



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

A Regular Meeting of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held at the HMT Recreation Complex, Peg Ogilbee Dryland Training Center, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, on Monday, February 2, 2009. Executive Session 6:30 p.m.; Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Present:

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

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

President, 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.

President, 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, Larry Pelatt, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:15 p.m.

Agenda Item #3 – Action Resulting from Executive Session

There was no action resulting from Executive Session.

Agenda Item #4 – Presentations

A. The Trust for Public Land

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Geoff Roach, State Director for The Trust for Public Land (TPL), and Don Goldberg, Project Manager for TPL, to be recognized for TPL's assistance in the Park District's successful Parks Bond Measure 34-156, a \$100 million general obligation bond measure for the purpose of preserving natural areas and water, improving parks, and creating trails. Josh Alpert, Northwest Conservation Services

Director for TPL, was unable to attend this evening, but was also a key TPL staff person involved in the bond measure.

Doug provided a detailed overview of the key role TPL played in the success of the Park District's bond measure and thanked them for their efforts and support.

- ✓ Geoff thanked the Park District for the recognition this evening and provided a detailed overview of TPL's mission, noting that TPL's success relies on partnerships and that the Park District's bond measure is a part of TPL's ongoing commitment to the region through the Connecting Green Alliance. In addition, TPL's national reach enables it to draw information from across the country to adapt for its local initiatives. Geoff noted that a large part of the success of the bond measure was also due to the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District's reputation and unparalleled service provided to its constituency.

Agenda Item #5 – Audience Time

There was no testimony during Audience Time.

Agenda Item #6 – Board Time

Bill Kanable noted that The Trust for Public Land was mentioned often and held in high regard during the National Recreation & Park Association annual conference he attended.

Joe Blowers invited the Board of Directors and Board meeting attendees to a work party at Bauman Park on February 14, 2009 at 9:00 a.m.

Bob Scott referenced the Management Report included within the Board of Directors information packet, specifically regarding the notice of the Special Olympics cancelling their State meet at the Aquatic Center. He asked whether the cancellation would affect the Park District financially.

- ✓ Sharron Hoffmeister, Superintendent of Aquatics, replied that it would not, noting that the Aquatic Center would now be open to the general public on that day.

Bob asked for an update regarding the future plans for the Park District's RecMobile.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, confirmed that an update would be provided.

Larry Pelatt noted that although he was unable to attend the Oregon Recreation & Park Association Day at the Capitol, he heard from staff that it was a successful day with many meetings with various legislators.

Agenda Item #7 – Consent Agenda

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve Consent Agenda items (A) Minutes of January 12, 2009 Regular Meeting, (B) Monthly Bills, (C) Monthly Financial Statement, and (D) Aquatics Advisory Committee & Jenkins Estate Advisory Committee Members. Bob Scott seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Agenda Item #8 – Unfinished Business

A. Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee Members

Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the Park District received 27 applications seeking appointment to the Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee, all of which are included within the Board of Directors information packet. At the January 12, 2009 Regular Board meeting, Board members Joe Blowers and Bill Kanable agreed to serve on a screening committee to review the applications and recommend the top candidates to fill the Committee. In addition to the appointment of the Committee, Board authorization is being requested to appoint three ex-officio members to the Committee: Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, and one Board member.

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the floor to Joe Blowers and Bill Kanable to provide an overview of their review of the applications.

Joe Blowers provided an overview of the screening committee's recommendation to the Board of Directors:

- That the size of the Oversight Committee be increased to 12 members.
- That the Board of Directors appoint the following individuals to the Oversight Committee:
 - Rob Massar
 - Mark San Soucie
 - Barbara Wilson
 - Dan Plaza
 - Deanna Mueller-Crispin
 - Fred Meyer
 - Lauren Danahy
 - Spence Benfield
 - Winslow Brooks
 - Brett Hays
 - Ken Boire
 - Paul Waldram

Joe noted that there was a wealth of qualified applicants from which to choose. When reviewing the applicants, the screening committee looked for geographical representation, a breadth of experience, and different skill sets that would be beneficial to the Committee.

Larry commented that Ken Boire expressed interest in a one-year term.

- ✓ Joe replied that he believes that having twelve Committee members allows for some attrition without significantly harming the Committee.

