



Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Minutes of a Work Session of the Board of Directors

A work session of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was held electronically on Wednesday, July 22, 2020. Executive Session 4:30 pm; Work Session 5:30 pm.

Present:

Ashley Hartmeier-Prigg	President/Director
Tya Ping	Secretary/Director
Heidi Edwards	Secretary Pro-Tempore/Director
Wendy Kroger	Director
Felicita Montebianco	Director
Doug Menke	General Manager

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

President Ashley Hartmeier-Prigg 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 under authority of ORS 192.660(2)(e) & (h).

President Hartmeier-Prigg noted that the news media and designated staff may attend executive session. Representatives of the news media were directed not to disclose information discussed during executive session. No final action or final decision may be made in executive session.

Agenda Item #2 – Work Session

A. SDC Discussion on Affordable Housing, Level of Service and Unit Cost

A Work Session of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District Board of Directors was called to order by President Hartmeier-Prigg on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 5:30 pm.

Jeannine Rustad, Planning Manager, provided opening comments regarding this evening's work session on the System Development Charge (SDC) Methodology Update currently in process, noting that staff has heard and understands the board's objectives for this project. Staff understands that the board wants to contribute to the region-wide effort of solving the need for affordable housing, and have also heard the board's concerns of making sure THPRD can still deliver the services that our patrons have come to expect. The recommendations presented this evening attempt to meet both sets of concerns, while also being sensitive to the current economic climate due to the ongoing pandemic. The direction received from the board this evening will be compiled into a final recommendation report that will be presented for the board's consideration at the August regular board meeting.

Jeannine read into the record a letter dated July 20, 2020, from Kelly Ritz, President with Venture Properties. The letter noted that, along with others in their industry, Venture Properties

is concerned about the region's challenge in providing housing access and affordability for all. While recognizing the importance of SDCs for funding public improvements and services, they also see the necessity of finding a balance between SDC rates and the direct impact these fees have on the cost of delivering new homes. Following are their comments regarding the topics under discussion this evening.

- Non-Residential SDC Increases. They support both the new non-residential SDC rate and the recommended two-year phase-in plan.
- Recreation/Aquatic Center Financing Percentages. They strongly encourage the district to continue to study the alternate 10-25% scenarios as well as a multi-year phase-in for any increases in order to slow the impact of these fees on district housing costs.
- Affordable Housing Waivers. They support the recommendation for a 100% waiver on 30% Median Family Income (MFI) housing, with case-by-case board discretion for waivers on 60% MFI housing.

Jeannine and Deb Galardi, Principal with Galardi Rothstein Group, the district's System Development Charge (SDC) Methodology Update consultant, provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, regarding the following SDC policy framework issues for the board's discussion and direction:

1. Non-Residential Fee Phasing
2. Level of Service
3. Affordable Housing Waivers

Non-Residential SDC Fee Increase

- Should the non-residential SDC fee increase be implemented immediately or phased in over time?
 - Non-residential SDC fees have been low for the past years. Updated calculations reflect an increase:
 - Current fee: \$397/employee
 - New fee: \$755/employee (at full funding of recreation/aquatic centers) or \$535/employee (at 30% funding of recreation/aquatic centers)
- Staff recommendation: Given the current economic climate, a phase-in is warranted.
 - Phase in over 2 years
 - Year 1: \$576/employee (at full funding of recreation/aquatic centers)
 - \$466/employee (at 30% funding of recreation/aquatic centers)
 - Year 2: \$755/employee (at full funding of recreation/aquatic centers)
 - \$535/employee (at 30% funding of recreation/aquatic centers)

Board comments and discussion on this topic included the following:

- A request for feedback from the Beaverton Chamber of Commerce.
- How the non-residential fee is calculated and assessed. The district's administrative procedures guide for implementing the SDC fees determines the non-residential fee amounts based on the type of business and other factors, typically resulting in lower fees per employee for businesses such as schools and hospitals compared to other uses.
- How the district's non-residential SDC fee compares to other local agencies. Even at the non-discounted unit cost of \$755/employee, the district's non-residential SDC fee would fall within the middle of other agencies' fees.
- The new non-residential SDC fee would take effect for building permits applied for after January 1, 2021.
- The board expressed agreement to move forward with a discounted non-residential SDC fee (funding recreation/aquatic centers at 30%) and phasing the new fee in over two years, in the interest of partnership with the district's business communities and supporting them during this time of economic uncertainty.

Level of Service

- How much of the cost of recreation/aquatic centers should be included within the SDC calculation?
 - Attachment 1a included within the board of directors' information packet shows the impacts of financing the recreation/aquatic centers at 10%, 25%, 30%, 50% or 100% on the district's SDC fees.
 - At 100% financing, multifamily housing SDCs would increase by 12%, and the largest single-family home category would increase by 35%. If considered, such increases should be phased in over time, especially due to the current pandemic.
 - At 30% financing, multifamily housing SDCs would decrease by 10%, and the first two tiers of single-family housing would see a 24% and 10% decrease.
 - Estimated cost is \$60 million per recreation/aquatic center (2) plus \$9.8 million for land acquisition for one center (land has been secured for the southwest center, but not a northwest center) for a total of \$129,800,000, which is over 25% of the total cost of the complete project list of \$502,448,288.
 - The district has a business plan to complete a facilities functional plan, which will better inform future needs for renovating existing and/or new facilities.
 - Stakeholders were shown options of 30% or 100% financing and feedback supported further investigation of financing recreation/aquatic centers at 10-25%.
 - SDC revenue collected could also serve as leverage for potential bond or other financing mechanisms (grants).
- Staff recommendation: Include 30% of the cost of the recreation/aquatic centers.

Board comments and discussion on this topic included the following:

- What percentage of recreation/aquatic centers has been typically funded via bond in the past? The district's last recreation/aquatic center, Conestoga, was built prior to the district having access to SDCs, using a combination of capital and bond funds.
- Funding 30% of the recreation/aquatic centers leaves opportunities for creativity in identifying other funding sources, such as bond measures and multi-use partnerships.
- The recommendation of 30% reflects the board's values in reducing the district's impact to the development of more affordable housing for the community.
- The board expressed agreement to move forward with including 30% of the cost of the recreation/aquatic centers within the SDC calculation.

Affordable Housing Waivers – Overview

- There is a significant affordable housing deficit in the region. Metro estimates that there is a 12,000-unit shortfall of affordable housing units for households earning less than 50% of the area median family income (MFI) in Washington County.
- Lack of access to housing, quality schools and parks, furthers systemic racism.
- The city and county are working on removing barriers through code changes.
- Affordable housing waivers will not leave district projects unfunded:
 - 5-year grant funding projection of \$2.89 million
 - Metro Local Share funding of \$8.62 million
 - Potential minimum of \$3 million in SDC projects
 - District affordable housing waivers help meet equity goal of Metro Bond
 - City of Beaverton's share is \$5.7 million
 - Metro bond trails funding of \$92 million for the region
- Anticipated SDCs from affordable housing projects over the next five years (at the SDC rate that includes 30% funding of recreation/aquatic centers):
 - 30% MFI: \$2.04 million
 - 60% MFI: \$3.5 million

Affordable Housing Waivers – Metro Bond Housing

- Should a 100% waiver on housing at 30% of MFI apply to Metro bond housing only or all housing at this level?
 - Feedback from stakeholders has been that non-Metro bond housing will need more help (i.e., they will have to find additional financing sources) than Metro-financed housing. In either scenario, waivers of SDCs are seen as leverage.
- Staff recommendation: Apply waiver to all housing at or below 30% MFI.

Board comments and discussion on this topic included the following:

- Appreciation for the feedback of affordable housing providers for sharing their expertise with the district.
- An overall comfort level in issuing waivers when considering the anticipated grant and Metro bond funding sources that would provide an alternate method of funding SDC-eligible projects. The board will be provided an annual grant funding and affordable housing waiver report.
- Gratefulness for the board and staff's efforts in this area, noting that the need for affordable housing could become even greater due to the current pandemic.
- The board expressed agreement to move forward with a 100% waiver for all affordable housing at or below 30% MFI.

Affordable Housing Waivers – 60% MFI

- What should be the waiver for 60% MFI housing?
 - Six scenarios are included within the board of directors' information packet.
 - The scenarios range from providing waivers only for 30% MFI, to 100% waivers for all affordable housing at or below 60% MFI.
 - Feedback on considerations will be included in a policy to be adopted by the board, and an affordable housing waiver application form.
- Staff recommendation: A new scenario of applying waivers for 60% MFI on an incentivized case-by-case basis using the following criteria:
 - Half of units are family size: 20% waiver
 - 12% or more units of the development are for 30% MFI: 20% waiver
 - 60-year affordability restriction: 20% waiver
 - Public open space component: 10% waiver
 - A development that includes public open space meeting district functional plan standards would likely receive SDC credits close to the amount of SDCs owed for the project.
 - Discretionary: 30% waiver
 - Demonstrated need; addressing racial equity; other services included in development; mix of income levels.
 - The recommendation provides both flexibility and discretion for the board, as well as certainty for developers.
 - Up to a 70% waiver could be issued if all of the proposed criteria is met.
 - 30% would be board-discretionary and would provide the opportunity for a developer to make its case to the board.

Board comments and discussion on this topic included the following:

- The public open space component, including concern that criteria associated with providing public open space would ultimately reduce the amount of space available for affordable housing, as well as support for the concept in that including a public space component would incentivize creativity and provide residents of the affordable housing developments with much-needed open space.

- A possibility of adopting criteria on an annual basis based on what components of affordable housing the board wishes to incentivize the most at that time, instead of formally adopting a set list of criteria within the methodology for the next five years.
- The need to reach out to affordable housing developers to seek feedback on the proposed criteria and inquire whether any additional criteria should be added, and to ensure that this method does not present any unintended barriers.
- Offers of board support, if needed, in reaching out to the affordable housing developers to facilitate additional discussion.
- The board expressed the need for additional time to consider this proposal, as well as to consider any feedback received from the housing providers stakeholders group. Jeannine suggested that the board may consider adopting the 60% MFI waiver as discretionary within the SDC Methodology and then follow-up later to determine what the criteria will be for the waivers.

Affordable Housing Waivers – Sunset Provision

- Should there be a sunset provision and, if so, what should it be?
- Staff recommendation: Yes; the earlier of:
 - board resolution rescinding the policy on waivers;
 - adoption of an updated methodology;
 - the established waiver cap is reached; or
 - five years (the district is required to update its methodology every 5 years).

Board comments and discussion on this topic included the following:

- The board expressed support for the staff recommendation in support of a sunset provision as described.

Affordable Housing Waivers – Waiver Amount Cap

- Should there be cap on the value of SDC waivers and, if so, what should the cap be?
 - Anticipated SDCs from affordable housing projects over the next five years:
 - \$5.54 million (30% MFI: \$2.04 million; 60% MFI: \$3.5 million)
 - The estimated grant revenue projected over the next five years is \$2.89 million.
 - Metro Local Share funding of \$8.62 million is anticipated:
 - Potential minimum of \$3 million in SDC projects.
 - City of Beaverton’s share is \$5.7 million.
 - Metro bond trails funding of \$92 million for the region:
 - The district is considering seeking funding for at least the Westside Trail Bridge (\$15 million total cost estimate) and Westside Trail Segment 14.
- Staff recommendation: Yes; a cap of \$3.5 million in waivers for all affordable housing.

Board comments and discussion on this topic included the following:

- The positive impact that the district is going to have on affordable housing by taking this step forward.
- The board expressed support for the staff recommendation of a cap of \$3.5 million.

The board thanked Jeannine and Deb for the hard work that went into preparing the information for this evening’s presentation.

B. Park Patrol

Mark Pierce, Security Operations Manager, provided a comprehensive update on the work of the district’s park patrol team via a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was entered into the record, and which included the following topics:

- Ambassadorship approach to engaging patrons in a positive manner

- Training required for park patrol team members
 - Customer service
 - Diversity, equity, inclusion and access
 - Conflict resolution/de-escalation
 - Conversational Spanish
 - Parent reunification
 - Run, Hide, Fight
 - Missing persons searches
 - Effectively dealing with camps
 - Lock out/lock down
- Regular duties of park patrol
 - Providing assistance to patrons/staff
 - Graffiti investigation/removal
 - After hours use
 - Off leash dogs
 - Parking concerns
- Future key performance indicators
 - Patron assistance provided
 - Community events attended
 - Staff assistance provided
 - Patrol walks conducted
 - Staff/Community training conducted
- Internal partners
 - Lulu Ballesteros Jones, Cultural Inclusion Specialist, provided an overview of the district's Talking Walls and Message Gardens pilot projects.
- External partners
 - Beaverton Police Department, Washington County Sheriff's Office, and Beaverton School District
- Community engagement
- Upcoming initiatives
 - Proactive crime prevention
 - Paws for Pets
 - Actively patrol our trails

Mark concluded the presentation by noting that he believes that the path forward for park patrol includes continued sensitivity to social justice issues, special attention to the stress that our community is under due to COVID-19, and a focus on community service to our patrons, and offered to answer any questions the board may have.

Secretary Tya Ping read the following testimony into the record:

Joey Whiting, an outreach worker with HomePlate Youth Services, provided written testimony noting that as an organization that works with houseless and at-risk youth, HomePlate Youth Services is excited to hear that the THPRD Board of Directors would have a discussion tonight around park patrolling. They would like to ask the board to consider, and to highlight the way that park patrolling has and continues to disproportionately affect the houseless community, houseless youth, and BIPOC youth. It is also imperative to examine and reassess the intrinsic ties to policing, and how the system of policing fails by and large to create truly safer spaces, for everyone in the community. While in the middle of this pandemic as well, it is important to recognize the lack of spaces for houseless folks, and how being allowed to spend time in parks can allow houseless people to separate themselves from others, and find a bit of the rest and ease that we are all struggling to find right now.

Felicita Monteblanco inquired what success looks like for park patrol?

- ✓ Mark explained that he believes success is best reflected as an active partnership between park patrol and the community it serves, resulting in a community that feels comfortable approaching park patrol in the field and through other communication methods with comments and suggestions.

Felicita questioned how the district can encourage community members to take ownership of and look out for their local parks, while also welcoming others.

- ✓ Mark described that the ownership aspect is already prevalent within the district, and continues to increase through relationship building between park patrol and the community.

Felicita asked what training is required for a park patrol member before day one in the field.

- ✓ Mark replied certification as an unarmed security professional, which is a fourteen-hour training mandated by the state. In the last few years, the course has moved toward a communications skills-based course. Additionally, training that is specific to the district.

Felicita requested additional information regarding the state-mandated course for her research purposes.

Felicita asked if it is common for park patrol members to use their position with the district as a stepping stone to becoming a law enforcement officer.

- ✓ Mark replied that it depends on the individual. Park patrol are part-time positions, which are difficult to fill long-term with experienced individuals and tend to attract students and people working multiple jobs. Today, all five park patrol employees aspire to go into criminal law, whether that is as a law enforcement officer, attorney, or some other role within the criminal justice system.

Felicita asked how five park patrol members was determined as the right number to serve the district and whether more staff is needed.

- ✓ Mark explained that the number of park patrol positions reflects the need and growth of the district. A formula was in the process of being developed to use in determining how much park patrol personnel needs to be added as the district grows, but has stalled due to the pandemic. His vision is for the department to be partially full-time and part-time, including a park patrol lead, and to have enough resources for a park patrol and park ambassador to be on the trails on a regular basis.

Felicita inquired how park patrol would typically approach a group of youth who are suspected of misbehaving in a park.

- ✓ Mark replied that it varies greatly depending on circumstance. Groups of youth are always in the parks; however, if park patrol sees something out of the ordinary, they may approach the group, whether or not they are youth. Examples would be a car or cars in the parking lot of a closed facility or a group gathered at a picnic shelter after dark.

Wendy Kroger complimented park patrol's ability to work cooperatively with others, including the community it serves, other local agencies, and interdepartmentally within the park district. She described the complicated nature of park patrol's role, noting that they are appreciated and that she is thankful for their efforts.

Tya Ping inquired how many park patrol members are patrolling the district at any given time.

- ✓ Mark noted that it depends on the day and time. There is a day shift and afternoon shift; the day shift has one person on some days and two on others, and the afternoon shift has two people five out of seven days.

Tya asked if park patrol members spend a majority of their time patrolling park property or responding to calls from the public.

- ✓ Mark replied that it is a mix of both, but that their activity leans slightly more toward self-generated versus responding to calls from the public. He provided an overview of the activity statistics for the past week, noting that park patrol responds to an average of 350-450 calls or emails from the public per week.

Tya asked how often park patrol contacts local area law enforcement for assistance and for what types of issues.

- ✓ Mark replied an average of three to five times per week, including EMS and fire, and provided examples of situations such as people suffering a mental health crisis, or those who make physical threats to park patrol staff.

Tya referenced the public testimony received this evening and asked at what point park patrol interacts with homeless people using the parks; if they are approached simply for being there, and whether park patrol connects them with services.

- ✓ Mark replied that homeless people are not approached simply for being in a park during the daytime hours. Typically, the interaction comes after a staff or community member has called park patrol after noticing a tent being put up on district property at which point park patrol will help them pack their belongings, offer information regarding services available, and help them carry their belongings to public transit. Mark noted that during his tenure at the district, they have had no interactions with homeless youth in the parks or facilities.

Heidi Edwards commented that the need seems greater than what five part-time staff members would be able to address. She wondered whether bikes could be useful for patrolling the trails.

- ✓ Mark noted that park patrol uses bicycles on occasion, but patrolling trails is more an issue of staffing as he would prefer to have two people out at a time, whether that is two park patrol members or a park patrol member along with a park ambassador.

Heidi suggested the opportunity for partnership between Portland Community College students interested in the field of criminal justice and the district's park patrol.

- ✓ General Manager Doug Menke expressed appreciation for this suggestion and commented that the challenge in staffing is that it is ongoing. There is a balance in that our highest threshold is to ensure the safety of our staff, and Mark works diligently in not allowing staff to get into unsafe circumstances, while also balancing our commitment to the public. Adding staff at this time presents a challenge due to limited resources.

Felicita complimented park patrol team member Rogelio Evangelista Morton, noting that he is kind and patient, and that she appreciates his and Mark's work with Virginia Garcia and that they set a great example of the type of work park patrol should be doing.

Felicita referenced Tya's question regarding park patrol calling upon other law enforcement agencies for assistance and asked what would happen if a park patrol member witnessed a law enforcement officer acting in a way that did not reflect THPRD values. Do other agencies understand our values and do we have an open-enough relationship with them to have those types of conversations?

- ✓ Mark replied that he would feel comfortable having a frank conversation if such a circumstance should occur, and believes the park patrol members would, as well. He has not had to have such a conversation yet as he has been very happy with the degree of compassion, respect and care shown by local law enforcement officers. However, if he did witness something, he would definitely have such a conversation, whether it be with district staff or outside law enforcement.

Felicita commented that she is happy to hear that district staff is willing to have such critical conversations and to reflect on our work as the tough conversations continue. She appreciates the willingness to ask critical questions of ourselves and each other.

President Hartmeier-Prigg stated that she is grateful to hear firsthand that park patrol leads with an ambassador approach, noting that it is important to the board to feel informed, to ensure that we have good practices in place, and that we're influencing other agencies that we have relationships with where we can. While there was no outright concern, there was the realization that the park district is not exempt from such tough conversations and reflection. She is also grateful to hear that park patrol interacts with our homeless community in a compassionate way. She noted that the board is always interested in more data so if there are any reports that Mark would like to share with them as a follow-up, it would be welcome information.

Heidi noted that a common topic for the Nature & Trails Advisory Committee is safety on the trails and that she appreciates receiving so much information this evening.

Felicita thanked district staff for the Talking Walls and Message Gardens projects noting that they perfectly represent THPRD values.

Agenda Item #3 – Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 pm.

Ashley Hartmeier-Prigg, President

Tya Ping, Secretary

Recording Secretary,
Jessica Collins