



Board of Directors

Agenda & Reports

January 17, 2012

Bend Park and Recreation District  
Board of Directors

AGENDA

January 17, 2012

**4:00 PM Work Session**

4:10 PM Regular Meeting

District Office Building  
799 SW Columbia  
Bend, Oregon



VISITORS

Work sessions are scheduled for the board to receive and discuss information regarding district operations, projects, and planning to aid in their decision-making process. **The board can choose to accept comment on work session agenda items at the end of their discussion. The chair may ask for comment from visitors at the appropriate time.** Please state your name and address and limit your comments to three minutes in the interest of allowing the board to complete their work session agenda.

**4:00 PM WORK SESSION**

1. Budget Calendar Review



**4:10 PM REGULAR MEETING**

VISITORS

This is the time provided for individuals wishing to address the Board regarding items not listed in the business session. **The Board may elect to ask for comment on business session items at the appropriate time.** The visitor's section is not designed for a lengthy presentation. If you have a proposal for Board consideration, briefly introduce the subject, and request that the Board consider adding discussion to a future Board meeting agenda. Visitors who wish to speak are asked to sign up on the public comment card provided. Please state your name and address at the time you address the Board. Please limit your remarks to three minutes.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes: January 3, 2012 – Work Session & Regular Meeting
2. OSU-Cascades MOU

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**BOARD MEETINGS CALENDAR REVIEW**

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

**ADJOURN**

**STRATEGIC PLAN WORKSHOP**

## **BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION**

**AGENDA DATE:** January 17, 2012

**SUBJECT:** Review budget calendar for fiscal year 2012-13

**STAFF RESOURCE:** Lindsey Lombard, Finance Director  
Don Horton, Executive Director

**PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:** None

**ACTION PROPOSED:** None ó for information purposes only

### **BACKGROUND**

Each year staff develops a budget calendar for the upcoming fiscal year's budget process. We are again planning a tour for the budget committee and board. The tour's purpose is to see some of the more significant sites of projects that will be in this year's proposals. The tour is currently tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, April 25, from 10:00am to 2:00pm, and the district will provide lunch.

We have also tentatively scheduled the budget committee meetings for Monday May 14 and Wednesday May 16, (with Tuesday May 22 scheduled as a tentative third meeting if necessary). The board adoption of the budget is scheduled for the regular Tuesday, June 5, board meeting.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the board note the dates for the budget tour and the budget committee meetings, and inform staff as soon as possible if there is a scheduling conflict.

### **BUDGETARY IMPACT**

The 2012-13 fiscal year's proposed budget is tentatively scheduled to be presented to the board and budget committee on May 14.

### **MOTION**

*None.*

### **ATTACHMENT**

None.

**Bend Metro Park & Recreation District  
Board of Directors  
Work Session & Regular Meeting  
January 3, 2012**

**BOARD PRESENT:** Ted Schoenborn, Scott Asla, Scott Wallace, Ruth Williamson and Dallas Brown

**STAFF PRESENT:** Don Horton, Bruce Ronning, Lindsey Lombard, Matt Mercer, Jan Taylor, Ed Moore, Theresa Albert, Steve Jorgensen, Dave Crowther, Colleen McNally and Paula Lowery .

**LEGAL COUNSEL:** Neil Bryant.

**MEDIA:** Nick Grube, The Bulletin.

**VISITORS:** Margaret Holman, Pam DiDente, Marion Davidson, Mike Lovely, Anne Goldner, Kristin Kovalik, Jim Mahoney, Helen Harbin, Gerald Itkin, Justin Gottlieb, Bruce Lilleston, Kiersten Lillesten, Dick Tobiason, Keith Scott, Arnis Berkulus, Maureen Berkulus, Bill Marlett, Terry Gloeckler.

**WORK SESSION**

Chair Ted Schoenborn convened a work session at 5:35 pm.

**SDC Fund Forecast**

Lindsey Lombard explained staff provides an update of the SDC Fund Forecast and district-wide 5-Year Financial Forecast annually in January. She presented and reviewed a copy of the economic assumptions used to prepare the forecasts noting the rates are based upon the Oregon Statewide Economic Forecast of 2011, the County Assessor's information for 2011-12 and staff estimates. Lindsey explained the information includes 2010-11 and 2011-12 actuals as well as projections for years 2012-13 through 2015-16. She reviewed the population/growth rate, single family, multi-family and hotel/motel housing starts, SDC cost index percentage of increase/decrease, SDC fees based on the cost index and Resolution 312, percentage of growth in assessed value, recreation revenue increase/decrease, personal services percentage of increase, materials and services percentage of increase and investment rate of return. She explained that historically central Oregon has lagged behind the state in recovering from a recession, and as a result she has applied 75% of the growth the state is projecting statewide overall for single family housing starts. Lindsey then presented the SDC Fund 5-Year Forecast project spreadsheet. She referred to the board's adoption of the fund forecast during the budget process and noted that was forecasted to be a little over \$900,000 in the red at the end of year five. She cited changes to the revenue numbers based on the assumptions just presented. She stated that based on improved revenue projection for the future four years plus more revenue in the current fiscal year than previously reported, the \$900,000 deficit has changed to a \$900,000 positive ending fund balance at the end of five years. Dallas Brown asked about Discovery Park noting that he is not familiar with that park. Bruce Ronning explained the district's agreement with West Bend Property Co. to contribute to the acquisition and development of Discovery Park. He stated that Discovery Park is the final element of the MOU that covered all of the parks and trails

in NorthWest Crossing. He noted the figure of \$1.7 million was estimated a year ago. He added that staff has been meeting recently with West Bend Property Co. about the timing and master planning for that development, and more information may be available when the board discusses the CIP at the upcoming board workshop.

### **5-Year Financial Forecast**

Lindsey Lombard presented and explained a graph tracking fund balances through 2015-16. She stated these figures are estimates based on all of our assumptions and the current adopted CIP. She stated this information does not include the annual debt service in the amount of approximately \$500,000 for the renovation and expansion of Juniper Swim & Fitness Center. Don Horton explained the large drop between 2010-11 and 2011-12 reflects the recent purchase of the Mt. Bachelor Park & Ride property, and this demonstrates that the district does not have the capacity to absorb many of the large projects that have been identified for a potential bond measure. He stated that we will continue to budget \$1.5 million in the general fund for capital projects plus the \$500,000 in debt service going forward. He noted that in years past we have tried to budget about \$2 million not counting the debt service. He stated that if the trend continues over the next two or three years we are going to be making some significant changes. Don encouraged the board to review the forecast documents in preparation for their discussion of the CIP during their workshop. He added that the assumptions used to develop the forecasts will also be used as we begin to develop the budget for the upcoming year.

### **Community Survey**

Don Horton referred to a proposed list of projects contained in the board report to be included in a proposed voter poll. He stated he wanted to ensure the board is in agreement with the proposed list. He also identified a request for proposal (RFP) included in the report and explained this will be sent to polling firms. He stated the RFP sets out what the firm will be asked to provide. He stated this project will be put out to bid to four different agencies. Don also explained the type of information to be gained from the poll in terms of how it is broken down to include cross tabs of demographic information. He added that he has confirmed that Trust for Public Land is providing a \$5,000 grant for the project. He stated the poll will be conducted by telephone, and 400 people across the community will be contacted. He added the Mirror Pond Project will be included in the poll with regard to whether a special district should be formed to address the issue long term or a one-time fix should be funded by a bond measure. Dallas Brown stated he would like to see more detail with regard to a fitness center, public opinion on an OSU partnership, and an indoor running track included in the poll. Don stated that we have some of this information that was collected in the Recreation Needs Assessment Survey with respect to the components of a recreation center. He stated he thinks it is important to find out how a recreation center compares to the other projects on the list in terms of voter's willingness to fund and how much they are willing to pay in increased taxes for a bond measure. Dallas suggested generalizing park improvements rather than identifying specific park sites. He stated he did not think the majority of citizens would know the names of the parks identified on the list.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Street Rapids Bridge Project**

Bruce Ronning explained that staff had refined the illustrations of bridge alternatives A and B2. He noted that staff had also conducted site visits with each of the board members. He stated that staff is asking for a decision from the board during the business session regarding the placement of the bridge in order to move forward with the project. Steve Jorgensen presented and reviewed refined illustrations of the proposed A and B2 bridge locations. He reviewed the height of each bridge and described the locations relative to the

