as an example, noting that it is small and cannot handle the area's growing need. It is a matter of whether there is enough space available to build a large complex, like the HMT Recreation Complex, or only a couple of acres with just enough parking to get by, and he questions where the balance is in that approach. He expressed the need to find a balance between providing the efficiencies of a large facility with the community feel of a smaller facility, and balancing the operational needs of both approaches.

John commented that the new recreation/aquatic center would be the largest facility the Park District has ever implemented and would have a different risk profile than past projects centered around various topics such as costs, attendance, manageability, construction of the facility, and others that the Board and staff would be learning for the first time. He expressed the need to view the center as what it would be, which is either a great, multi-use center, or a challenged amenity. Another concern would be the operational costs associated with such a facility. He asked that a question be included within the secondary survey regarding the support for such a large facility being completely funded via the bond measure, as well as the support for using some of those incremental dollars to purchase more land.

- ✓ Larry cautioned the Board that land without a plan is only dirt and he believes the Park District needs to be careful of acquiring land purely for that sake, without any development plans.

Joe described some businesses that may have a wetland in the back of their property that could be incorporated into the Park District. He is not advocating that the Park District purchase such properties without a reason, but if the land accomplishes something, such as providing wildlife habitat or a trail corridor, it should be considered.

- ✓ Larry replied that this would be land with a purpose or plan. He was referring to land banking just for the sake of acquiring land.

Joe replied that the amount of funds proposed within the bond package for natural area acquisition could be doubled and that the Park District could still find land that serves a purpose.

- ✓ John noted that in his time on the Board, he cannot recall a land purchase the Park District made without a use in mind.

Larry asked for confirmation that the Park District can purchase land outside of the Ultimate Growth Boundary.

- ✓ Doug confirmed this, noting that the previous legal opinion has been reviewed by the Park District's current legal counsel.

**Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors direct the General Manager to undertake the reasonable and necessary steps to submit a capital bond measure proposal to District voters in the November 2008 general election and authorize to continue the public outreach process using the proposed bond package discussed at the April 7, 2008 Regular Board meeting with the intent to return to the Board at a later date and time to request adoption of the final bond package and levy amount. Larry Pelatt seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:**

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

**The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

**B.      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:

- Washington County Urbanization Forum
- MACC Grant Opportunity
- Energy Trust of Oregon Audit
- NRPA Environmental Summit
- Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

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

- ✓ Hearing none, President, Joe Blowers, opened the floor for Board Time.

**Agenda Item #8 – Board Time**

Bob Scott asked that suggestions be provided as to the educational sessions Board members should attend at the upcoming NRPA Environmental Summit.

- ✓ Bill Kanable noted that he would be unable to attend the NRPA Environmental Summit.

**Agenda Item #9 – Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

---

Joe Blowers, President

---

Larry Pelatt, Secretary

Recording Secretary,  
Jessica Collins