Bill noted that the terms for the Committee are staggered one and two year terms.

- ✓ Doug confirmed this, noting that once the Board of Directors has made its Committee selections, there would need to be a designation as to which members receive one or two-year terms. He noted that the original resolution to form the Committee passed by the Board of Directors at the December 8, 2008 Regular meeting would need to be amended to account for the increase in Committee members, as well as the staggered terms, which would now include six one-year terms and six two-year terms.

Bill commented that the Board of Directors does not need to make a final determination regarding appointment of the Committee this evening as there is some time before the Committee's services will be needed.

- ✓ Doug noted that the first Committee meeting would most likely be held in the middle of March, noting that while there is no urgency, a significant orientation process would need to be started.

President, Larry Pelatt, opened the floor to comments from the Board members.

Bob Scott expressed support for the screening committee's recommendations, noting that there were many applicants with a great amount of knowledge.

John Griffiths expressed support for the screening committee's recommendations, noting that he is pleased so many community members are interested in serving on the Committee.

President, Larry Pelatt, noted that the resolution would be brought back to the Board of Directors at the March Regular Board meeting to expand the Committee to twelve, adjust the terms, and that the Committee would be formally appointed at that time as well.

Larry thanked Joe and Bill for screening the applications, noting that it is a credit to the community that so many qualified individuals wanted to be a part of the process.

Doug Menke, General Manager, stated that with Board consensus to appoint the staff mentioned earlier as ex-officio members of the Committee, in the meantime the Board can discuss which Board member should serve on the Committee as well.

- ✓ Larry noted that the Board will continue to discuss this, noting that it will be important to have Board representation on the Committee.

B. Jackie Husen Park Master Plan

Steve Gulgren, Superintendent of Planning & Development, provided a detailed overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that staff has hired 2.ink Studio as the consultant to update the 2003 Jackie Husen Park Master Plan and that a neighborhood meeting was recently held to review the updated plan and to gather public comment. Since the approval of the original master plan in 2003, the Park District finalized the Athletic Field Needs Assessment Study in 2005 and updated the Comprehensive Plan and Trails Plan in 2006. In addition, Jackie Husen Park was included as a Local Share Project for the Metro 2006 Natural Areas Bond Measure 26-80 and in early 2008 the Park District purchased a one-acre property east and adjacent to Jackie Husen Park. The enlargement of the park has allowed the Park District to reconsider the elements of the original master plan.

Steve introduced Jonathan Beaver, Principal with 2.ink Studio, who provided a detailed overview of the proposed new master plan elements, which now include a U8 practice soccer field, as well as an 18-stall on-site parking lot and 11 on-street parking spaces, via a PowerPoint presentation of the materials included within the Board of Directors information packet.

- ✓ Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that the proposed parking lot would consist of pervious material.

John Griffiths asked how large is the practice field.

- ✓ Steve replied 75' x 105'.

John asked whether that is large enough to be used for league games.

- ✓ Bill Kanable noted that traffic flow would have to be taken into consideration since using the field for games would double the parking needs for the field.
- ✓ Doug noted that from a programming perspective, the recommendation is to start with a nicely sized practice field and to see how things progress, respectful of the area and amount of activity.

Joe Blowers asked why a storm water facility is included if pervious pavement is being used.

- ✓ Jonathan replied that clarification is needed from Clean Water Services and that a storm water facility may not be required. He noted that there also may not be a requirement to do detention on the site either.

John asked whether the Park District has ever considered installation of an outdoor climbing wall in a park, noting that he has seen them in other parks and that they seem to be quite popular.

- ✓ Doug replied that past staff discussion has centered around interior climbing facilities, but that it would not surprise him if staff has had discussions about outdoor ones as well. He noted that the concept would be explored.

Bob Scott noted that the project budget was developed in 2006 and asked whether the cost overrun is due to using 2006 pricing.

- ✓ Steve replied that the project budget was assigned based on the original master plan and prior to acquisition of the additional property.

Bob noted that Jordan-Husen Park is also listed as a bond measure project and asked what portions of the proposed master plan is included within the bond measure.

- ✓ Steve replied that the bond measure funding is pertaining to the trail within Jordan Husen Park, not the master plan elements being discussed this evening.