trail, staging area, crane pads, beach and kayak paths, and the Tumalo Irrigation District fence. He noted the large boulders on the Davis Park site and explained options for dealing with those including removal, moving them lower, or block them up and fill it in temporarily to accommodate the crane. He presented information regarding the use of a helicopter to set the bridge in place that found this approach would not be viable due to the weight of the bridge. He demonstrated views of the bridge from west side and east side residences. Dallas Brown asked if there is any other type of bridge that could be installed. Steve explained there are fiberglass options that some claim to be 10 times lighter in weight than a comparable steel bridge. He stated the problem is with span length that typically cannot accommodate over 100' in a single span. He stated the longer span bridges are very large, suspension style requiring towers on each end of the bridge. Dallas asked if staff receives board approval tonight, when the construction would start. Bruce stated that upon approval W & H Pacific would do the final design work necessary to get to a constructible design, followed by submittal to the city for permit approval including the Waterway Overlay Zone (WOZ) with anticipated construction beginning in late spring or early summer. He noted that depending upon the alternative approved by the board, option B2 is more constructible and will not require dealing with the irrigation pipe. He stated that alternative A will likely push construction off to winter when there is no water in the pipe. Dallas asked about the timeline for Davis Park. Bruce explained the development of Davis Park is not on the current CIP for master plan improvements. He stated the CIP includes the bridge and trail connection to the bridge. He stated the Davis Park master plan was delayed until a bridge location was chosen and there is no funding for park improvements as of yet. Dallas asked about the impact of parking on the west side of the river. Steve stated that it is anticipated parking will be included in the Davis Park master plan and it is expected that with the bridge opening access to both sides of the river, people will park at Pioneer Park. He also described options for improving the parking at the end of 1<sup>st</sup> Street in connection with the design of a trail connection on the sidewalk as an accessible route. Scott Wallace stated that until the site visit, he was not aware of the impacts on Davis Park and the amenities that exist on the east side of the river at that location. He asked Barry Johnson, W. & H. Pacific, about fill sections on the east bank of option A. Barry described the fill sections at the abutments and the slopes to existing grade. He noted a more gradual grade could be used for option B2, and explained the need to address accessibility. Scott Asla stated he agreed with Scott Wallace with regard to the impact to Davis Park and added that he is very excited about how this project opens up both sides of the river. He stated it is going to generate a lot more use and the use will be spread out between both sides of the river. Ruth Williamson stated that she appreciated staff going the extra mile and the graphics were very helpful. She stated the level of thought that has gone into this has been impressive as has the contribution from the community, and her questions have been answered. Ted Schoenborn stated he agrees that the Davis Park site has been previously overlooked, and once you see what a fine piece of property it is you begin to see opportunities there. He stated people will have much more access to the river and sandy beaches as well as a much longer stretch of the river.

The work session was concluded at 6:55 pm.

## **REGULAR MEETING**

Chair Ted Schoenborn called the regular meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

## VISITORS

Keith Scott addressed the board. He stated that quality should come first in consideration of the 1<sup>st</sup> Street Rapids Bridge and in regarding future projects as well. He cited the importance of grants and a potential bond measure for future projects. He wished everyone a happy new year.

## CONSENT AGENDA

### Minutes: December 20, 2011, Work Session & Regular Meeting

Scott Wallace moved to approve the consent agenda. Scott Asla seconded the motion. Scott Wallace, Scott Asla, Ted Schoenborn, Ruth Williamson and Dallas Brown all voted aye. Motion passed.

### Financial Statement Audit

Lindsey Lombard presented the financial statement audit for fiscal year 2010-11. She stated the audit was conducted by Harrigan, Price, Fronk, and the district has received a clean opinion. Lindsey noted the district has received a clean opinion every year since the district's first fiscal year, 1976-77. She introduced Candice Fronk and Michelle Rich with Harrigan, Price, Fronk. Candice explained the clean opinion of the audit means that everything is fairly stated in all material respects. She briefly reviewed the audit document and explained each section. She stated they confirm the information used in the audit with LGIP, the bank, the county, city of Bend, and the state. She added they also rely on the district's checks and balances and noted there is a good system in place. She stated all of the compliance requirements were positive and noted the only new accounting policy added this year was the GASB 54 adopted by the board. She stated there were no audit adjustments. Candice stated that staff is very good about providing full access to staff and statistical information and that the RecTrac system helped in terms of knowing how much unearned revenue existed at the end of the year. She stated the system also helped in tracking the online VISA purchases and determining that is being handled properly. Ruth Williamson moved to accept the 2010-11 audited financial statements. Scott Asla seconded the motion. Ruth Williamson, Scott Asla, Scott Wallace, Dallas Brown, and Ted Schoenborn all voted aye. Motion passed.

### 1<sup>st</sup> Street Rapids Bridge Project

Chair Ted Schoenborn invited public comment on the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> Street Rapids Bridge Project.

Terry Gloeckler addressed the board. She urged the board to consider no action on the bridge. She stated now that the stakes are in place she feels even more strongly about the proposed bridge. She stated she has talked to many people who are surprised by the proposal and feel the Portland Street Bridge allows them access to the 1<sup>st</sup> Street Rapids trail and they have requested signage directing them to the trail from Steidl to 1<sup>st</sup> Street.

Mike Lovely addressed the board. He stated he is in favor of option A. He stated the cheapest plan is not always the best and this protects the rapids and you can see more of them. He stated it breaks up the congestion around the picnic area where option B2 is proposed.

Margaret Holman addressed the board. She asked if there has been a no action alternative talked about evaluating what will occur if nothing is done. She stated the major objective of the bridge as she sees it, is connectivity. She stated that Sawyer Bridge and the bridge upstream from the Healy Bridge are essential to connect trail segments. She stated the proposed conceptual bridge, regardless of the alternative chosen, in her personal opinion is that it is a nonessential bridge because of the usage or Portland Avenue

Bridge. She stated she wondered how wise it is to let the decision on a project of this magnitude be driven by a grant opportunity and a conceptual design drawn on a master plan. She stated a master plan is a guiding document and can change with circumstances.

Pam DiDente addressed the board. She stated she and her husband live at the end of 1<sup>st</sup> Street, right on the rapids. She stated they feel it is an honor, privilege and responsibility to live on that stretch of the river and while she has opposed option B2, they would hardly see B2 from their house because of two ponderosa pines that block it. She stated they feel as stewards of the river, all of the activity on the river points to an already maximized user area and that is where their perspective comes in terms of speaking against B2. She shared information regarding the creation of Davis Park and provided a copy of a rendering prepared at that time depicting what Davis Park could look like. She stated the dedication of the board and staff is impressive and she appreciates the openness and time given to all of them.

Marion Davidson addressed the board. She thanked the board for the careful attention and thought given to the project. She stated this natural strip of river in the city merits the kind of care it is being given. She stated she is happy to hear of the interest in Davis Park which has languished for several years and developed some problems that she hopes will dissipate with the district's interest in it. She stated she was happy to hear some discussion about the handling of the traffic issues at the end of 1<sup>st</sup> Street, at the cul-de-sac. She stated during peak use times it can get jammed and emergency vehicles have trouble getting down the street. She stated she continues to support option A for reasons of aesthetics, safety, and congestion, and if you look at this beautiful strip of natural river, it doesn't merit the cheapest treatment.

Gerald Itkin addressed the board. He shared a scenario of a proposal to develop a play area with a beach, kayak use area and swim area in the 1<sup>st</sup> Street location, for \$250,000, and asked the board if they would do it. He stated the good news is, it's already there, so the extra \$250,000 that alternative A will cost over B2, is as if you were buying the amenities of the beach play area that already exists. He stated going cheap with B2 option isn't cheap because you sacrifice in a very substantial way, this existing, delightful amenity that Mother Nature gave use. He asked the board to please go with alternative A.

Jim Mahoney addressed the board. He stated he has lived on Utica for 20 years and he thinks it is very important that we build a bridge. He stated if we don't build a bridge you will lose the impetus to develop Davis Park and he reminded those who talked about the land swap to form Davis Park that a bridge across the river was always a part of that proposal. He stated if we don't have a bridge we will lose the continuity of the Deschutes River Trail and the trail from Portland Avenue to Davis Park essentially becomes a dead end, and no one will use it. He stated he would like the district to build A if you can, but B2 is not a bad option. He stated he thinks the impacts on the sandy beach and kayak put in will be minimal because the sandy beach is separated from the bridge footings by big boulders, shrubbery, a huge ponderosa pine and it's about 45 feet. He stated similarly the kayak put in area is separated from the bridge footings. He stated the east side landings are almost identical between A and B2. He cautioned trying too hard to make alternative A work will result in analysis paralysis and no bridge will be built. He stated nothing is really too expensive for someone who doesn't have to go out and find the money to build it.

Bill Marlette addressed the board. He stated he wanted to clarify for the record that he is opposed to all bridge options and the placement of the poles reinforces, in his opinion, that this bridge would have a significant impact on the visual aesthetic environment of an existing treasure in Bend. He stated there is an issue with possible NEPA compliance and federal ODOT monies.

At the conclusion of the public comment Ted Schoenborn asked Bruce Ronning to summarize the proposed project. Bruce referred to the board report and findings posted on the district's website. He stated this has probably been the most extensive public process the district has ever conducted. He stated the project is linked to the ODOT grant that has funded the W & H Pacific Engineering work and we are aware there are environmental concerns and issues that we will address. He stated having listened carefully to all of the comments received, including a mail survey, two public open house meetings, various stakeholder meetings, the enormous amount of comment received by email, personal contacts, letters to the editor, etc., the staff recommendation remains that option B2 is the most constructible and the most cost effective solution to crossing the river. Scott Asla stated he doesn't think the district or this board has ever put money above doing the right thing. He stated he respects the ideas everyone has shared. He stated he can't support alternative A due to the environmental impact on the east side of the river and the aesthetics of Davis Park. He stated he thinks B2 is a great alternative and thinks those accesses to swimming; kayaking and canoeing will be improved. He stated that side of the river will become more ADA accessible and the use will be spread out by opening up the east side where there are some very nice sandy beaches. He stated that overall it is a much better design, and a better place to put a bridge for all of the citizens of Bend to use that area. Scott Wallace stated after looking at the proposed location of the B2 option bridge his concerns regarding congestion on the sandy beach and kayak area have been somewhat resolved. He stated that he is of the opinion that where the abutments are on the west side of the river splits very nicely in an area that would not adversely affect either one of those from a usability standpoint. He stated he thinks with the construction of the pad for the crane will involve reconfiguring the accesses coming off the hill will provide some controls for mountain bikers coming off the end of 1<sup>st</sup> Street. He stated there has been a decades-long irrigation canal, chain-link fence, concrete structure and other hard improvements in that area and with the bridge construction we may be looking at doing some things to open up that side of the trail as well. He stated from his perspective B2 is the best option for the district and the citizens of the community. Ruth Williamson stated she is grateful for the amount of time that has been given to this project. She stated there are some mitigating factors to option A that make it an undesirable alternative, not least of which is cost. She stated we are responsible to a larger community than the just the adjacent neighborhoods because the dollars that we will be spending on both developing the bridge as well as Davis Park will be coming from our entire community. She stated she weighs heavily the impact to the landscape and she can't justify digging out the hillside on the west side and disintegrating boulders so we can make the bridge access work on the east side. She stated that all of the public comments have clearly impacted the thinking of the staff and engineering firm, and they have been sensitive to the existing usage, but that usage is going to change for the better by dispersing the usage. She stated you have to think of the bridge as a whole package including Davis Park and we will be asking ourselves to consider how we can develop this park in conjunction with the bridge and deliver the whole package. She thanked the public for their input and stated she would have to vote for B2. Dallas Brown stated he has to ask if we need a bridge. He stated while he believes the board as a whole agrees that a bridge is necessary, and he could come around to support that, he has trouble with building a bridge when we don't have any sort of plan budgeted for Davis Park. He stated he would like to see Davis Park master planned and funded before we have a bridge, otherwise it is kind of like a bridge to nowhere. He suggested considering placing the bridge on a future bond measure, or even having it included in the survey. Scott Wallace stated the bridge would provide continuity for a trail that we have been building for a number of years and are now at a point to make that connection with Pioneer Park and the west side of the river. Scott Asla noted the trails are funded and it opens up Davis Park as a natural area now. Don Horton reviewed the history of the planning documents that included a bridge to continue the Deschutes River Trail

before the district owned Davis Park. He stated the park site was never a catalyst to build the bridge. Ruth Williamson stated she thinks this will be a tremendous asset to the river trail and the neighborhood with the improvements making it a more welcoming and engaging place to interact with the river. Dallas asked why we need the bridge now when we don't have Davis Park included in any funding, especially if there is a chance for a bond. Scott Wallace cited the input consistently received from residents through surveys with regard to taking care of what we have and trails. He stated trail connectivity and continuity ranked higher than a recreation center and almost everything else we talk about in our CIP discussions. He stated that while the connection to Davis Park is important, he thinks the trail is a separate important issue that falls into that category that resonates very strongly with our residents. Don Horton stated that a lot of the Deschutes River Trail has been opportunistic and little by little we have been able to get more of the trail finished. He stated the purpose of the trail was not to get people to Davis Park although it will open up the use of the park. He stated that when the trail plan was drawn the district did not own the land and anticipated securing a right-of-way for the trail, and the park was never contemplated. Dallas asked how many of the identified trail projects have been completed. Bruce stated that approximately 46% of the 56 identified projects have been completed. Scott Asla stated that while Davis Park will not be developed right away, there will be usable amenities on the site to accommodate more people. Following additional discussion regarding the potential for funding the trails through a bond Don Horton clarified the decision before the board tonight is to select the best location for the bridge. Dallas stated that he has concerns regarding the existing parking congestion on the street at Davis Park and would like to see that resolved before determining where the bridge is going to go. Ruth Williamson stated that the challenge with a further delay is that we are still going to have to address this question one year or even five years down the road. Bruce noted the project has been underway for three years beginning with phases one and two of the trail on the east side of the river connecting Pioneer Park and the bridge planned for phase three of the project. Scott Asla moved to approve bridge Alternative B2, to authorize the executive director to complete the final design through the ODOT Design Acceptance Package and to apply for a city of Bend WOZ project permitting. Scott Wallace seconded the motion. Dallas Brown thanked the staff for doing an excellent job. He stated he would vote against the bridge, and while he thinks option B2 is the better choice, his concern is that he is not prepared to commit to doing it. He stated he would prefer to wait until the public poll is completed in terms of potentially putting it on a bond. Ruth Williamson stated that she hopes that the public feels their voices have been heard, we have captured your sentiments in these options, and that we will continue to work with the neighborhood to do the best job possible with the bridge and the park. Scott Asla, Scott Wallace, Ruth Williamson, Ted Schoenborn all voted aye. Dallas Brown voted nay. Motion passed 4 to 1.

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Don Horton noted a copy of the 2010 board workshop agenda had been included in the board folders. He stated that this year's workshop will follow the same model. He added the workshop is scheduled for Friday, January 13. The board set the meeting time for 3:30 to 7:30 pm.

Don Horton referred to Dick Tobiason's request for funds from the Bend Heroes Memorial account for a separate project. He stated while this project has a lot of merit, all public documents relating to the Bend Heroes Memorial state that all proceeds from the brick sales will be allocated to the care and maintenance of the memorial per the memorandum of understanding. Don shared a packet of documents with specific language highlighted. He noted the similarities of the Bend Heroes Memorial agreement to the arrangement following the construction of the Old Bend Gym to set up a fund to care for future major

repairs of the building. He recommended against approving Dick's request. The board reached consensus to follow the original MOU and the supporting decisions of the board that entered into the agreement.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER**

Dallas Brown asked about the process for appointing budget committee members. Don Horton explained how the positions are advertised and the application process that involves interested parties submitting a resume and completing a questionnaire, followed by board review and appointment.

Dallas Brown noted that in the future he would like to receive the audit prior to the board meeting to allow more time for review before considering the vote to accept it.

Scott Asla asked about the district's radio ad and suggested that it did not include the district's web address. Jan Taylor explained the ad is scheduled to be updated in connection with a complete revision of the district's marketing plan. She added the new plan will be presented to the board soon.

Prepared by,

Paula Lowery  
Executive Assistant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ted Schoenborn, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Asla, Vice-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth Williamson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Wallace

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dallas Brown

## BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION

**AGENDA DATE:** January 17, 2010

**SUBJECT:** OSU-Cascades Memorandum of Understanding

**STAFF RESOURCE:** Don Horton, Executive Director

**PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:** None

**ACTION PROPOSED:** Staff recommends that the board adopt the MOU

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

On December 27, 2011 the district acquired the former Mt. Bachelor Park and Ride property. During consideration of the purchase, the executive director approached OSU-Cascades about their interest in the property. The university was in the process of acquiring a building in Shevlin Center and had been looking at the Mt. Bachelor parking lot. The vision of the university is to continue expansion of the campus in the Shevlin Center area.

Upon further discussion, the university and the district began to realize that a relationship could be forged to jointly develop the property into a center for recreation and education. The attached memorandum of understanding begins to establish a working relationship toward that end. The MOU is non-binding and calls for both agencies to work toward the development of a master development plan.

#### **BUDGETARY IMPACT**

None.

#### **MOTION**

*I make a motion to authorize the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with OSU-Cascades for the possible development of the former Mt. Bachelor Park and Ride property.*

#### **ATTACHMENT**

Memorandum of understanding

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_, 2011

PARTIES:

Bend Metro Park and Recreation District (District)  
799 SW Columbia Street  
Bend, Oregon 97702

AND

State of Oregon acting by and through (OSU - Cascades)  
The State Board of Higher Education on behalf of  
Oregon State University - Cascades Campus  
Cascades Hall  
2600 NW College Way  
Bend, Oregon 97701-5998

(collectively the Parties)

RECITALS

- A. WHEREAS, the District is guided in its operations by its adopted *Parks, Recreation and Green Spaces Comprehensive Plan* that calls for the even distribution of park and recreation facilities throughout the district; and
- B. WHEREAS, the District annually budgets the funds for the acquisition of land for the orderly expansion of the District; and
- C. WHEREAS, the Parties encourage coordination and collaborations between government agencies and private enterprise to acquire and develop spaces that benefit the community and students; and
- D. WHEREAS, the District is in the process of purchasing 11.04 acres formerly known as the Mt. Bachelor Park and Ride (Property); and
- E. WHEREAS, the Property is ideally suited for the development of recreation facilities such as swimming, fitness, ice, and event space currently unavailable on the west side of Bend; and
- F. WHEREAS, OSU - Cascades is interested in exploring options to expand its campus in the general vicinity of its recently-purchased Mill Point building; and
- G. WHEREAS, the Parties desire to explore means of collaborating to develop programs and building facilities that can benefit the general public and students and that serves the interests of the Parties; and

- H. WHEREAS, it is in the economic interest of both Parties to explore ways to avoid duplication of facilities and to attempt to make efficient use of each Party's limited financial resources by sharing in the cost of acquisition, planning, design, and development of facilities and infrastructure that meet the strategic goals of each Party; and
- I. WHEREAS, collaborative development of the site requires the agreement of proportional ownership or leasehold interests, and development, responsibility, planning, operational and other management responsibilities that would be acceptable to both Parties; and
- J. WHEREAS, this Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is non-binding but intended to set forth the process and framework for the potential creation of a long-term collaboration for the future acquisition, use, development and care of the Property to be acquired by the District.

THE DISTRICT AND OSU - CASCADES ENTER INTO THIS NON-BINDING MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING:

1. The District has entered into a purchase and sale agreement to acquire the Property (parcels 181206AA-1600, 181206AA-1603 and 181206AA-1604).
2. Once the District has acquired the Property, the Parties will work in good faith to develop a collaborative approach for shared ownership or leasing, joint-use, and development of the Property.
3. The Property is currently a large parking facility and will require a Master Plan to create a vision and lay the framework to guide the evolution of the Property's development. The Parties will work together to develop a Master Plan (the "Master Plan") for the use of the Property, in consultation with outside consultants with experience in park and school facility planning.
4. The Master Plan will include joint use of facilities if and when the Parties reach a mutual understanding of operational goals for those facilities. The Parties will work closely on the design, construction, funding, and operational plans of any joint use facilities included in the Master Plan. It is understood that there may be facilities built upon the Property for which the Parties do not share a mutual understanding of operational goals and about which the Parties do not agree on joint use and, therefore, will be the sole responsibility of the facility owner. The Master Plan will reflect the intent of the Parties to coordinate the growth of all facilities located on the Property, including both shared facilities and those that are the sole responsibility of the owner.
5. The Parties recognize that the Master Plan will affect residents of Bend, the surrounding neighborhood, and those students who choose to attend OSU-Cascades. In order to assure a design process that considers the input of these stakeholders, the Parties will strive for a process that affords stakeholders the opportunity to provide input regarding the Master Plan.

6. The Parties will equally share in the cost of the Master Plan by contributing \$60,000 each in fiscal year 2012-13, or at a mutually agreeable time, contingent on the availability of funds. A design firm with experience in park and school design will be selected by mutual consent of both Parties and be retained to lead the design and public involvement process. The Executive Director of the District and the President of OSU-Cascades will jointly develop the process for the involvement of staff and the public.
7. The District will be the fiscal agent during the master planning process.
8. Once the Parties have adopted the Master Plan, the Parties will enter into a development agreement with the city of Bend in order to identify conditions of development/off-site requirements. The Parties will include a per-acre pro rata of off-site improvement costs in the development agreement with the city of Bend.
9. Once the Parties have adopted the Master Plan, they will amend this MOU to prescribe in detail the shared use strategies and the operational and developmental responsibilities of each Party and the ownership of facilities.
10. This MOU is non-binding. In the event the Parties cannot reach a consensus on a Master Plan, either Party determines that it has insufficient funds to contribute to a Master Plan or if it is deemed to not be in the best interest of one or both Parties to continue developing a collaboration for the development of this site, this MOU shall be of no further effect. Otherwise, this MOU shall remain in effect until the completion of the Master Plan or five (5) years from the date first written above, whichever comes first.
11. This MOU may be extended, amended, or terminated at any time by written consent of both Parties.

DISTRICT:

OSU ó CASCADES

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Don Horton  
Its: Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
By:  
Its:

## Board Calendar 2011-12

*\*This working calendar of goals/projects is intended as a guide for the board and subject to change.*

### **February 7**

#### Work Session

- ◆ Budget Committee applications
- ◆ Web interface trail map
- ◆ Police Services Report
- ◆ Results of community survey
- ◆ Miller's Landing

#### Business Session

- ◆ Adopt Strategic Plan
- ◆ Appoint 2 Budget Committee members
- ◆ Kiwanis Park construction contract approval – consent agenda
- ◆ Ponderosa Park construction contract approval - consent agenda
- ◆ Concessionaire agreement – consent agenda

- ◆ **SDAO Conference – Sunriver – February 10-12**

### **February 21**

#### Work Session

- ◆ Review CIP
- ◆ Review property tax revenue forecast
- ◆ Recreation program update
- ◆ Access Plan review priorities

#### Business Session

- ◆ Appoint Benefits Committee members
- ◆ Scholarship Policy
- ◆ Financial policies
- ◆ Recreation Fees & Charges Policy
- ◆ Emergency Plan
- ◆ Risk Management Plan

### **March 6 (1 meeting)**

- ◆ Foundation update
- ◆ Sponsorship Program
- ◆ Branding campaign presentation
- ◆ Codify administration policies
- ◆ Marketing communications plan update
- ◆ Trash collection & recycling program
- ◆ Comp Plan
- ◆ Contract approval: Miller's Landing
- ◆ Design review: Hillside Renovation
- ◆ Comprehensive Plan discussion
- ◆ Benefits Committee meeting
- ◆ Shevlin Park Master Plan review
- ◆ **NRPA Legislative Forum – March 12-16**

**April 3 & 17**

- ◆ CAPRA
- ◆ Compensation & Classification Plan
- ◆ Benefits Committee meeting
- ◆ **Budget Committee Tour – April 25**

**May 1 (1 meeting)**

- ◆ Recreation Program update
- ◆ Set SDC fee schedule – Resolution
- ◆ **Budget meetings – May 14, 16 & 22**

**June 5 & 19**

- ◆ Adopt budget & impose taxes
- ◆ Adopt CIP
- ◆ Hearing & first reading – Comprehensive Plan
- ◆ Second reading & adoption – Comprehensive Plan

## BOARD AGENDA COMMUNICATION

<b>AGENDA DATE:</b>	January 17, 2012
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Strategic Plan Work Session
<b>STAFF RESOURCE:</b>	Don Horton, Executive Director Bruce Ronning, Director of Planning and Development
<b>PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION:</b>	The Board of Directors adopted the 2006 - 2010 Strategic Plan on February 7, 2006. The Plan has since been revisited on an annual basis at the onset of the budget process.
<b>ACTION PROPOSED:</b>	Board participation in a work session with Barbara Heller to begin the 2012 Strategic Plan revision.

### **BACKGROUND**

Strategic planning is intended to answer the questions: Where are we now; where do we want to go; and how will we get there? The Strategic Plan is written to address the community needs and goals identified in the BMPRD *Park, Recreation and Green Spaces Comprehensive Plan*. The Strategic Plan provides direction regarding all major initiatives and district operations anticipated during a five-year planning period. The current plan was adopted in February 2006 to address the period 2006 ó 2011. The Plan is reviewed and undergoes minor revision in discussions between the board and staff at the onset of the annual budget process. It influences the scheduling and funding of projects identified in the District's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and helps guide the creation of the annual budget and departmental work plans.

The district has engaged Barbara Heller of the national consulting firm Heller and Heller Inc. to assist in re-writing the 2012 - 2016 Strategic Plan. The Recreation and Indoor Facilities Needs Assessment, including the September 2011 community-wide survey, was the first phase of the strategic planning process. The findings and recommendations of the survey and the needs assessment as well as information obtained in staff interviews conducted in December will help inform the strategic planning effort. Ms. Heller will lead the board work session discussion which will include:

- Review of organizational performance;
- Organizational SWOT;
- Identification of Core Services;
- District Mission and Vision;
- Major Focus Areas;
- Strategy overview;
- Balanced Scorecard information; and
- Development of Strategic Themes.

The needs assessment recommendations and additional background information will be provided to the board electronically prior to the January 17 work session.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff asks the board to review the 2006 ó 2010 Strategic Plan and give thought to the strategic initiatives the district should take up in the coming five years. The 2006 - 2010 Strategic Plan is located on the district's website at: [BPRD Strategic Plan](#)

## **BUDGETARY IMPACT**

The BPRD Strategic Plan informs financial decisions in all areas of the district's work. It has long term impacts on the district's development program, recreation services and operations budgets. It helps guide the annual review and revision of the district's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as well as the creation of the annual budget and department work plans.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Additional background information will be forwarded to the board electronically prior to the January 17 work session.