

**CITY OF CORVALLIS**  
**MINUTES OF THE PARKS, NATURAL AREAS AND RECREATION BOARD**  
**AUGUST 23, 2012**

Attendance

Lynda Wolfenbarger, Vice-Chair  
 Marc Vomocil  
 Randy Willard  
 Nick Castellano  
 Phil Hays  
 Ed MacMullan  
 Tatiana Dierwechter  
 Deb Rose  
 Kevin Bogatin, 509-J District Liaison

Staff

Karen Emery, Director  
 James Mellein, Aquatic Center Supervisor  
 Jackie Rochefort, Park Planner  
 Mark Lindgren, Recorder

Visitors

Steve Duh  
 Karen Badalamenti  
 Dave Peterson  
 Colleen Wolfe

Absent/Excused

Betty Griffiths, Chair  
 Jon Soule  
 Joel Hirsch, City Council Liaison  
 Carolyn Ashton

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

Agenda Item	Information Only	Held for Further Review	Recommendations
II. Introductions	X		
III. Visitor Propositions	X		
IV. Parks and Recreation District Feasibility Study			Motion passed that the board recommended the City Council implement the district feasibility study's next steps.
V. Master Plan Update	X		
VI. Adjournment	X		The next Parks, Natural Areas and Recreation Board meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., September 20, 2012 at the Downtown Fire Station, 400 NW Harrison Blvd.

**CONTENT OF DISCUSSION**

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lynda Wolfenbarger called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- II. INTRODUCTIONS.**
- III. VISITOR PROPOSITIONS.** None.
- IV. PARKS AND RECREATION DISTRICT FEASIBILITY STUDY.**  
 Aquatic Center Supervisor James Mellein introduced Steve Duh, a consultant with Conservation Techniques, and highlighted the staff report on the feasibility of a parks and recreation district. Mellein stated that recent property tax reductions have particularly affected Parks and Recreation. The Council

directed the department in late 2010 to look at revenue alternatives. Among a couple dozen of these alternatives was conducting a parks and recreation district feasibility study.

He explained that Measures #47, #50 and #5 capped what revenues cities could get from property taxes, and expenses in recent years have outstripped revenue. Minimum wage increases, rises in vendors' costs of doing business, higher health care costs, and other increases have outstripped property taxes.

Consultant Steve Duh said his firm has been around since 2006; it focuses on parks and recreation system planning, funding and finance, and conservation strategies to help communities grapple with the same kind of changes Corvallis is faced with.

Mellein said the department was tasked to look at alternatives to offset reductions in the property tax authority. In 2009-2010 the city saw broad cuts, which have increasingly hit the department harder and harder since then. Last year, cuts were about \$750,000; the department was spared when voters approved a 3-year short-term operating levy, which gave a little breathing room to look at other alternatives. The levy sunsets in FY13-14 (June 30, 2014, the end of next fiscal year). The levy funds the Aquatic Center, the Senior Center and the Library. He said general fund tax dollars are remaining flat but expenses are rising and outpacing the ability to provide services at the current level.

He showed the department budget profile, with the Finance Department projecting a department shortfall of \$1.5 million on average over the next five years. But because the fund balance carries forward year after year, it compounds the problem.

Duh said the project scope is to determine the feasibility of whether to set up a Parks and Recreation District. He summarized that it *is* feasible; *but* with many caveats. One of the items in the project scope was to engage six other comparable parks and rec districts across the state; including Chehalem, Willamalane, Bend, Tualatin Hills, North Clackamas, and Redmond. He said the packet outlines all of those robust conversations in detail. Another piece was to talk to other local taxing districts, which could be affected, if a park district were to be set up. He talked to Benton County, Adair Village, the School District, and Philomath; each of these could be potential partners or competitors in regard to taxation and public support. The project also looked at the financial and operational implications of setting up a district, outlined the mechanics of what it means to have a district, and the pros and cons.

Duh related that the State defines a park and recreation district as a special district, much like a fire district or a library district; it is a local government, meaning it is a separate legal entity, having the responsibilities of any other local government; and has a separately elected government body, typically a board of three to five people to manage and operate the district. It is comparable to the City Council, for the district and must follow rules of the state.

Setting up a district requires a petition of 15% of registered voters, and one to three people identified as chief petitioners. It gets filed with the county and gets processed for signature gathering. Expenses for an election for the district are paid by the district, so that means that outside fundraising is needed to pay for the costs of the election. That requires creating and managing a volunteer effort, for signature gathering, fundraising, and the "Vote Yes" campaign. Though there are many details, the process is fairly straightforward, and there are a lot of local jurisdictions that can give guidance.

In terms of governance, the Parks and Rec board is the governing body. The three to five board members can be elected at large across the district, in zones, generally of equal population, or a combination thereof. The board is responsible for administration, management and operation of the district.

The state doesn't define or prescribe boundaries for a parks and rec; that's up to the petitioners. Those considerations could include locations of existing and planned facilities, catchment areas for existing facilities and program users, potential for partnership arrangements or agreements (possibly with the school district, County or other jurisdictions), and the voter profile (who might vote for, or against a district). A map of the district boundary, with a legal description, is needed for the petition and the district formation.

With regard to what the district can do, funding is the primary tool, and the property tax is the primary tool; it has a cap of up to a half percent of real market value. He estimated that that could generate around about \$20 million annually; however, this is far above what would actually be available. Other aspects include the ability to set up general obligation and revenue bonds, for capital expenditures or other improvements.

He related that in the conversations with other parks and rec districts around the state, they each had different perspectives on what to consider and lessons learned. He highlighted a major theme of paying attention to how boundaries are defined; this is the most important thing going forward. This encapsulates the base of supporters, program and facilities users, and must be large enough to finance what the district is proposed to do. Accompanying this, the petition and ballot measure define the tax rate, so that people know what the tax rate is, what the cost is, and have a dollar value attributable to the district quickly after elections in order to keep operations running.

To get to that tax rate, each of the districts developed a detailed *pro forma*, a financial plan for expenditures, potential revenues and how partnership arrangements might offset some costs; he said this was almost as critical as setting up the boundary. In defining what the *pro forma* includes, the districts also suggested looking at current services and service delivery to see what the department is currently doing that may or may not need to shift to the district. He noted that that is a potentially sensitive internal discussion, but the district, if formed, might not need to be doing all of the services that the department is currently doing. The board and staff can look at priorities and look at the clear mission. He recommended spending time looking at how tax compression affects the other tax jurisdictions within the potential district.

Regarding core issues of setting up a district and the implications of that, there are a few core items within a *pro forma* that must have extra attention. Regarding administrative support, the department currently pays about 12% of its budget for administrative support, including internal service charges for IT, HR, and other internal city support costs, about \$700,000 annually. Other comparable districts pay between \$300,000 and \$500,000, so a potential benefit of a park district could be lowering those administrative and service costs. He said further research was needed on insurance rates, and adding up dollar values of support services.

Regarding program revenues, the department currently captures about 25% of its budget from recreation program fees; the new cost recovery program could increase that. The *pro forma* must balance what's coming in relative to what the potential tax rate from property taxes should be set at. In concert with the system plan being set up, in terms of where additional facilities are needed, parks, trails, and other ways to enhance system capacity, if boundaries are set beyond the city boundary to Philomath, say, there are other capital costs may be needed to be included to ensure everyone's needs are addressed equitably.

He noted that irrigation expenses and domestic water expenses may need to be transferred to the district; those costs are about \$250,000 annually, including upkeep of supplies, equipment, vehicles, and other repair and replacement items.

He explained that “compression” occurs when the aggregate tax rate exceeds the state mandated maximum, and so tax jurisdictions get compressed in terms of how much tax revenue they get. Right now in Oregon, there is a \$10 cap for general government services, and the City aggregate tax is about \$8.90, so the available capacity for taxes is about \$1.10. That could be tapped into; however, as more taxes are put on properties throughout the region, if any of the individual properties exceed the \$10 cap, then their property taxes are capped, and missing revenue is not captured by that jurisdiction, and thus everyone’s taxes are compressed and loses potential tax revenues, even though the tax rate is a reasonable rate.

Compression will be an important part of the conversation going forward with the City Council and the County, because there is not a significant amount of capacity available, and in coordination with the county, compression must be calculated on a parcel by parcel basis, and can’t be easily projected. Therefore, there must be coordination with the County Assessor’s Office to run calculations if the project moves forward with Council direction. The tax rate must be established, with an understanding of the impact on the aggregate available tax capacity, and the effect on overall compression. He stated that you’ll want the City and County to be partners, not competitors, and not necessarily losing revenue.

Duh said the notion of Park District’s potential tax neutrality should be discussed with the City Council. If the messaging on setting up a district, with additional tax and additional government, is balanced with an agreement with City Council for some offset, or complete offset of the tax rate, to compensate for the rate established by the park district, then there’s a stronger argument for property tax neutrality. Regarding voter willingness to support such a district, the report looks at past elections. He said that it boils down to campaign messaging and a clear definition of what’s in and out, and for who; what they’re getting; how it’s different; what they’re paying for; and what’s better about having a district.

Regarding assets and personnel, setting up a park and rec district presupposes personnel, equipment, land and facilities could potentially be transferred or leased from the City, so detailed conversations with the City would be necessary, as well as looking at how that affects the potential for grants down the road. There needs to be a look at personnel and contracts, the obligation of the district to take staff, with comparable HR and PERS benefits, so employees have a measure of security as they transfer to the district.

He noted that regarding discussions with the City, the System Development Charge (SDC) for Parks could be on the table. Currently, SDC’s are for parks within City boundaries; it might behoove a new district with a boundary larger than the City’s to implement an SDC for its entire boundary, and have the City eliminate its own park SDC. That would eliminate the City transferring SDC funds to the district.

Regarding next steps, the main one is a conversation in a month or two with the City Council’s Administrative Services Subcommittee; giving a presentation and getting feedback and consultation. If the Council directs, additional next steps include defining boundaries, with the extent and distribution of services and facilities; determining a catchment area of existing program users and how that matches the department mission; and assessing the interests and willingness of voters to support a district. Once a budget *pro forma* is developed, the property tax rate requirements can be established, and there should be talks with other local taxing jurisdictions regarding tax compression.

The establishment of the district will require voter approval. It will require a public opinion research, perhaps via a survey, which can test voter sensitivity on tax rates, demand for particular services, and test key messages on selling points for establishing a district. There can be partnering with jurisdictions like the school district, Philomath, the County, Adair Village, non-profits, and agencies for program partners, facility partners and cost-sharing partners (especially if the boundaries are established beyond the city limits). There can be consultation with the Special Districts Association of Oregon (SDAO).

If the Council directs to move forward to next steps, there would need to be coordination on human resources issues, asset transfers and resolving property tax rate neutrality before a petition is put together. That would be followed by forming a campaign, creating an election strategy, and doing grassroots outreach for setting up the district.

He highlighted other information in the report. He said a potential timeline reflects the levy sunset in FY 13-14. A May-March election could be feasible, but that depends on direction from Council. Mellein said the objective is looking for a recommendation from the board on staff implementing next steps.

Ed MacMullan asked about tax neutrality in other districts; Duh replied that only Chehalem was able to successfully argue for tax neutrality within the district. The other districts were set up long ago; Chehalem could offer guidance on how to craft that conversation.

MacMullan asked if the other districts had had to increase user fees at the time they were set up; Duh replied they were set up a long time ago, none raised user fees at the time of formation. MacMullan asked if boundaries of any of these had changed; Duh said boundary changes were legitimate and doable.

Phil Hays said the transfer of property seems very complex and it seemed there could be huge costs in setting up a district, including transfers. Duh replied that there were costs in setting up a district, but if the Council is supportive of establishing a district, it could offload some of their general fund obligations. The City's legal staff could help to a degree in order to limit some external costs. There will be costs in further study of what voters think about the need for setting up a district; there are also HR-related costs and other costs. Also, election costs would be borne by the district.

Nick Castellano asked about his recommendation; Duh summarized that setting up a park and rec district was feasible for Corvallis, but the biggest question mark is whether the City Council would consider an offset in its tax rate to support and promote the establishment of a district. If that conversation is successful, that gives an opportunity to look outside current city boundaries in forming district boundaries (30% of current users live outside the city). That is an opportunity to serve those residents more directly, allowing a lower tax rate to support the overall operations and revenue needs. It is possible, but Council and voter willingness are strong caveats. He encouraged doing a survey to assess voters in terms of the need for a district, and willingness to support such a district.

Hays said the main reason to consider establishment of a parks and rec district was to make it less susceptible to fluctuations in property tax revenue; however, revenue would still be coming from property taxes, so a district would still be susceptible to fluctuations in property tax limitations and change in market value. He asked about the taxing advantage. Duh replied that one advantage was related with boundaries; with a significant portion of current users coming outside the city boundary, having a boundary reflective of the user base is an opportunity to capture more property tax at a higher rate, or have a more balanced property tax revenue stream, since you'd not be tied to city boundaries.

Another benefit is that the board of the district has a sole purpose to promote, manage and maintain the district; currently, the City Council has many other concerns it must balance. A district board would have more clear focus. Other districts across the state have been doing well and haven't been as impacted by property tax changes that nearby affiliated cities have been.

Hays said Parks are always popular here, but it sounds as if there would be no point in keeping the same boundaries, since you'd be using the same base; Duh concurred on using a larger district boundary than the city boundary. Mellein noted that last fiscal year there was a citywide \$2.2 million shortfall; about \$1.7 of that was asked for from Parks and Recreation and the library; the levy helped meet that shortfall. He related that the city has about 400 FTE's, while Parks and Rec has 34 FTE's. Hays said the passage of the levy shows that people will vote for Parks and Rec while they may not vote for other things.

Tatiana Dierwechter asked about the responses from other local municipalities to the idea, and cost savings from new collaborations. Duh replied that none of them explicitly said they'd be in support or opposition, but were concerned about impacts on compression in tax rates and their own needs to go back to their own elected officials or boards for direction on the matter. Regarding opportunities for partnerships, the school district was interested in partnering on some admin-related services like HR, payroll, legal, etc. The County discussed the district potentially taking on, managing or overseeing County properties near the City boundaries. He related that Philomath and Adair were more keen on the kind of recreation programming the city already offers.

Dierwechter asked whether there had been discussions with areas like Monroe; Duh replied that the study focused on closer jurisdictions, but that further outreach could be done.

Director Emery asked for further information on the internal service charge component, as it related to potential district efficiencies. Mellein highlighted page 13 of the report, saying the city has eight departments, and most use each other's services, and pay for them by charging each other. There are four major departments and five internal service charges, amounting to about \$700,000, roughly 12% of the operating budget. We pay about \$700,000 to other City departments for services, such as IT services. Parks own all its computers and equipment, but it pays for desktop support, server support, etc. MIS fees cover administrative services, such as the Finance Department helping cutting checks for payroll and invoices, budget help, and HR. He noted the other districts that were interviewed get their risk management services through the SDAO. Currently Public Works charges for repair services, preventative maintenance and inspections of facilities.

He said research on similar districts found that they hire a payroll clerk, someone for accounts payable, and staff and employees to take care of facilities. On page 13, those costs range from \$310,000 to \$532,000 for very similar services that the department is currently charged for. There are potential savings from forming a district; it may not use all of the services currently provided by the City.

Hays asked what the next steps recommendations would cost; Mellein replied that some would be done internally and other costs would be essentially put together if directed by the Council; he was not sure of the amount. Wolfenbarger said it sounded like a lot of extra work for Mellein; he concurred.

Marc Vomocil said he wasn't convinced yet, but felt it was worth the board recommending that the City Council implement the district feasibility study's next steps, including implementation of the boundary refinement, tax rate requirements, public opinion research, and election strategic development. Hays said formation would be a lot of work, but a district could be a good thing and could provide stability, and seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**V. MASTER PLAN UPDATE.**

Karen Badalamenti, principal of GreenPlay, noted she had previously worked with the department on cost recovery. She introduced Dave Peterson from Design Concepts, who will answer questions regarding graphs, and Colleen Wolfe from Walker Macy regarding potential recommendations for indoor facilities.

She said she would present survey results and said she would work through the various kinds of results with staff tomorrow. She related that the Corvallis survey had an excellent 15.6% return from the 4,500 households surveyed, with a very small margin of error. The survey responses were weighted regarding age and ethnicity in order to keep it statistically valid. She said there was initial concern that students would be over-represented in the survey, but in fact the opposite occurred and it was surmised that students had survey fatigue, though adequate numbers of students were reached through the random sampling (since three quarters live off campus). All the graphs are based on a statistically valid survey representation.

The surveys asked respondents about their families and households. The top results on key issues included maintaining the infrastructure that we have (preventative and predictive maintenance, caring for existing assets); healthy active lifestyles, aging well, fighting obesity; and connectivity/alternative transportation, including trails.

She highlighted the menu of what respondents had to pick from. They were asked about frequency of use; the dog off-leash parks had very high frequency of use, more than the Aquatic Center. There needs to be concern where dog parks are located. Emery clarified that the City has only one fenced dog park, but also has the highest acreage per capita in the state of dog off-leash areas.

Badalamenti related that 59% of respondents used OSU facilities, but OSU can't open them up to people not associated with OSU. About 16% use the Boys and Girls Club, KidSpirit programs, the Majestic Theater, and other facilities.

She said Master Plans often ask how important something is; she added that it was also important to ask how well users needs were being met, and looking at the nexus of the two. If needs are being met for something really important, it doesn't necessarily mean doing more of that; it may simply mean to continue to do what you are doing. The survey also looked at unmet needs that were also rated as very important.

Neighborhood parks, natural areas and trails were all deemed as part of needs being met, along with Osborn Aquatic Center and athletic fields. She highlighted a matrix of "importance" versus "needs being met". Trails were the number one thing that people want, and is a big value, but it doesn't necessarily mean to do more trails; it may mean to continue to improve connections or continuing service.

She highlighted opportunities for improvement, including field issues, such as considering non-grass field surfaces for longer playability; locating shelters elsewhere, improvements to Osborn Aquatic Center, etc. The survey asked what items most important to add or expand; trails were number one. Open space and conservation lands were also important, but these can only be added to or expanded when opportunity exists. Community gardens were a big deal; she highlighted the recently completely master plan that targeted gardens within a half-mile of all residents. She said there was specific analysis on playgrounds. Respondents wanted more indoor swimming areas; she noted that there are capacity

issues at Osborn Aquatic Center. Respondents wanted trails, shelters, and a multi-generational community center. She said the lowest rated item was cricket; however, once OSU adds thousands more students, with many coming from parts of the world that enjoy cricket, thus changing the city's demographics, the City might want to look at cricket fields. She recommended that for the next five year of the plan, looking at a cut-off point for investments just below the multi-generation community center, especially in terms of looking at costs. For example, the next item below that was an ice skating rink, but such dedicated facilities are very expensive to build and maintain.

The survey asked about elements that were important to add or improve; responses included local food growing, youth programs, fitness and wellness opportunities; leagues, sustainability, and family. Responses to unmet needs included swimming programs and special events (she noted the latter are very costly and recommended not adding more, but simply improving cost recovery of existing special events).

She related that 68% said they'd probably or definitely continue support for a levy; this points in a good direction for things like a possible parks and rec district, or just a continuance of the levy. She recommended that a levy be dedicated, since currently tax funds are discretionary, and can be re-directed by the Council. The survey found that 79% were willing to support new programs, new facilities, and adding and expanding items at a cost of between \$1 and \$25; that's really good. There may be room to be able to do good things.

Dave Peterson highlighted Resource Map A, which is a system map showing parks, trails and future trails, facilities, etc. Badalamenti said schools are shown but are discounted, since they are not always accessible, though they have some degree of public amenity, along with Boys and Girls Club and other providers.

Peterson said map Perspective A: Access to All Components, looks at the reasons that people go to parks, including design and ambiance. A well-designed park, with a tennis court, will score better than an equally nice tennis court in a not-so-nice park. It also looks at indoor facilities, trails and schools. As the orange gets darker in the map, that indicates a higher level of service and assets. The purple/yellow map is a threshold map; everything *above* the threshold is purple, and everything below that, with some sort of score, is yellow, and represents opportunity sites where ambiance can be improved or "modifiers" to improve service, like benches, can be added. There are ways to increase service besides buying more land. Badalamenti said the map showed that 75% of the service area is above the threshold; that's pretty good. Peterson said the study area was within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB); 75% of the UGB is purple. The threshold was chosen at the neighborhood parks level of service (meaning anyone living within the purple area has access to at least an average neighborhood park within a half-mile and one-mile radius catchment area).

He said the map Perspective B represents walkable access to all components. He said 48% of city residents had the ability to walk to a neighborhood park, meeting the threshold; that includes schools, neighborhood parks and trails. He noted 30% didn't meet that threshold; sometimes there were barriers to pedestrians, like rivers and highways. Badalamenti clarified that it doesn't mean that there's a service that people want within walking distance, but only that they have *some* service. She added that it's OK there aren't services at the airport and campus.

Peterson said map Perspective C represents walkable access to playgrounds (within a half-mile); 22% of the study area has walkable access to playgrounds. They included elementary school playgrounds, though they probably don't have the same level of service as City parks; so one possibility is to improve

those playgrounds. He said the consultants could be directed to do further study to analyze where kids are to determine if more services are needed where kids are.

Badalamenti added that any new schools coming on line could be an opportunity to add a new playground. Peterson highlighted a program in Denver, Learning Landscapes, which is a partnership between the Parks Department and the School District, which has created a sense of community in areas where neighborhoods surround schools. It develops the schoolyard as a neighborhood park, which bridges a gap in highly developed areas where park land are not available, by adding land that is not otherwise available, and bringing it into the system.

Dierwechter asked about opportunities to look at improving access in low-income neighborhoods and families, and how that might overlap with existing infrastructure. She noted engaging these families was critical in improving healthy school outcomes. Peterson said the study would need more direction to do more in-depth analysis if that's where the board wants to go. He said the focus was on making the maps as meaningful as possible to the City.

He highlighted map Perspective D, Composition Analysis, showing areas where between one to three components exist. These three key components are natural area or blueway, developed park component, or trails. Areas in blue on the map have access to all three areas; pink areas have two of those; and green areas only have one component. Peterson said using these different analytical tools is like all the gauges on a car: you look at all of them to determine what's going on while driving the car.

He highlighted map Perspective E, the OSU study area, looking at walkability in that study area; it found that it was deficient in green space and park acreage, well below the average in the urban growth boundary. He acknowledged that adding acreage in the area is probably very difficult. There are small parks in the area, but they have a lot of amenities in them. Badalamenti said Chintimini Park is surrounded by lots of new dense student housing; she only saw lots of students using the park when she was there last night. She said the Senior Center was the right thing in the wrong location; it is very difficult to park there, and most seniors are trying to drive there. There is an opportunity to get more bang for the buck by going to another full-service Community Center in another location with plenty of parking and on transit, and re-purposing the Chintimini facility for the changing demographic it is serving, or replacing it with green space and community gardens.

Peterson cautioned that the colors on the maps don't show whether you're meeting the need with the right service; he said Chintimini Park was a good example of a possible mismatch. He highlighted the Capacity Chart; it doesn't say if the current ratio is the right ratio; for example, whether the number of ball fields are the right number for the city; staff can provide some insight on this. Badalamenti said the study used 2010 data; she said she was willing to project the data, but noted that the Corvallis system was not growing. What she could add would be the potential impact on the system of OSU over its growth over the next period of time. She will talk to staff tomorrow about the survey; whether the ratios of trails, playgrounds, etc, are good enough, and can then look at what-ifs with the growing population.

School District Liaison Kevin Bogatin asked whether there had been a look at other, similar-sized cities; Badalamenti replied that different places have different opportunities and values, so there's no real standard. She said if there's an area that you want to be like, then we could make a comparison.

Badalamenti highlighted the Key Issues Analysis Matrix, which seeks to get a feel for the number of times something has come up as a priority in the past, colored red here. It includes long-term sustainability and financial stability, maintaining what you have, etc. It is a tool for focusing the recommendations.

Colleen Wolfe said that she would focus on the analysis of indoor facilities within parks. She said her firm, Walker Macy does landscape architecture and planning, so looks at indoor-outdoor connections and how a facility in a park benefits from the open space around it and how it supports uses within the park. The study looked at nine facilities and made nine recommendations for maintaining and improving what we have, and what kinds of things could potentially increase levels of service, program revenues and cost recovery.

Regarding Osborn Aquatic Center, there could be pool system infrastructure upgrades, including potential energy efficiency improvements, and more efficient ways to operate; covered outdoor bike parking (since that's important to the community); potentially expanding the therapy pool; providing a cardio/weight-training room; possible ADA access to the spectator area and a cardio room; potentially installing a new in-wall climbing wall; and improving all-purpose rooms to make them more rentable. Badalamenti said the emphasis was on maintaining and improving on what we already have.

Wolfe stated the Senior Center location isn't the best, so relocation should be explored. She suggested if it is relocated, there could be consideration of expanding it to a multi-generational community center that is central, walkable, and well served by parking and transit and alternate modes. It should prioritize better integration of indoor and outdoor activities. The current Senior Center could be re-purposed for other uses, or removing it and expanding the open green space of the park.

Regarding the Central Park Arts Center, the location is really great, though the building has limitations. Improvements could include providing ADA access to basement activity and craft rooms, HVAC and air conditioning, and improved daylight for crafts and projects. There is currently a lack of storage.

Wolfe related that the Majestic Theater recently got a new director. The space could be renovated to better support flexibility for different kinds of performing arts programs. These renovations could include renovating the theater seating area by ability to remove theater seats and replace them with a flat ballroom-style floor, to allow for greater flexibility in performance programming. It was designed to show movies, but could be altered to be a music or dance venue to better serve a younger audience. The stage could be also renovated to work better with performing arts. Badalamenti related that director Corey Pearlstein said he was open to a rooftop garden there.

Wolfe said Avery House Nature Center was a wonderful concept and facility in a nice place, but deferred maintenance issues must be addressed to preserve the historic building; and ADA access and indoor-outdoor connections could be improved.

The Walnut Community Room is a wonderful, new space, but could strengthen its indoor/outdoor connections, and adding a kitchenette would improve rentability.

Corl House is a wonderful facility in a nice location. She suggested minor improvements to improve rentability. These could include upgrading AV equipment and improving access signage.

Wolfe state that improvements were already underway for the park surrounding the Tunison Community Room. She suggested strengthening indoor-outdoor connections, and relocating the basketball area, which is currently in the prime parking area.

Pioneer Garage in Pioneer Park, adjacent to Avery Park, is an old single-room garage currently being used by the food coop. She suggested taking advantage of the great park space and eliminating the existing structure.

Badalamenti said the trails element was not within the purview of this study and must be added; an RFP is due on August 27, 2013 and will provide more detailed information and should improve levels of service scores. She said her firm's next visit here will be in November for more in-depth development of recommendations and will begin to piece together the CIP. They will return in January or February for a draft plan for the board to bring to the Council.

Badalamenti explained that "LOS" meant Level of Service, and is measured by quantity, condition and function of assets. It is an asset score, ranging from 1 to 3; a score of "1" means "needs improvement"; most things in the inventory are scored "2"; the cumulative score makes up the overall score for a facility. Peterson said the analysis seeks to use Corvallis' own standards; the consultant team worked with Planner Rochefort to determine what was a good, consistent fit with Corvallis. Rochefort noted that it is a generalized overview; it is refined through the CIP. Peterson added that the study didn't look at maintenance, unless its lack is affecting the functionality of a facility.

Vomocil asked about an unlabeled histogram of an average LOS of an acre served; Peterson replied that those numbers are in relation to the average neighborhood park level of service threshold of 65.3, referring to the walkability level of service chosen for this system. Everyone within purple areas had access to a neighborhood park. He explained that each component gets a score of between 1-3; and includes "modifiers", things that enhance one's experience there (e.g., benches and restrooms); the most subjective score is the design and ambiance score. Badalamenti said the threshold is the average score of average neighborhood parks, when all the components are added in; the overall score was a really great number for Corvallis.

Hays said facilities like picnic shelters and Corl House get rented out. In the County, any facility nice enough for weddings will be rented a long way out; that tells him there is a shortage. He asked what "event space" was; Badalamenti replied that that could include a number of different venues. Hays said a number of groups were also looking for meeting space; he asked if there had been an analysis of need for that or weddings. Badalamenti replied that that was not addressed in the survey, since they didn't come up through the public process; we know that there aren't enough community rooms or gym space, so they will be factored into analysis. Emery added that there are a number of types of meeting spaces in the inventory and they are not at capacity; the focus is maintaining and marketing what we already have. Peterson said some of those may not lend itself to distribution mapping. For prime wedding spaces, for example, people tend to drive to where the resource is.

MacMullan asked about the study in regard to OSU's aspiration to rapidly expand, with many students living off-campus; Badalamenti replied that the growth of the student population would certainly change things. She said having open space was huge for students. The management plan is a vision and planning document for the next five years, as well as farther out. Corvallis will probably want to re-survey in five years. Emery said currently the fastest-growing population is seniors.

Rochefort said the other changing demographic is the increasing number of foreign students and the accompanying potential for alternative activities. We may need facilities that can be converted to multiple uses. Vomocil said his understanding is that OSU wants to *get* to 30,000 students, and there are currently 22,000.

Dierwechter asked if a park district would require a new assessment. Peterson replied that the community will need to determine whether the threshold is appropriate; we may need to concentrate on Levels of Service in the other areas, and there may be opportunities to increase LOS in yellow areas.

Rochefort said that at some point we just need to settle on a stated vision for the future; similarly, Vision 2000 struggled with deciding on a likely population level.

Vomocil asked the definition of trails; Peterson replied that they considered them as an opportunity to recreate, and not just associated with commuting. Vomocil said he thought of trails as primitive dirt paths in the forest. Peterson said it was hard to distinguish the different types of trails using GIS data. Emery said there would be more information on trails within a few months. Badalamenti agreed that part of the problem is that people define trails differently. Rochefort said when the trails piece is added, then the plan will be much more detailed.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m.