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

Greg Cody, 13955 SW Barlow Place, Beaverton, is before the Board of Directors this evening in support of the parking lot included within the proposed master plan, noting that many of the Park District's parks lack this amenity, which forces users to find parking on the street, thereby affecting nearby residents. In addition, he asked whether a small backstop could be added to the practice field to enable it for casual baseball use.

- ✓ Steve replied that Park District staff would research the request.

Bob Scott moved the Board of Directors approve the following actions: 1. Approval of the updated Jackie Husen Park Master Plan; 2. Direction to staff to work with the consulting firm to complete construction drawings, construction cost estimates, obtain necessary permits, and release the project for construction bidding. Staff will return to the Board at a future date to seek Board approval on the construction bids. And 3. Approval to use Undesignated SDC Funds to fund the estimated project shortfall. Bill Kanable seconded the motion.

Discussion followed:

President, Larry Pelatt, asked whether the concept of adding a backstop to the practice field should be added to the motion.

- ✓ Bill Kanable replied that it should not be added, as it is the responsibility of staff to configure the field for the best use of the Park District. In addition, staff will need to take into consideration the recommendations from the other fields committees.

Roll call proceeded as follows:

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

C. FY 2009-10 Park District Goals & Objectives

Doug Menke, General Manager, noted that staff is returning to the Board of Directors this evening to request adoption of the proposed FY 2009-10 Park District Goals & Objectives, which have been updated to reflect the Board's discussion at the January 12, 2009 Regular meeting, and offered to answer any questions the Board of Directors may have.

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors adopt the FY 2009-10 Park District Goals & Objectives as presented. Joe Blowers seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

D. 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:

- John Quincy Adams Young House
- Family Assistance Program
- Budget Committee Orientation & Upcoming Budget Committee Meeting
- Legislative Update
- Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Grant
 - Larry Pelatt confirmed that he would be available to testify in favor of the Park District's project at the February 12, 2009 public hearing.

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

Joe Blowers asked whether the increase in Family Assistance Program requests is a reflection of the current economic situation or the result of increased awareness.

- ✓ Doug replied that this is unknown as there has likely been an increase in need due to the economy and there has been increased public awareness as well. Part of the balance will be managing the increase from a budget perspective and, as such, there will be a recommendation from the Family Assistance Program Task Force this spring.

Larry Pelatt asked whether the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program grant will save the Park District bond funds if successful.

- ✓ Doug replied no, that the Park District intentionally chose a project that would complement bond funds rather than replace them.

Agenda Item #9 – New Business

A. 2008 Bond Measure Outline

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, and Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, to provide an overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet.

Keith provided a detailed overview of the memo section regarding the Bond Fund Cash Flow Projections and Bond Repayment Structure, noting that in working with District Bond Counsel and Financial Advisor, two questions have surfaced needing Board input:

#1. Repayment term for bonds issued at two different times

Under the ballot language approved by voters, the Park District has up to 21 years from the date of issue to repay the bonds. With the intent to split the bond issue into two phases, the second issue will likely not occur until 2-3 years after the first bond issue, meaning that the repayment term on this issue could stretch out to 23 or 24 years from the initial issue date of the first phase. The trade-off for District voters would be a lower debt service (and corresponding tax rate) in the first two years as the debt service is paid on only part of the \$100 million of bonds. An option, however, is to structure that combined debt service of both phases of bond issues so that the combined debt service results in a level tax rate, and the combined term stays within 21 years of the date of the first issue. Staff recommends using the latter option since it better meets the intent to create a debt service structure that results in a level tax rate. The other benefit of this option is that it completes the retirement of the bonds within 21 years total and avoids any extension of the tax levy beyond that time.

#2. Lower rates vs. shorter term

At this time, interest rates on the bonds are below the rate used in the projections for election information. If this rate holds true, it would give the Park District the option of either keeping the term of the bonds and having a lower tax rate than indicated in the election materials, or shortening the repayment term of the bond, but keeping the tax rate at the amount indicated. Staff recommends keeping the term of the bond at the length indicated, 21 years, and apply any interest rate savings to reducing the property tax rate. The tax rate may still vary based on changes in the Park District's total assessed value. If the assessed value grows faster than projected, the tax rate will still decrease below the estimate, and if the assessed value grows slower than projected this will provide a cushion against higher tax rates than projected.

