



City Parks Advisory Board – Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 7, 2024 – 4:00 P.M.
520 E. Cascade Avenue, P.O. Box 39, Sisters, OR 97759

City Parks Advisory Board Attendees:

Board Members: Eli Madrone, Emily Curtis, Nancy Connolly, Doug Buell, Emily Coonrod (Zoom), Asa Sarver
Absent: Molly Baumann, Jennifer Holland, SPRD
Council Representative : Gary Ross (Zoom)
Staff: Scott Woodford, CDD Director, Paul Bertagna, Public Works Director,
Visitor: Steve Donovan of Donovan Enterprises, LLC
Recording Secretary: Carol Jenkins

I. CALL TO ORDER

Board Chair Madrone called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. A quorum was established. The agenda for February 7, 2024, was approved and seconded.

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION - None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 6, 2023

Board Member Connolly made a motion to approve the minutes for December 6, 2023, as presented.

Board Member Curtis seconded. Motion passes.

IV. STAFF

- a. Park System Development Charges and Parks Level of Service.
- b. Sisters Community Garden Proposal.

Director Woodford asked *Director Bertagna* to explain the process for the Park System Development Charges (SDC's) and the Parks Level of Service (LOS) before introducing the consultant, Steve Donovan with Donovan Enterprises, LLC.

Director Bertagna stated that as part of this process we are changing not only the cost amounts per SDC but changing the methodology as well. When changing the methodology, you calculate, access, provide a 90-day notice, and hold a public hearing. We have already started the 90-day clock, and what it does is allow interested people, mostly the building community, that would be interested in these going out right. To be able to engage, provide

comments, feedback, work with staff and the consultant on making sure everything is legit and making sure i's are dotted and t's are crossed, etc.

Director Woodford gave some history on the Park System Development Charges (SDC's) and Level of Service (LOS).

Park System Development Charges (SDC's) and Level of Service (LOS).

Feedback from the Parks Board on the proposal to increase the SDC rate for park improvements and consideration of an increase in the LOS parks standard in Sisters.

Background:

The Parks Master Plan (PMP) for Sisters was updated last year and is a 20-year plan to ensure that parks facilities are constructed in line with community desires and growth projections. The PMP includes a Capital Improvement Plan with specific improvements and costs associated needed to keep pace with growth. Park improvements are typically funded through SDC's which are fees charged to new development to ensure growth pays for its impacts. Grants, bonds, and partnerships are also ways to pay for parks. By law, SDC's can only pay for improvements to create future capacity and cannot be used to fix an existing deficiency.

Typically, SDC rates are examined upon update of the PMP update to ensure that the rates are appropriate to result in adequate funding for park improvements. The city has retained Steve Donovan of Donovan Enterprises, LLC to help conduct that process, which will culminate with the City Council review. He has put together a Power Point presentation and will join us for the meeting to present and answer questions. The current SDC rates would generate only \$2.7 million over 20 years – not enough to pay for the CIP projects in the PMP (approximately \$14.3 million).

LOS is an industry standard benchmark for how well a community is providing park space for its citizens. The updated PMP noted that our current LOS is on the low side (2.04 acres/1,000 people currently) compared to other similarly sized towns and, perhaps, not in keeping with community desires. The PMP recommends increasing the LOS to 5 acres/1,000 residents. According to the National Recreation and Park Association website, "the typical park and recreation agency offers one park for every 2,287 residents served, with 10.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. But park and recreation agencies are as diverse as the communities they serve, and what works well for one agency may not be best for your agency. Therefore, you need benchmark data to identical the best practices to serve your community optimally". To meet the LOS target of 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents, the city will need to develop about 26 acres of additional parkland over the next 20 years.

Analysis:

If we raise the LOS to 5.0 acres per 1,000 acres, Sisters will become "park deficient". In other words, we will not have enough parkland to meet the needs of our current population.

Raising the LOS will result in 55 percent of the parks needed by 2042 not being able to be funded by SDC's and so they will have to be funded with other sources, leaving 45 percent of the 20-year CIP that will be SDC eligible. So, if we do raise the LOS, the discussion will be how do we fund the 55 percent of parks that are not SDC eligible.

If we raise the rates to fund 55 percent of SDC eligible parks, that will increase the fee from \$1,193 to \$3,376 (less than what Prineville, Redmond, and Bend charges).

Staff requests the CPAB feedback on the recommendation to increase the LOS and on the proposed park SDC rates that will help inform the City Council's decision.

Director Bertagna stated that Consultant Steve Donovan has done SDC work for us on Transportation SDC's, water and sewer multiple times, and this is the first time with parks.

Mr. Donovan stated that parks SDC's are different than water, sewer, and transportation because of what we call a Level of Service (LOS) approach to this. He stated that we will be talking about the history and the background of the parks SDC's, the policy issues which are very important, and then loop into the 2023 Parks Master Plan Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) which is substantial, the specifics of the details, and a forecast of what is being proposed relative to what other communities are charging in other neighborhoods in Central Oregon.

Park SDC Methodology Update Presentation – *Steve Donovan, Donovan Enterprises, LLC*
Agenda: History and background of parks SDC's, Policy issues concerning SDC's, 2023 Parks Master Plan Capital Improvement Plan, Specific details of the analysis, Forecast of single-family Parks SDC, Parks SDC's in neighboring communities, Next Steps.

History: Current Park SDC methodology adopted in 2011 and updated in 2016 via Parks Master Plan Update. The estimated population in 2016 was 2,315 people, and the total 2016 Parks 20-year Master Plan Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was just \$2,004,634.

Current Conditions – 2024: The new Parks Master Plan was adopted by the City Council on April 12, 2023 (Ordinance 527). The estimated population in 2023 was 3,778 people. The total of the 2023 Parks 20-year Master Plan CIP went from \$2,004,634 in 2016 to \$14,362,156 now. The other key point of the Parks Master Plan is a recommended Level of Service (LOS) of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 of the population. This LOS is the bar we have to achieve to make SDC's.

SDC Methodology: Level of Service (LOS) is the guiding force in the calculation of the parks SDC's, by current LOS standards, Sisters is "park deficient", no capacity in the existing system to serve growth, SDC's will be based on planned future project costs.

Who pays SDC's: This is a charge for new and future Development, SDC's charged at the time of permit issuance, and it consists of three components – Reimbursement Fee (a fee that we would charge developers to buy into existing built capacity), Improvement Fee (is for planned future capacity that the developers will buy into), and Compliance Fee (the Statue allows cities to charge a compliance fee to be in compliance with the Statue). There are things that the city has to do relative to accounting and reporting of SDC's.

Use of SDC's: SDC's are "restricted revenues" under Oregon Budget Law, cannot be spent on operations or maintenance, cannot pay overhead on General Funds, it must be spent directly into a separate account or fund and needs to be restricted for the purpose of paying for planned future capacity. There is an annual report required on receipts, expenditures, and cash balances.

Policy Issues Concerning SDC's: SDC's have an impact on how and when development occurs, and we calculate based on the statute the maximum price we can charge for SDC's. The City Council must strike a balance from a policy standpoint for growth paying for growth, attracting smart growth and living wage jobs yet balance that against existing customers subsidizing growth. The Council is clearly aware of this process.

A description of the different parks in Sisters (17 projects) requiring that based on the scale, about 41 new acres of parkland and \$14 million dollars' worth of expenditures – a vast array of project in the Parks Master Plan. Each project is identified in the plan stating their Project ID, Project Title, Description, Size (Acres) and Cost associated with each. Harold and Dorothy Barclay Park, Fir Street Park, Cliff Clemens, Creekside Park, Village Green Park, Creekside Campground, Wild Stallion Park, Creekside Park Eastward Expansion, Future Northwest Park, Sun Ranch Park, East Portal, Lazy Z Ranch Open Space, Unsited: Pickleball Complex, Unsited: Pickleball Court (2 courts only), Unsited: Dog Park, Wildlife Observation Areas, and Whychus Creek Access.

Mr. Donovan stated that the 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population is the LOS we aspire to. Based on today's population of 3,778 people estimated and there are 7.02 acres of parkland – there is a current service level of 1.86 acres per 1,000 and below the 5 acres which is the bar and recommended LOS. This shows that you are deficient relative to the LOS recommendation. We took a look at what is going to happen in 20-years and based on the population growth of going out to 6,917 people and keeping that bar of 5 acres per 1,000 of population, by 2042 we should have an inventory of 34.59 acres of parkland where there are only 7 today and to make up for the deficiency, you will need to add 18.89 acres to the total to bring up to the LOS that is required and then growth would pay for 15.7 acres of that total 34.5 acres. Of that 14 million Capital Improvement Plan only 45 percent is going to the SDC calculation – 55 percent is going to need to come from somewhere else. Like many communities, the tax base is not getting covered, and parks are going to a fee base across the country where fees for service are being instituted where parks are almost being treated like a utility.

Reimbursement Fee: No capacity in the current park system, LOS analysis – 1.86 acres/1,000 now, and 5.00 acres/1,000 required.

Improvement Fee: 45.38 percent of 2023 20-year CIP is SDC eligible based on LOS analysis, 54.62 percent of 2023 20-year CIP must be funded from other sources. Parks Total Acres Planning in 2042 = 34.59.

A visual was given and discussed on the Park SDC Components – Single-Family, Proposed, Current, Difference, and the Proposed Schedule of Parks SDC's - Customer Classification, Number of Dwelling Units, Reimbursement, Improvement, Compliance, and Total.

Mr. Donovan stated that for a single-family home, we are currently charging \$1,193 and based on the Master Plan Capital Improvement Plan and the LOS bar, we are recommending that it be raised to \$3,676. For multi-family it would be lower – a duplex would be \$1,910 and triplex would be \$3,820 etc. It is a multiple based on dwelling units.

Neighboring Communities System Development Charges – Parks SFR.

- Bend = \$ 10,852
- Redmond = \$ 6,417
- Prineville = \$ 4,340
- Sisters – Proposed = \$ 3,676
- Madras = \$ 1,175
- Sisters – Now = \$ 1,193

Board Chair Madrone asked if this process can be phased in or something that is one time and you just need to live with.

Mr. Donovan stated absolutely you can phase it in and this is a strategy that many communities have, but that would be up to the City Council. He believes the phasing might be a recommendation that we might hear from COBA – the Central Oregon Builders Association.

Director Bertagna stated that we never have, and we go from July 1st giving everybody a heads up so they can get the building permits ahead of time if they need to. The further we push it out, the less SDC revenue we get. When growth needs to pay for growth – we are losing that balance. The previous Parks Boards and previous City Councils have recognized that we do not have the acreage in town because we are surrounded by 200,000 acres of parkland.

Councilor Ross stated that in terms of the SDC's, 5 acres was a number we put in to bring us to a minimum level that is recommended by some of the national organizations. What he is hearing today, if we were to choose to reduce that LOS recommendation to 3 acres, then the differential would be more favorable to SDC's reclaiming as we move forward. As we think about recommendations to the City Council, it may be that we might want to reexamine that LOS number to be more efficient in the collecting of SDC's to pay for these improvements because these improvements that are going to need to happen that are not covered by SDC fees will be coming out of the General Fund budget, or through grants, etc. The Council can decide if they want to phase it in or do the whole amount, but he stated that his recommendation based on his experience with SDC's is that you set the number and that is what you go with. Phasing does not do any good other than encouraging more building which is not a bad thing, but right now, we do not have a lot of places to encourage that building to happen.

Mr. Donovan stated that is correct.

Board Chair Madrone asked Director Bertagna when they raised the SDC's the last time what was the pushback from the building community.

Director Bertagna stated that what we are going to hear now is to phase it in, give us six (6) months, etc. COBA represents the building community, so they are going to lobby for them, and they do not like increases.

Director Woodford stated that they have also raised the idea of factoring in school owned land and private parks into the calculations, which is something we have not done. For the LOS to factor in that type of land, those parks are not factored into the LOS because you do not always have access to them and cannot guarantee that.

Director Bertagna stated that it is important to remember that to come up to the current LOS, we need 25 additional acres, which seems like a lot. We have 18 acres at the Lazy Z and that once we develop that, it is going to take a lot of money, but gets us a long way there. We did not count the over 7 acres at the Creekside Campground. We are not going to be that far off and the Capital Improvement Plan going from 2 million to 4.3 million – take out the pickleball courts which is not a big of an increase in the CIP. Once you take out the 10.3 million for the Northwest Playground – that is the big one.

Councilor Ross stated that we are gaining additional park space (not ours) but accessible to the community when the elementary school becomes property, or a location for SPRD. They are going to have some acreage there that will be dedicated to game use, etc. We have already programed them in our parks and can count them towards our LOS if we choose.

Director Bertagna stated that the Council will be wrestling with a UGB expansion as part of that and an opportunity to negotiate through the annexation process to get parkland donated to us.

Board Member Buell asked if the SDC's are going to fund the Capital Improvements, is there any other funding in the foreseeable future that is going to kick in – a bond measure, etc.

Director Bertagna stated that we are not anticipating that in this analysis, but it is always possible to get a grant, or going out for a bond is a potential thing to do. It is tough in this town because we are so bond heavy with the School District, and we do not want to compete with that, so we try and cash fund our things. Also, financing is a possibility using general fund dollars and potential park SDC dollars to serve that debt that you would be taking on. As part of this analysis, it is completely SDC paid for in the next 20 years.

Board Member Connolly stated that having been on Council and going through the last Master Plan, the same chart showing the City of Sisters fees against LaPine, Prineville, Madras, and Bend, my recollection was that we were proud of the LOS that we provided at that low SDC fee, but in hindsight, it has cost us a great deal because now it is a bigger gap to fill. She stated that her recommendation would be to try and meet the 5 acres per 1,000 unit because there are a lot of future projects that Director Bertagna mentioned that are planned for, that are coming on line, a lot of land mass, and prior Councils have look at and made comments about if a UGB expansions happen those new developments could have and should have a park built in that is open to the public which helps us get to that level. If we do not say that we are trying to get 5 acres per 1,000, we are going to be at the LOS we have now that is hidden because of the Forest Service property surrounding the whole city. It feels like we have a lot of parks, but it is a different type of park.

Board Member Sarvar asked how this affects the Master Plan for parks with short funds to reach the LOS, and there all these other projects coming on board and how is it going to work.

Director Woodford stated that we are going to have to be creative in terms of how we fund those things, or if we revise the Capital Improvement Plan. The big chunk is that park (10 million) of it, and that is the huge one. In the Master Plan it does talk about different potential funding sources out there that we might be able to take advantage of. Park Master Plans can always be updated if we find out that certain things are not feasible or have different priorities.

We try to base everything off the results of the Parks Master Plan because that was the result of a community process, and we want to honor that as much as we can.

Board Member Buell stated that things seem to have appreciated since 2016. Does the SDC fund correlate with the appreciation of property values because it has doubled and goes from 1,900 to 3,500, etc. and how does that compare to the value of the property and the home.

Director Bertagna stated that it is not based off property value, but per dwelling unit. It doesn't matter if it is an apartment, or a 5,000 sq. ft. home, they pay the same amount. What we have seen that has really appreciated is inflation and the cost of these projects – that has been the biggest effect on what the CIP shows.

Board Member Coonrod stated that she is on a work travel trip, but happy to be here remotely. Listening to the conversation, it seems like the big opportunity here is taking advantage of the conversations around the Urban Growth Boundary and trying to get the parks perspective plugged into that early and often.

Board Member Buell stated that we should continue with the work we have put into the Parks Master Plan and fund what we have on the plate and move forward.

Board Vice Chair Curtis stated that she agrees, and her recommendation would be to raise the LOS to 5 acres.

Board Chair Coonrod stated that she agrees with that as well.

Board Member Sarver stated that he agrees with that as well.

Board Chair Madrone stated that we are all in agreement and that it makes the most sense. He stated that we as the Board would recommend raising the LOS to 5 or keep it as it is in the Master Plan and make sure that is the goal moving forward.

Councilor Ross stated that he would speak from a Council perspective to not get too concerned at this level with the pushback that we might get from the Builders Association, and that is a political problem for the Council. It is part of the process and to forward to the Council what is the best recommendation and let Council decide how to best handle that.

Director Woodford stated that how the city has been handling those kinds of requests in the past is not to waive or reduce SDC's for affordable housing projects. We do have an affordable housing grant fund that is funded by a portion of our Transient Room Tax (TRT), and affordable housing developers can apply for that and often use that to pay for their SDC's.

Sisters Community Garden:

Introduction of a proposal from the Sisters Community Garden to utilize Sun Ranch Park for a community garden facility. Staff seeks CPAB initial input on the concept to assist the City Council in determining if this is an appropriate location for the garden and under what conditions.

Background:

Sisters Community Garden (SCG) has approached the city about their need to relocate their community garden from its current location at the Sisters Airport to a new location starting in 2025. According to a letter submitted to the city, they are interested in moving their operations to the vacant, city owned parcel known as the Sun Ranch Park off Sun Ranch Drive.

Proposed are 49 garden plots, a greenhouse, tool storage, wash sink and tables, and porta potties within a 6' high, deer resistant fenced area, along with a public covered gathering space, picnic tables, landscaping, trails, soil storage area and parking outside of the fence.

Sisters Community Garden has requested some assistance from the city, including helping to facilitate water and electrical service to the garden, along with improvements outside of the fenced area, such as the covered gathering space, picnic tables and benches, and trail. The City Council will have the final say on what improvements the city will fund, but staff has preliminarily indicated that paving the parking area and extending water to the garden are items the city would be able to assist with.

For consideration of changes to city parks, staff relies on the Sisters Parks Master Plan (PMP) for guidance, which offers the following support for community gardens:

- During the community outreach phase of the Parks Master Plan update, there was interest in a publicly accessible/rentable community garden space.
- PMP Policy 8.10: "Where appropriate, support inclusion of community garden spaces and work with local community groups and public entities to support development of neighborhood and community garden programs.
- " Recommended locations: community garden space on existing undeveloped parks land (Sun Ranch Park, Creekside Park Eastward Expansion, Future NW Park).
- New Facility Recommendation (N7 in the PMP): "Community Garden: Provide opportunities for community garden plots in different city quadrants. Support construction of fencing, gates, and secure access to potable water where community interest is present. Alternatively, work with Sisters Community Garden to support expansion and improvement of amenities and utilities at existing location as need increases."

Analysis:

City staff has reviewed the proposal internally and provided initial feedback to Sisters Community Garden with some questions, including:

How reservation of the garden plots worked – is it prioritized for city residents?

Does Sisters Community Garden charge for use of the plots?

- Who does maintenance?
- How does the use of city land by a non-profit organization work?
- What about liability?
- Potential concern about garden location near the city well # 3.
- Is there legal access to the property along the alley (staff is researching if the city has an access easement along the alley or if access would need to be taken from Sun Ranch Drive)?

Sisters Community Garden responded with responses and a set of their own questions in a letter dated November 16, 2023.

Staff did some additional research on non-profits utilizing publicly owned land in other areas, specifically on property owned by the Bend Parks and Recreation District (BPRD). BPRD currently allows the OSU Extension Office to use a portion of their land at Hollinshhead Park for a community garden through a Facilities Use Agreement and has a similar arrangement at Millers Landing Park with the Miller’s Landing Community Garden Group for operation of a community garden. This research will allow us to better understand their standards for gardens, amenities offered, and construction and maintenance costs.

From BPRD staff, we learned the following:

- They use a Facilities Use Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding for use of their land as community gardens.
- The timeframe for use of the property was initially one year but could be renewed annually with written consent of both parties.
- The agreement spells out roles and responsibilities, including.
- For OSU to manage all aspects of the gardening operations.
- Assign one lead person as a liaison between the two entities.
- Allocation of garden space to “Bend residents, adjacent neighborhoods and the local restaurant community as space allows”.
- Must coordinate with BPRD on any major improvements.
- Not hold BPRD responsible for loss or damage to any equipment.
- Be responsible for the maintenance and appearance of the tool shed.
- Winterize and clean the plots by the end of October.

BPRD will:

- Pay for water, trash, and garden debris removal services.
- Ensure the area surrounding the garden is kept free from debris and weeds.
- Work with OSU to provide repairs as required to maintain proper and safe operations of the gardens.
- Provide water to the garden and maintain irrigation system, including repair of broken heads and pipes, turning water on in the spring and winterizing system in the fall.
- Deliver up to twenty yards of wood chips or mulch if they are available in the district stockpile.
- Require a Certificate of Insurance naming BPRD as additionally insured for bodily injury and property damage for \$2 million dollars.

The City of Sisters can tailor an agreement to meet the specific needs of the SCG and the city to ensure needs are met on both sides, and the city is protected from unreasonable maintenance requirements and/or any legal exposure.

Financial Impact: As noted, SCG has requested some assistance from the city, including facilitating water and electrical service to the garden. If this is an acceptable location for this use, there may be additional costs to the city as determined by the Council. Projects recommended in the Parks Master Plan are generally paid for with Park's System Development Charges (SDC's).

Mimi Schaefer (President), Nancy Bright (Vice President/Greenhouse), Jani Boyle (Garden Manager) Karen Lord, Toni Del Guidice from the Sisters Community Garden.
P.O. Box 434, Sisters, OR 97759

Board Vice Chair Curtis stated that she is in support of the Community Garden space in Sisters. She does have some concerns about private use of public land and considerations of the nearby residents. She asked about the porta potty location and the Sisters Community Garden stated that it is only for summer use from June to September 1st or the 15th. The other one is the setback from the property, and deliveries for soil and fertilizers. The Community Garden stated that they have about 2 ½ yards of aged manure – 6 to 10 years old that they use because it does not stink and is broken down, etc. About 2 ½ yards about 4-5 times a year. The other is compost which is 1 ½ cubic yards of composted manure. In a season, we use about a 1 ½ gallons of fish emulsion. We have had two bee boxes at the property, and could not use any pesticides there, etc. The porta potty is new for the past few years and mainly for lunches, etc.

Board Vice Chair Curtis asked if there was a waiting list for the Community Garden. The Community Garden members stated about five (5) almost all the time. There are about 20 percent of newcomers every year because of the turnaround.

Board Vice Chair Curtis stated having worked in management of public lands, she generally has concerns about making public land and space of resources only available to some, and her personal recommendation would be to not have a locked fence for the garden, but does see the need for locks on storage areas, etc.

Board Chair Madrone asked the members about their budget and what do they primarily spend the money on. The members stated that they have been saving money with the fundraisers, replacing the wood around the parameters of everybody's plots keeping it bug free, soil amendments, community events, luncheons, musicians, habitat, food bank, best friend's programs, testing irrigation programs.

Board Chair Madrone asked what their minimum time requirement would be if there was an agreement between the city and your group for using this space. The members stated that they hope it is generous maybe 10-12 years, but we would like 25 years because there is a lot to do and maintain. We have a lot of support in helping us move forward once we have the land, etc.

Sue Stafford, Sisters, OR

Ms. Stafford stated that the whole point for starting the Community Garden when we did was the outgrowth of development of a Vision Statement for the city. It was broken into parts and one of the parts was all about building community and that was the whole point of the garden. It was not to teach people how to garden, it was to build community. From the very, very beginning it wanted to include as many people as possible and not have it turn into a private garden club and not do any of those types of things. The garden is available for people to walk through in daylight hours, etc. The whole point was to encourage people to come, and an important thing to have as a benefit for a lot of reasons and a lot of work has gone into that garden.

Board Member Connolly stated that Councilor Ross made the comment earlier that they get to deal with the big issues, problems, and comments from the community. As we learned earlier today, the Park System Development Charges are very small right now. The work that the Garden people are asking for would come from Park SDC's. That will be up to the Council to determine if this moves up in the pecking order, is this project more important in allocating funds than a dog park or pickleball court, etc. She stated that her biggest concern is because residents who already live here have paid the park SDC's which would be used to pay for the improvements that you might ask for, get the waterline going in, the electrical line, the blowing out of the irrigation and garbage, etc. that the priority would be given to the city residents because they have already paid the SDC's to acquire that park. The plots being given out should go to city residents first with the hard deadline or cutoff and then open to the general public regardless of where you live after such a date, but priority should be given to city residents first. That is the recommendation she would make that goes to the City Council. The rest is the capacity for the park employees, and this will be part of the

contract which is a careful consideration also. She stated that she does support the garden and thinks it is a good amenity for the community, it is a nice community builder, it is a teachable moment, and carries through with the pollinator park idea from years ago.

Board Member Coonrod stated that she has been listening intently and thinks that Board Member Connolly's comment around what we will have to give up supporting this project is well taken. She also supports the idea that the Community Garden being a Sisters' amenity, but we need to weigh that against the other asks, or at least the Council does. She thanked the Community Garden team for putting together a nice plan and coming to talk with us tonight.

Councilor Ross stated that he looks forward to seeing what is brought forward and that is when the hard questions will start to happen. He appreciates what Board Member Connolly had to say and we need to keep in mind that we are looking at city resources and utilizing city resources that have been collected by city tax payers in the city, and how do we weigh that against the amenity, and the value to those of our friends that do not live within the city limits but close enough by that they think they do.

Janie Boyle, Sisters Community Garden

Ms. Boyle stated that they are not asking for a lot of labor or materials to build out our infrastructure. We have accommodated in this draft plan what we thought would be appealing to the powers to be, and the citizens to have this be a garden park where there is a lot of public area, a way for the public to interface with the garden and appears to be inviting to them. We do not expect a lot of this infrastructure to be paid for by the city because we run with volunteers and donated materials and that's our plan. We may have to phase in some of our dreams like a shelter for public meetings and special things such as signage and for educational materials.

V. UPDATE FROM THE SISTERS PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT

VI. OTHER BUSINESS / OPEN DISCUSSION

Board Member Sarver asked about the pavilion (Future NW Park) because students and teachers are asking how and in what way they can support this project. He stated that he is curious if this is going to happen and if it does are we talking 10 to 20 years and what can the community do to move it forward.

Director Bertagna stated that we need a good sponsor to come forward and donate 10 million dollars. It is in the draft goals for City Council's work plan to push the original concept to more of a Master Plan of the site. We are going to be applying for an Oregon Park and Recreation grant to do that work and we would like to get that started this summer. Part of that is going to be a lot of public outreaches and that is where we need to hear from the people that you

are talking to. Then, we are going to need to figure out how to phase this thing because that is going to be the bottom line. We cannot do it in one fell swoop, so we have some existing Park SDC's because the Park SDC's update is huge, especially with some big projects coming on in town. We can get there but we are going to have to be creative, etc.

Board Member Sarver asked if there has been any research done on what Bend Parks and Recreation District bring in from their facility, etc.

Director Bertagna stated one million a year, not sure what the distribution is between summer and winter, and they just cover operating expenses. The majority of that is open skate is where they are getting their revenue from.

Councilor Ross stated that being on the Council, we worked out our draft goals the other day and there is a lot of discussion about that location and what might be there and what might not be there, etc. Even if we had a bucket full of money in front of us today, just the process of carefully planning and considering what can and cannot go in there, the design, the community input, bidding for construction, and there are a couple years or longer out but the opportunity to speak to the Council will come up, and to keep an eye out for the different agendas as they are posted. The Parks Board will know when this is a topic of discussion as with the other parks and be able to give us input prior to the Council meetings. It is on the workplan and we are good at going down through those goals and paying attention, etc.

VII. ADJOURN

Board Chair Madrone adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary