

CITY OF CORVALLIS
MINUTES OF THE PARKS, NATURAL AREAS AND RECREATION BOARD
OCTOBER 16, 2013

Attendance

Betty Griffiths, Chair
Lynda Wolfenbarger, Vice-Chair
Joshua Baur
Jon Soule
Ed MacMullan
Deb Rose
Ralph Alig
Phil Hays
Marc Vomocil

Excused

Tatiana Dierwechter
Michael Mayes
Joel Hirsch, City Council Liaison
Kevin Bogotin, 509-J District Liaison

Staff

Karen Emery, Director
Jude Geist, Park Operations Supervisor
Jackie Rochefort, Park Planner
James Mellein, Aquatic Supervisor
Sharon Bogdanovic, Sr. Center Supervisor
Mark Lindgren, Recorder

Guests

Julie & Dennis Hansen
Lori Stephens
B.A. Beierle

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

	Agenda Item	Summary of Recommendations
III.	Approval of September 19, 2013 Meeting Minutes	Approved as presented.
IV.	Visitors' Propositions	Motion passed the board recommend to the City Council to accept ownership of the house and place it at Owens Farm.
V.	Budget Process- Director Emery	Information only.
VI.	Senior Center Gold Pass	Motion passed to table the proposal until finding out the levy results, and dealing with it as part of the overall budget process.
VII.	Linn County & Corvallis Primary Code Differences	Information only.
VIII.	PNARB Goal Four Discussion	Information only.
IX.	PNARB Goal Five Discussion	Information only.
X.	Staff Updates	Information only.
XI.	Commissioner & Liaison Updates	Information only.
XII.	Other Business	Information only.
XIII.	Adjournment	The next meeting will be held November 21, 2013 at 6:30 p.m., at Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Betty Griffiths called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2013 MEETING MINUTES

Josh Baur moved to approve the minutes as presented; Lynda Wolfenbarger seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

IV. VISITORS' PROPOSITIONS.

Julie Hansen introduced her husband, Dennis Hansen; **Lori Stephens** of Broadleaf Architecture; and **BA Beierle**. She said she learned of the presence of a historic schoolhouse on 9th Street several years ago. The building is not well known, it is not on any survey of historic buildings, it is not on the Historic Registry, and was used as a school between 1912-1929, after which it became a residence. She tried but failed to purchase the building earlier this year, it was then sold, and the current owner of the 1.34 acre site wishes to develop the land to a higher density. She asked the owner for permission to move the building, which otherwise was planned to be demolished soon.

She related that historian Mary Gallagher found that several children from the Knotts family (of the nearby historic Owens Farm) attended Sunnyside School. She said that because of that link, she discussed with staff moving the building to nearby Owens Farm.

She said the building has problems, but the bones of the building were still good. The owner gave permission to move the building, and she was proposing moving the building to Owens Farm, where staff were suggesting re-purposing it as a visitors center. She stated that she and her husband will pay for the moving costs, and asked the City to accept the offer.

Hansen related that the owner moved back his development plans to facilitate the move, but it must be moved by January 15, 2014, otherwise, demolition will move forward (there is already a demolition permit). BA Beierle stated that Chris Schoap had previously moved a building for her, that he had already moved a number of historic buildings, including the Peavy House, and trusted that he would do a good job.

Hansen related that Schoap estimated his costs at between \$20,000 and \$24,000, and then it would have to be temporarily “parked” on the Owens Farm site until a survey and other site preparations were completed; the second move was estimated at between \$4,000 and \$6,000. Utility companies must also be paid, though there are few wires on the route, which is fairly short. State approval is required for crossing the right of way and the highway, and she will handle utility company contacts.

Hays said Consumers Power charged \$1,000 per power line during the recent Commanders Building move; Hansen guessed there were fewer than thirty overhead lines. Hays asked if Schoap’s quote included building a foundation; Mr. Hansen replied that it did not; it would temporarily sit on cribbing at Owens Farm. Planner Rochefort said she would handle the foundation.

Beierle said the building’s ridgeline was straight and the walls true. She acknowledged that moving a building from its original context was a last resort. The schoolhouse is in the style of a sturdy, squat bungalow. It was also known as Bryant School and Mudflat School (as the area was originally very muddy). The Owens family has been tied to the structure for a very long time. She said Schoap moves few structures and that the city was lucky to have his offer of help on the project. Hays noted that there wasn’t much change of context, since the school building was originally isolated from the town; Beierle agreed that it was an ideal opportunity.

Rochefort outlined procedures for the move if it were to be accepted and the background of Owens Farm. She said there was a City process for moving and that she would work with the Hansens on permits and contacting nearby property owners. There is only one power line and only a short distance, but cautioned that the farm driveway was very narrow. She will work with the City Forester regarding protecting trees and City staff on encroachment issues. She said a permit was also needed to place the building on Owens Farm, and a permit to move it from the City into the County.

She displayed the conceptual plan for Owens Farm. She said she spoke to former owner Tom Owens and his family about the plan to move the school there, and related that they were excited about the proposal. She said BA Beierle got the Owens Farm homestead into the Benton County Registry, so the schoolhouse would probably be sited just outside

the homestead area to avoid having to obtain another level of permissions. She said Benton County strongly suggested putting up an interpretive sign (similar to those downtown) to make clear that the schoolhouse was *not* originally part of the Knotts-Owens Farm property.

Rochefort said part of the Owens Farm Master Plan included a classroom and that it would be a working farm, to give schoolchildren and other visitors a sense of what a farm was like in the 1800's. She said it made sense to locate the school adjacent to the proposed area for bus parking.

It would move up the gravel road and up a dirt road, siting it just south of the existing homestead. She said staff would arrange to have the site surveyed and graded. She is getting quotes on the work. With the board's recommendation to accept the gift, the City Council could consider the donation at their November 4 meeting.

Baur asked about the cost of renovation to make it into a visitors center classroom, including bathrooms. Rochefort estimated the cost of the *entire* Owens Farm site work (along with the house and barn as well) at roughly \$1 million. The Friends of Parks and Recreation group is working on fundraising, and a sizable donation has been promised from the Owens family. The barn needs immediate attention and an assessment, and the house roof also needs work in order to buy some time. It is in the upcoming CIP. Director Emery said the donation from the Owens family was sizable and grants would be pursued as match.

Rochefort said the farm house had been vacant since September 2012; staff will inventory and empty the house of its contents. Julie Hansen said the school house has been vacant only recently. Rochefort clarified the Hansens' donation was to move and stabilize the structure.

Phil Hays moved the board recommend to the City Council to accept ownership of the house and place it at Owens Farm; Josh Baur seconded; motion passed. Hays thanked the Hansens for saving the house.

V. BUDGET PROCESS.

Aquatic Supervisor James Mellein said the budget process was starting much earlier this year, since staff is looking for direction on the FY14-15 budget and beyond. He highlighted the draft budget in the board packet. He said the City Manager was seeking long-term sustainability and achieving a stable budget for the next year as well as the next five years.

He highlighted the City Manager's Attachment A: The Six Steps to Budget Sustainability. Along with establishing a firm expenditure limit, it integrates priority based budgeting, has better management of the size of the work force, improved budget transparency, examines the inventory of real property assets for possible sale, and builds a substantial reserve to protect against future downturns.

He highlighted key dates in the budget process. In September 2013 the Finance Department developed and presented preliminary revenue estimates using a five-year history, and a FY14-15 expenditure limit. That limit starts with dedicated revenue. The Corvallis Arts Center, formerly a non-department expenditure line item, is now under the Parks and Recreation Fund. While the department has always been in charge of supporting the Center, it will now be part of the budget. He stated \$100,000 will be set aside for City-wide CIP.

It will involve sharper cuts now in order to stop the downward spiral. In October, the City Council and the Budget Commission invited advisory boards and commission chairs to hear about the new budget process. Between October through January, some departments will work with advisory boards and commissions to develop recommended funding priorities for use of available resources.

The department will soon learn what the expenditure limit is for FY 14-15, much earlier than usual. Emery added that with fixed budget expenditure limits this early, the department has the opportunity to have the board give input and help decide what to do.

Jon Soule asked how the levy vote affected the process. Mellein replied that the budget was being built assuming the levy will not pass, without the Aquatic Center and the Senior Center, and without those facilities' services and revenues. After the November election, if the levy passes, their expenditures and revenues will be added back into the budget. Griffiths asked about expenditures for those facilities not in the levy; Emery explained that the expenditures of non-levy property taxes were roughly \$171,000 for the Aquatic Center and \$20,000 for the Senior Center.

Emery explained that the board will know the result of the levy when it next meets. She said if the levy fails, then the department will proceed to put together a budget for FY14-15 without the Aquatic Center and the Senior Center. If the City Council decides to put it on the May election, and if it is passed, then that will allow a few weeks to put it back in the budget.

Mellein said the framework for the budget process will establish the expenditure limit up front, and it will be less than it is for the current year, though the exact number is not yet known. There will not be enough money for all programs as designed. He asked the board for what information it needed to help develop priorities for FY14-15 and beyond. He anticipated four potential expenditure increases including COLA increases, healthcare cost increases, minimum wage increases, and step increases.

Hays said that "developing priorities" in effect meant determining what we are going to cut. Mellein replied that the direction staff has been given is to ask boards and commissions to look at what programs and services the department wanted to offer, using its property tax dollars, and have a discussion on priorities, and have less of a discussion of what we'll not do anymore.

Hays responded that the department just went through a master planning process in which the community said, through surveys, what it wanted; maybe we simply should look at juggling department expenditures to match what the community has told the department it should be doing. The top community priority expressed was better trails, though it hadn't put much into that in the past. We might have to restructure some things; the department has put more emphasis on some things lower down in the community surveys.

Emery said staff were asking the board to look at what we currently do, and use that data. She said staff could give information on program areas, such as youth recreation, and list costs, revenue, and cost recovery in order to provide some background. Board members said that would be helpful; MacMullan said data on numbers of users would also be helpful.

Hays said one of his concerns is having to make value judgments on what areas do for the community; it may not come entirely down to dollars. There may be programs that are money-losers that the department still wants to support. Emery said the board may next want to talk about values as a screening filter; Hays said that that was in the master plan.

Soule said there didn't appear to be provision for covering increased expenditures with increased fees for programs. Emery replied that there was some flexibility, and in December, the department could present the Council with a modified, supplemental budget; it could also do so in May.

Hays asked when the proposed changes must take effect. Mellein replied that the budget starts July 1, 2014 and the payroll for FY14-15 starts June 16, 2014. Hays suggested the board immediately look at programs that would survive if users were willing to pay raised fees so that the program revenue provided 100% of costs. If users are not willing to pay increased fees, they have in effect, voted on it. Emery said there was an opportunity to vet revenues for a couple weeks.

Vomocil noted the five-year history used by the Finance Department to set projections doesn't reflect that over the last year or two, the department went through an extensive cost recovery process and made changes. It set priorities, and showed where the department was willing to subsidize programs, using the cost recovery triangle model. Vomocil asked if the expenditure limit would be net or gross; Mellein replied that it was gross. Vomocil said it should be net, instead; Mellein said that that is where the supplemental budget comes into play.

Soule said a number of programs, such as swim lessons, for example, were dependent on the Osborn facility, and run through the Osborn budget; if we lose Osborn, we lose all those programs. He suggested looking at individual programs as well as the Osborn budget as a whole. Emery said Senior Center and Aquatic Center budgets have contained subaccounts and are not blended into Parks and Recreation. The accounting system clearly shows any money expended or revenue brought in unique to either facility.

Emery stated that the budget was being built without the facilities, and depending on what the voters decide, the facilities will either be in or out. The levy is specifically dedicated money for those two facilities. The only flexibility with the Senior Center is with the historic \$20,000 of annual subsidies, while the Aquatic Center has \$171,000 of non-levy subsidies.

Hays said if the Senior Center and the Aquatic Center are shut down, the board has to look at what programs through them would have to be cut; some programs, especially at the Senior Center, might be done elsewhere, and we'd have to look at the impact of the closures, noting that that would have a big impact on fees. Soule said his concern was that given the upcoming hit from the expenditure limit, so that if the levy passes, the department would be obligated to spend the levy money to operate Osborn Aquatic Center, committing the department to additional expenses at Osborn; that could do great damage to everything that is not at Osborn and the Senior Center. Hays added that if it doesn't pass, there would also be a cost to maintain the facilities.

Emery said staff could get the board most of the information it had asked for by November 1 for consideration; however, the most critical budget information must wait until December.

Vomocil asked if the budget was independent of the CIP process; Mellein replied that it was not. He highlighted page three of Organizational Budget Goals in the packet: \$100,000 will be set aside for facility maintenance projects (CIP). The amount will be transferred to the Capital Construction Fund each year so that it can be carried over from year to year, within limits, to do single large dollar projects. Mellein explained that amount was for the entire city; several board members said that that was not much. Griffiths said much of the CIP came from grants and SDC and said she wasn't sure what the existing CIP amount was.

Griffiths asked about reserves; Mellein replied that future reserves will be the reserves that are currently being set aside, for the building reserve fund, the Aquatic Center, the vehicles reserves, and softball reserves. It will be up to the board's guidance what, if any, contributions should be made to those reserves in the future. Griffiths asked about the Council policy on reserves; Mellein said staff will find out, but noted that many financial policies were changed two years ago.

Griffiths said there were typical organizational strategies regarding reserves; she advocated not losing facilities just because nothing was budgeted for them in reserves, such as building maintenance. Hays said the department had reserves that the rest of the city couldn't touch; Emery said there was a Building Maintenance reserve at Osborn Aquatic Center (Griffiths noted that that was part of the bonding for the facility); also the softball program takes \$5 per player (from 2,000 players) and puts that into a reserve for softball field improvements, noting that that was an internal policy that could be changed by the board.

Vomocil asked how establishment of a Parks and Recreation District would affect this process. Emery said such as district would be a separate legal taxing authority, not part of City government, and governed by a five-person board, which would decide how services would be provided, and funded by a dedicated amount of property taxes.

Emery stated she would send out the information the board has asked for next week, and encouraged members to email her with question in order to prepare for the November board meeting.

Griffiths said given projected expense increases, she asked if the following year would have a new expenditure limit; Mellein replied that such increases would *not* be built into future year increases in expenditure budgets, but must be accommodated into the year's total budget. The assessed property tax receipts would generally only go up a little, and increased fees could provide alternative revenue.

Griffiths asked if there was any discussion of alternative sources of revenue for the city as a whole; Emery replied the Council was still discussing a matrix of revenue alternatives. Hays related that the mayor had recently dismissed the possibility of a sales tax. Griffiths highlighted the entertainment tax on the list of alternative revenues.

Vomocil asked for staff advice on what they felt were high priorities. Baur added the board must keep in mind vulnerable populations that need services but could not pay for them. Emery said staff would provide data on the Family Assistance Program, including the number of people served. Vomocil said the triangle cost recovery model could be used in seeking to get more cost recovery.

VI. SENIOR CENTER GOLD PASS

Senior Center Supervisor Sharon Bogdanovic distributed a memo, noting that the Senior Center Gold Pass Program had had a negative impact on customers. She said the idea was to bring in more revenue, and it did the first year, but it involved a high level of staff and volunteer time to implement and upset many customers. Many users said they'd just passed a levy to keep the facility open, but now were being asked to pay more, and walked out angry.

The \$25 In-City annual pass program used a \$15 coupon to make it more attractive the first year, though it required extra staff and volunteer energy that could better be used elsewhere. She said that discontinuing it would generate more customer goodwill. They sold 845 passes. Financial assistance is available for low-income customers through two scholarship programs. It brought in roughly \$25,000 of revenue, minus the coupon, so netting about \$13,000 in the first year. She recommended discontinuing the program, given the constant negativity about the program.

Hays asked what a single class, say yoga, would cost; Bogdanovic said the beginning class was \$78 and advanced was \$93, and after the coupon, many would end up spending another \$10 for the Gold Pass membership; it feels like a significant amount to many people. Lynda Wolfenbarger noted that participants from out of city limits were charged

extra; Bogdanovic noted that staff and volunteers were still struggling to sell the out-of-city fee. There was discussion of cost recovery targets. Emery said the Gold Pass originated from consultant recommendations to strengthen historically weak areas, and a way to capture revenue.

Wolfenbarger said the memo doesn't address lost revenue from upset customers. Emery said the pass was becoming a barrier to some customers, and damaging goodwill.

MacMullan asked how phasing it out would affect users of passes; Bogdanovic replied that staff was discussing that anyone purchasing membership as of July 1, 2013 would receive a credit. Staff would send out 569 letters to explain the plan. They can give customers choices on what to do with the credit. She said many regular users would likely prefer to keep the sum in their account.

Soule asked for participation data going back several years that could demonstrate a drop in other revenue generating activities of the Senior Center that could justify eliminating the pass. Emery said that historic participation levels were available; Rochefort added that there were also parking problem impacts, as well. Bogdanovic noted that implementation of the cost recovery model increased fees, as well, and may have affected class participation. The Center has been working hard to increase program participation, so she doubted a drastic decrease would be demonstrated. Bogdanovic highlighted complaints at the front desk.

Soule said it would be terrible to implement a change in the pass; in essence, cutting fees at this time. Emery related that some participants were angry enough to phone her, saying they'd voted to pass the last levy, but the Gold Pass was an additional fee, and they didn't understand it. Mellein related his staff has also fielded the same complaints. Baur added that many users at State and Federal facilities express the same concerns about passes.

Bogdanovic said there were \$5 day passes; she said that those would be dropped, as well, if the Gold Pass was dropped. She said many drop-in programs were very well attended (around 500-600 people per month). Hays said participants of drop-in classes get exposed to other programs that they might spend money on. Hays said that with the proposed budget, the board would be looking at programs and costs, and probably looking at increasing some fees. If a program isn't popular enough to pay for its expenses, maybe it will be dropped. We're meeting our goal now, but all fees could be increased to meet new cost recovery goals, increasing fees enough to make up the difference; Bogdanovic said customers would understand that.

Griffiths asked if the board's recommendation would have to be approved by the Council; Emery said it would not, City Council reviews cost recovery as a whole annually, but not by each specific fee. Hays said that if staff recommended dropping it, then board should recommend eliminating it; he cautioned that doing so before the election would smack of electioneering, however.

Soule moved to table the proposal until finding out whether the levy passes, and dealing with it as part of the overall budget process; Hays seconded. Vomocil noted that even seniors that can well afford a fee will grumble about it. Wolfenbarger said the advanced yoga class has just the bare minimum number to keep it going, but beginning yoga has 18-23 participants; Bogdanovic said it was one of the biggest classes. Wolfenbarger said that currently, Senior Center participants must circle the Senior Center and the block and wait for the previous Senior Center classes to depart in order to find a place to park. **Motion passed unanimously.** Griffiths said getting trends and specifics from staff would help; Bogdanovic will bring the information back to the board.

VII. LINN COUNTY & CORVALLIS PRIMARY CODE DIFFERENCES.

Planner Rochefort summarized that Orleans Park was in Linn County and zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU). She said that EFU and Ag Open Space (a City designation) were very similar. For the City and Linn County, civic uses are limited to wireless telecommunications lines up to 60' in height. Agricultural type uses are consistent between the two. Accessory Uses allowed outright tend to support agriculture, and are similar; Special Uses are both consistent. Linn County has different uses that are not outright permitted but fall under Conditional Use, but are generally related to soil types; for example, you could have an accessory building that supports agricultural uses. Linn County is more prescriptive in this detail. In both zones, the goal is to protect and enhance natural and agricultural lands. The City also has the Conservation/Open Space zone, which generally limits use to "non-consumptive" recreational uses, such as hiking.

Griffiths asked about Linn County requirements for a water treatment use there. Rochefort said the Willamette River Greenway is the same for parks and industrial lands along the length of the river. A water treatment use would require a Greenway permit from Linn County, and it would have the same criteria as the City of Corvallis.

Soule said the concern was that Linn County requirements would be less stringent than those of Corvallis. Rochefort replied she had to choose a similar Corvallis zone to compare to Linn's. Hays noted that Linn County required a 100' setback from the rivers edge, while at Riverfront Park it is 150'. Rochefort said she could bring back more information. The riparian setbacks are different from the State Greenway standards, and that varies. She will bring information on riparian setbacks to the board.

Hays asked if State EFU rules allowed for public facilities such as wastewater works; Rochefort replied that EFU zoning was a County issue; the outcome of whether a proposed use is allowed often depends on how it is described. Talking Waters could be described as a recreation use with an added feature of cleaning water. Some uses are allowed under the code outright but the code also allows conditional permit uses.

Griffiths noted the park is already a conditional use, and that would have to be modified for a water treatment plan. Rochefort said it depends on how it is presented; it could be presented as a park that also has a water treatment feature, or a stormwater facility with trails. Hays said that with a 150' setback, there wouldn't be any way for the Public Works

wastewater treatment proposal to work. Soule said that if PNARB is in charge of the site, there was no reason to treat it any differently than any other City park. Soule said we could ask Linn County to make a zoning change. Griffiths asked Planner Rochefort to bring back the requested additional information.

VIII. PNARB GOAL FOUR DISCUSSION. Discussion postponed.

IX. PNARB GOAL FIVE DISCUSSION. Discussion postponed.

X. STAFF UPDATES

Mellein said the 50 meter pool has been repaired. Rochefort said staff will present the CIP to the CIP Commission on October 29. Last night, the Planning Commission voted to deny the Comp Plan amendment and Planned Development overlay change for the Campus Crest project at Witham Hill.

Jude Geist reported that Herbert Farm was moving forward on Phase I of the restoration plan. Partner Applied Ecology is applying for an OWEB grant, to raise plants of resource value at the farm to plant for other restoration projects.

XI. GOALS REPORTS.

Deb Rose related Goal #3 is to develop a plan to increase funding for the department. Committee members met and sent out ideas to the rest of the board; she asked commissioners to comment. The committee will meet to prioritize ideas on October 31, at 1 p.m. at the Aquatic Center. Griffiths said the rating scheme included small and big ideas, and reflecting varying amounts of effort (other than staff) and financial returns for each proposal.

XII. COMMISSIONER & LIAISON REPORTS:

Griffiths asked FA Coop members to vote on the Friends of Corvallis Parks and Recreation to be among the 16 groups to get donation “beans”.

Griffiths related that she, Steve DeGhetto, and Sharon Bogdanovic attended the recent Urban Services Committee (USC) meeting to give testimony based on the board’s September motion on Senior Center parking impacts, and proposed designating 39 spaces for Senior Center users, using passes; however, there was not a positive response from the committee. Some USC members suggested creating more parking within the park.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.



MEMORANDUM

To: Parks, Natural Areas, and Recreation Board
From: Karen Emery, Director Parks and Recreation
Stephen DeGhetto, Assistant Director Parks and Recreation
Sharon Bogdanovic, Senior Center Supervisor
Date: October 17, 2013
Subject: Discontinuation Gold Pass Program at the Chintimini Senior Center

Issue: The Chintimini Senior Center Gold Pass Program has had a negative impact on customers.

Background: The Chintimini Senior Center created a Gold Pass Program as recommended in the Cost Recovery Methodology established for the Parks and Recreation Department. The Chintimini Senior Center began requiring a Gold Pass Membership to participate at the Senior Center July 1, 2012. The Gold Pass created alternative revenue to reduce the reliance on property tax allocation for the Senior Center operations. The Gold Pass Membership annual fee is \$25 for a City resident, \$31 for non-residents. The Gold Pass Membership is required for all Senior Center programs, unless a program has been designated exempt due to funding from an alternative source (sponsorship, grant funding, or donation).

Staff has received many complaints from customers about the additional fee and the required membership. Senior Center staff and volunteers spend a great deal of time and energy selling and explaining the membership to customers. The Senior Center lost customers due to the additional fee of the Gold Pass Membership. Management of the Gold Pass Membership has created addition work for staff and has been time consuming and difficult to operate and manage.

The Chintimini Senior Center's primary source of funding originates from the voter approved operating levy. The Cost Recovery Methodology was implemented to reduce property tax reliance.

Discussion: Participants and community members have shared negative feedback over the implementation of the Gold Pass Program. The Target Tier Cost Recovery minimum for level two is 45%. In Fiscal Year 12-13 the level Two Tier recovered 93.45%. This exceeded expectations and the trend continues this Fiscal Year 13-14. The first quarter cost recovery for Tier Two is currently at 66.36%. First Quarter cost recovery without the Gold Pass revenue would be 51.71%. This positive performance allows the Parks and Recreation Department the latitude to discontinue the Gold Pass Fee while still meeting Cost Recovery.

Recommendation: Staff recommends Parks, Natural Areas, and Recreation Board advise staff and give staff direction on this issue.