John Griffiths asked for staff's reasoning behind the recommendation for #2.

- ✓ Keith replied that there is a possibility that if the Park District's assessed value did not grow, tax rates could rise over what the projected amount was in the election material. By applying the interest savings to lower tax rates, the Park District would be passing through the benefit of the lower interest rates to the taxpayers and as well as leaving some cushion in case there is a period of low growth activity.

Bill Kanable asked what the dollar assessment per \$1,000 would be with the lower interest rate.

- ✓ Keith replied that the bond projections in the election materials stated \$0.37 per \$1,000 of assessed value and right now, at current interest rates, that amount would be approximately \$0.32 per \$1,000.

Larry asked what would happen if the second issue is sold at a different rate than the first.

- ✓ Keith replied that if the second issue was sold at a higher interest rate than the first, it could bump the aggregate rate up a little, although the indications are that the Park District would not intend to sell at a higher rate. But, if market conditions worsen and the Park District does not have a choice but to sell the bonds at a higher rate, applying the interest savings to the tax rate would provide some cushion in that case.

Bill commented that this is more of a political decision. He personally would prefer to pay off the bonds earlier, but the Park District needs to be careful about the message it sends in this choice.

Larry suggested that the decision be based on which method would provide the most public relations value, noting that decreasing the tax rate from \$0.37 to \$0.32 would be a strong positive message to convey to the Park District's constituents.

- ✓ John Griffiths noted that a positive public relations value could be gained from paying off the bonds early as well.

Larry replied that he believes the average person would be better able to understand a reduction in property tax rates over paying off the bonds early.

Bill commented to keep in mind the number of constituents who voted no on the bond measure and how this could be an opportunity to provide a positive adjustment to them on this issue. His personal preference is to pay off the bonds early, but if he looks at the issue from an overall aspect of reaching out to the Park District's residents, both the yes and no votes, his preference is to lower the tax rate. In addition, when considering the current economic climate, it will have an even greater impact on the residents.

Joe Blowers noted that, in his opinion, the typical voter is going to be much more influenced by seeing a savings on the next year's tax bill rather than thinking in terms of the bond being paid off in 18 years rather than 21. He noted that in 18 years, many residents are not planning on being in their current homes.

- ✓ John replied that another way to look at paying the bonds off early is that the Park District's debt structure goes down faster.

Joe agreed, noting that it influences future bond measure planning as well if the Park District has less debt; however, he believes that in this case, it is better to be able to tell the Park District's constituents that they will be asked to pay less property taxes than originally thought.

Larry commented that if he were considering such options with his own personal finances, he would want to pay off the debt earlier, but he believes a lower tax rate than expected has higher public relations value and is easier to understand.

John asked whether the savings could be split in order to offer a lower tax rate as well as shortening the life of the bonds.

- ✓ Keith replied that additional information could be brought back to the Board of Directors at the March Regular meeting.

Bill asked whether this would interfere with the timeline to issue the bonds.

- ✓ Keith confirmed that Board approval in March would provide adequate time to finalize the process, assuming that the Board agrees with the resolution being discussed during the next agenda item.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked whether it is the consensus of the Board to bring a combined repayment schedule to the Board of Directors in March for consideration.

- ✓ The Board confirmed that this is the consensus.

Keith asked whether there is any clarification needed on the recommendation for #1.

- ✓ The Board confirmed that the staff recommendation for #1 is acceptable.

Hal Bergsma, Director of Planning, provided a detailed overview of the memo section regarding the scope of issues for the Bond Oversight Committee, noting that as stated in the Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee charge, the Committee should work with Park District staff to develop performance measurement tools and reports for providing accountability and communication with Park District residents, and recommendations, if any, for improving Bond Program efficiency, administration or performance. Based on this, staff has identified a list of operational issues to seek input on from the Parks Bond Citizen Oversight Committee. These issues include:

1. What is the process for assigning interest earnings to project budgets to cover inflationary cost increases?
2. What process will be used to address budget overages on individual projects?
 - a. Use savings from other projects in the same category?
 - b. Value-engineer the project scope to reduce costs?
 - c. Use funds from another funding source such as SDC funds?
 - d. When is it appropriate to use the contingency funds?
3. If an entire category of projects is under budget, is it appropriate to use the funds to cover budget overages in a different project category?
 - a. Do all projects need to be completed before funds are transferred?
 - b. What process should be used to add projects or project elements?
4. In determining whether to acquire a parcel of land, how do we establish the market value?
 - a. Is an appraisal always necessary, even for low value properties, or should we establish cost-benefit criteria for when to request them?
 - b. If negotiations continue for some time after the appraisal is completed, should another appraisal be done before finalizing the acquisition?
 - c. Should we ever pay more than the appraised value and, if so, under what circumstances?
 - d. If we are buying property from The Trust for Public Land, should we always have our own independent appraisal?
5. How should the public be informed of progress on bond projects and expenditures to ensure transparency?

Doug noted that part of the communication to the Committee will be the perspective that the Park District would like their input on these topics and to make a formal recommendation to the Board, respecting that it is the Board's decision in the end whether to agree, disagree, or modify. Having a Board member serve as an ex-officio member on the Committee will be helpful in this process.

- ✓ Larry asked how this level of involvement will be clearly communicated to the Committee, even prior to potential members accepting the appointment.

Doug replied that the orientation process will be critical, noting that all applicants had been advised as to the charge of the Committee on the application. He has spoken with many of the applicants regarding the charge and has mentioned numerous times that it will be a very high-level review. This message will continue to be emphasized.

Bill expressed concern with item 4 outlined above noting that the questions posed seem to indicate a curb level review by the Committee.

- ✓ Doug replied that the Committee would not be involved in whether to purchase particular parcels of land; the questions to the Committee revolve around the assurance of using funds properly.

Joe noted that the ultimate decision rests with the Board. He noted that another area that needs discussion is regarding the different scenarios that can arise when purchasing land, such as whether to purchase land outside of Park District boundaries, partially within Park District boundaries, or outside current Park District boundaries, but within the ultimate service boundary. He stated that while he is not sure that the Committee is the appropriate venue for this discussion, guidelines are needed.

- ✓ Bill replied that this discussion would be outside of the scope of the Committee.

Joe replied that perhaps it is a discussion the Board needs to have.

- ✓ Larry expressed agreement with Joe's comments.

Joe noted that discussion of this issue would still be a high-level review and that he believes these questions should be addressed at the same time that the other questions referenced above are being answered.

- ✓ Larry stated that the questions outlined in item 4 referenced above brings the Committee too close to the Board's role. He expressed concern with involving the Committee in setting up the criteria for such acquisitions.

Joe replied that he is not suggesting that the Board give such authority to the Committee, he is saying that it is a question that needs to be answered around the same time as the other questions are answered or the Board will be behind the game.

- ✓ Doug noted that item 4 referenced above may not be phrased well in that there was no intent to involve the Committee in specific land purchases. It was more from the purview of answering generic questions, such as when is an appraisal outdated?

Bill noted that the Board did reach out to individuals with real estate, planning, and financial backgrounds that could be helpful with such questions. He expressed support for the Committee offering some kind of guidance, but not to the extent of being involved in particular issues.

- ✓ Larry replied that he does not believe that there is anything that prevents the Board from asking the Committee for guidance. If the Park District has an appraisal that is nine months old, the question could be posed to the Committee whether it would be appropriate to get a new one.

Doug noted that some of the criteria listed is designed as seeking advanced information so that certain criteria is set in place prior to funds being allocated.

- ✓ Larry replied that this is fine, as long as all parties realize that it is a game plan, not a set of fixed rules.

Joe noted that the questions referenced above seem like a game plan for the first quarter and that subsequent game plans will be needed for the second, third, and fourth quarters.

- ✓ Bill noted that once the bond projects begin, there will be a lot of activity for the next few years thereafter and if the Board can get some ideas ahead of the game, they should do so.

Hal provided a brief overview of the following next steps detailed within the memo:

- Consultants of Record
- Master Plan Review Process
- Bond Project Contract Requirements
- Communications Plan
- Land Acquisition Consultant
- Temporary Planning Staff

Bill asked how many projects would be effected by the \$100,000 waiver being requested.

- ✓ Hal noted that the waiver would only be for Architecture and Engineering contracts, not construction.

Joe noted that in essence, by having a pre-approval list, the Board is saying that it pre-approves staff's choice regarding which firm to use for contracts over \$100,000.

- ✓ Hal confirmed this.
- ✓ Doug noted that contract award would still be a negotiated process.

Larry stated that even if there are five pre-approved firms, all five could be asked to bid on the project in order to see who is the lowest bidder. In turn, this process also allows the Park District to move more quickly if needed. He described that just because there is a pre-approved group of contractors does not mean the Park District will lose its competitive edge and that the Park District still has the ability to participate in an open process if a project calls for it. Contractors on the pre-approved list are not guaranteed that they will be awarded a project.

Doug noted that there are no formal action items requested of the Board this evening and that staff will return to the Board with another update at the March Regular meeting.

B. Resolution Authorizing Issuance of General Obligation Bonds

Keith Hobson, Director of Business & Facilities, provided a brief overview of the memo included within the Board of Directors information packet, noting that staff is requesting Board of Directors approval of a resolution to authorize the issuance and sale of the General Obligation Bonds, not to exceed \$100,000,000, along with the authorization of other necessary appointments, in order to proceed with the issuance of said bonds. Keith offered to answer any questions the Board of Directors may have.

President, Larry Pelatt, asked if there were any questions.

- ✓ Hearing none, he stated that he would entertain a motion to approve the resolution.

Bill Kanable moved the Board of Directors approve the resolution to authorize the following actions: Issuance and sale of not to exceed \$100,000,000 General Obligation Bonds, designate the General Manager or Director of Business & Facilities as Authorized Representative, appoint a Financial Advisor and Bond Counsel, authorize appointment of a Paying Agent and Bond Registrar, and authorize execution of the Purchase Agreement. John Griffiths seconded the motion. Roll call proceeded as follows:

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

The motion was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

C. Compiled District Policies

Doug Menke, General Manager, introduced Tom Sponsler with Beery, Elsner & Hammond, LLP, the Park District’s legal counsel, to provide an overview of the memo and attachments included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a reorganization of the Park District’s Board of Directors policies.

Tom provided a detailed overview of his memo included within the Board of Directors information packet regarding a reorganization and update of the Park District’s Board of Directors policies, as well as proposed District Compiled Policies Chapters One through Four.

Tom noted that after speaking with staff, rather than transferring the current Board policies 1, 19, 21, and 23 to be delegated as administrative rules adopted by the General Manager, that some portion of these policies may need to remain as Board policies, which will most likely be included in a new chapter titled Operational Policies.

Tom noted that the timeline for this project will allow for the new District Compiled Policies to be adopted by the Board of Directors via resolution to take effect by July 1, 2009, and offered to answer any questions the Board may have.

Bill Kanable referred to the proposed policy regarding communication with staff. He noted that some Board members work closely with staff in other roles, such as through volunteerism with specific sports groups or departments.

- ✓ Tom replied that he could clarify the language to pertain more to while being in the role of a Director.

Joe Blowers referred to language in Chapter 3, page 2, that states: “During public meetings, Board members will not attempt to edit or revise prepared documents”. He noted that often the Board is asked for input, such as on the Park District Goals & Objectives, which sometimes results in the modifying of a prepared document.

- ✓ Tom noted that the concern revolves around changing and adopting the document at the same meeting. However, it does not mean that the Board cannot do that or that it is not appropriate to do that very thing on some occasions through making an amendment.

Bill suggested the addition of the word “generally” to the sentence for clarification.

- ✓ Doug noted that the primary issue is related to when staff is proposing a resolution, such as the resolution discussed this evening regarding the Oversight Committee, which will be brought back to the Board at the next meeting in edited form so that it is a document in the Board of Directors information packet that the public can see and be aware of the proposed edits.

Tom asked for Board consensus of the proposed materials this evening, noting that the final action will not occur until the last chapter and after any changes have been made. The Board can change its mind and edit wording up until that point and then the entire District Compiled Policies will be adopted via a resolution, except for the Rules and Regulations policy, which needs to be adopted by ordinance.

✓ The Board of Directors confirmed this is the consensus.

Agenda Item #10 - Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Larry Pelatt, President

Bob Scott, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins