



**PORTLAND PARKS BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
May 7, 2014
8:00 – 9:30 a.m.
Lovejoy Room, City Hall**

Board members present: Mike Alexander, Judy BlueHorse Skelton, Mary Anne Cassin, Kathy Fong Stephens, Nick Hardigg, Dion Jordan, Andy Nelson, Jim Owens, Meryl Redisch, Linda Robinson, Christa Thoeresz, Tricia Tillman, Sue Van Brocklin, Julie Vigeland, Mauricio Villarreal

Board members absent: Tony Magliano, Shelli Romero, Bob Sallinger

Staff present: Mike Abbaté, Margaret Evans, Warren Jimenez, Kia Selley, Jeff Shaffer, Jennifer Yocom

Call to order Andy Nelson, Chair, called the meeting to order.

Park of the Month Andy noted that the park of the month for April was Spring Garden Park, and said that in May, he looks forward to seeing everyone at the East Portland Community Center. Linda Robinson commented that the East Portland Community Center is in the Mill Park neighborhood, and that the swimming pool is new. Kathy Fong Stevens added that the center is a huge asset for the community. Mike Abbaté noted that the new play area was part of E-205 improvements, and that the new equipment is heavily used.

Parks Board Retreat Andy announced that the Parks Board retreat has been scheduled for the 30th of this month (May). Mike Abbaté noted that they will meet at Leach Garden in the parking lot at the bridge, and board the tour van. They will be doing a tour of properties in East Portland that have not been developed—some with master plans, and some without. He noted that they will visit the two parks that are currently being developed (Gateway and Beech). PP&R has properties all over the city, he said, but they are limited to 3 hours for the tour, so they will focus on the east side of the city. He noted that David Porter and the folks at Leach Garden will allow the Parks Board to use the stone cabin with an outdoor tent for their lunch and meeting from 12:00 to 2:00pm. Meryl Redisch asked if there will be room for one member of the Urban Forestry Commission, and noted that they would be very interested in seeing some of the properties that will be developed. Mike said that we will check, but that the shuttle bus has a set number of seats, and he believes we may already be at capacity. He asked Board members to make sure to RSVP, and also let us know if anything changes. He noted that it is very important for the Parks Board to see these properties.

Approval of the minutes Julie Vigeland moved to approve the April minutes. Mike Alexander seconded this motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve the April minutes.

Park Foundation Update

Nick Hardigg reported that all is well with the Parks Foundation. They are currently doing a lot of work on the foot bridge over Burnside. That project is moving well, with a strong chair and committee fundraising for initial start-up. He noted that they are also co-planning a June 5th event with PP&R called Parklandians Unite. This will be a fun partnership event for those who volunteer and fundraise for parks. It is an effort to reach out to parks partnership organizations, and neighborhood committees that fundraise for concerts and movies in the park. Mike Abbaté noted that they did this eighteen months ago, and as many of 120 people attended, representing friends and partner groups. Last time, he noted, the event was held at the World Forestry Center. This year, it will be at the Oregon Historical Society.

Parks Board Nominating Committee

Andy reported on the work of the nominating committee—Mike Alexander, Dion Jordan, Jim Owens, Julie Vigeland, and Andy Nelson. The Committee was tasked with looking to find candidates to replace the 4 outgoing board members. Bob Sallinger, Tricia Tillman, and Mary Anne Cassin will be terming out. Shelli Romero is stepping down. The committee received over 20 applications, and interviewed ten people over two Wednesdays. Andy noted that they had outstanding candidates. They knew that they could never replace the quality of individuals leaving the board, but hoped to find complementary skills, and they feel very excited about the four individuals who have been selected. Andy noted that he called them last night to let them know. He gave a brief summary of the four individuals. 1) Tonya Booker is a higher education administrator, with a Parks and Recreation and forestry background. She has a strong grasp of the issues – very aware of the issues we discuss, and the 2020 plan. He noted that she will make a fantastic board member. 2) Gladys Ruiz works with Audubon at Leach Botanical Garden, and does a lot of east county work. She is from New York City. Meryl Redisch added that she was a park ranger at Central Park. Andy noted that the nominating committee was very impressed with her. 3) Patricia Frobes is a retired lawyer, who has done amazing work at Crystal Springs Park and Peninsula Rose Garden. Andy noted that she and the whole team of folks at Peninsula had worked to restore the garden with a lot of love. He commented that Patricia understands and can articulate the value of parks, and her experience at Peninsula. She is very committed, and sharp as a tack. 4) Kendall Clawson works for the Governor, and has a lot of experience with parks and public policy work. She is an outstanding individual. Julie Vigeland added that Kendall is a really good friend of hers, and it has been fun for her to see how excited she is about being selected. She noted that it is a great reflection on the Board.

Mike Alexander added that sometimes with these searches you have to kiss a lot of frogs to get to a prince, but this process was entirely different. He noted that they left at least another 5 unbelievably quality people out of this, and that it was remarkable to see the caliber of individuals. They knew the organization, tracked 2020. He noted that it was a very difficult decision.

Linda Robinson added that she knows Gladys, and is pleased. She noted that this was a very good choice. She added that she is younger than some of us.

Nick Hardigg added that he knows Pat Frobes from her work with Friends of Peninsula. He said that her management of the team is absolutely wonderful, and impressive. She serves on several corporate boards, and Nick noted that he would

give her a very strong recommendation.

Andy noted that we are pretty pleased with ourselves, and asked for a motion to nominate these four individuals.

Meryl Redisch said that she was happy to nominate all four applicants. Tricia Tillman seconded the nomination, and the board voted unanimously to approve the nomination. Andy noted that they will be invited on the tour at the end of May. He thanked the nominating committee, and said again that it was a great experience, and he really enjoyed serving

Kathy Fong Stevens noted that when she came on the board, she was assigned a board buddy. She added that it didn't quite work out, but she thought it was a good concept. She recommended that each new Board member get matched with a current or former member, and perhaps schedule coffee beforehand. Kathy also recommended looking at adding someone from one of the high schools to the Board at some point.

Mary Anne Cassin volunteered to be a buddy. Tricia Tillman commented that when she joined the Board, they had a happy hour, and it was a good opportunity for people to meet on a social level. She added that it was a nice welcome. Andy Nelson agreed, and noted that he would plan a happy hour to welcome the new members.

Julie Vigeland noted that in addition to assigning buddies for each board member, there have been mentors assigned in the past - people committed to Parks, such as Joey Pope, Chet Orloff, and Mary Anne (Cassin) will be a perfect addition. She added that it is important to include people with long experience, to give that perspective. For those who have experienced this, it is a real plus. Julie noted that she would be happy to make those reconnections. Andy Nelson noted that these are all good ideas, and he wants to make sure they get into action.

Andy noted that the nominating committee will continue conversations on the slate of officers, and will report back to the Board in June.

**Smoke free policy
update**

Sue Van Brocklin reported that the smoke free policy committee has been working on a revised case for smoke free parks. She noted that before we start, she wanted to let the Board know that Oregon Health Authority is a client for the advertising firm she works for. She has discussed this with Andy Nelson, Mike Abbaté, and her lawyer. Among many issues, including chronic illnesses and diabetes, anti-smoking efforts is one of the things they work for. Sue noted that she wants to be clear that her work here (on the Parks Board) is her personal time, and the discussion here is in no way influenced by that work.

Sue distributed a hand out on the case for a smoke free policy for Board members to review, and noted that they would like to make a formal recommendation in June. She added that they took under consideration the conversation from the last Board meeting, as well as e-mail messages that she received from individual Board members. She noted that they hoped to have more discussion at today's meeting to help us come to a more formal recommendation.

Andy Nelson added that last time, the hand-out looked more like a recommended policy. This is a step back, and is more of a case. From here we can build out thoughts on policy. Sue noted that last month, there were some concerns that we were presenting a solution in search of a problem. Some Board members wondered whether we really need to spend time and resources on this effort, and asked if there is really a problem. In other words, why do we want to do this just because 57 other jurisdictions are doing it? Sue noted that the new hand-out includes data collected by the Oregon Health Authority that hopefully answers these questions, and makes the case for why this policy is needed now. The data includes a survey of people attending the Blues Festival. Of the people surveyed, more than 80% supported not just the Blues Festival being smoke free, but wanted all parks to be smoke free. Sue added that we already have some smoke free policies in place, including no smoking within 25 feet from playground, the South Park Blocks, Jamison Square, Director Park, all of our pools and community centers. She noted that this would expand the existing policies to include all PP&R properties. She added that in coming to this recommendation, the committee centered on our mission – Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland. It seemed contrary to allow smoking.

Meryl Redisch said that in reading last month's minutes, she saw Bob's comment, and wanted to note the thing that's different about consuming beverages, or fast food, is that second hand smoke affects the people around the smoker, it really affects the space.

Meryl then asked if the committee has discussed the practical implications of who enforces, and asked about the steps that will happen once the policy is in place. Sue noted that the committee spent a lot of time discussing and exploring other counties, and jurisdictions, including the State of Oregon. She noted that signage will be needed. In terms of enforcement, rangers are already there in Portland parks, but she said that in many jurisdictions it is enforced through self-policing. People pointing out that there's a smoke free policy, and you are not allowed to smoke. She noted that the committee will leave to the Parks Bureau to figure out the cost and logistics of implementation. Julie added that the Board is advisory. We come up with the recommendation, and implementation is up to Parks. She added that the committee knows enforcement will be an issue, but that it is not for us to go there. Warren Jimenez noted that he can speak to enforcement, and said that it would be the exception where we would write a ticket. Typically, it's a really quick conversation where the ranger educates and explains what the rule is. The typical response is compliance, "Oh, I didn't realize that." Warren added that you can use our entire budget around enforcement, but it would really be about ensuring signage is posted. Sue noted that there are other rules that fall under a similar category. For example, there is no alcohol in parks, and you have to hold a permit if you want to have an event and drink. It goes along with a lot of like-minded policies that Portland already has. Mary Anne Cassin added that we don't want a police state, and we don't want a whole new crop of signage. This would be more like an expansion of existing policies.

Sue noted that she received an e-mail from Kathy Fong Stevens, whose brother works for City of Ashland Parks, and they have recently gone through this process. Sue noted that small places like Ashland, as well as larger cities like Philadelphia, are implementing smoke free policies. Mike Alexander added that Philadelphia just did

this last week. Sue said that Kathy wrote to her about her brother's experience, and said that there was a lot of questioning in the beginning. However, once it was implemented, it just became something they do now. It is just part of the park. Sue noted that she thought it was an interesting story, and thanked Kathy for sharing.

Mike Alexander asked for follow-up on the discussion about excluding PIR and golf. Sue said that the committee was undecided on this. She noted that the research has an equal number who say let PIR and golf do what they want because they are private enterprise. While the same number say absolutely not, they should be a part of this. She said that this is one thing on the table. Our committee has not decided one way or another on this issue. Mike Alexander noted that in thinking about employees, if there is a smoke free policy, and I'm transferred from Washington Park to PIR – you have created a health hazard. Under that scenario, you have moved an employee from a smoke free zone to a place where he or she will be exposed to secondhand smoke. Mike added that you can't pay enough to pollute someone's air, and it is important to look at from the perspective of employee, and not differentiate that exposure. Mike Abbate said that there will be workplace issues on both sides that will need to be address, including an individual's right to smoke. We have current rules for employees, and facilities. Where you can and where you can't. If an employee's workplace happens to be within the confines of the park, we will have to work that out.

Jim Owens thanked Mike Alexander for bringing this up, and noted that he feels strongly about this issue. He said that it is dangerous to create two classes of public facilities. Both for employees, but even more critically for visitors. If our message is that we are concerned about the public health for visitors to parks, but not concerned for public health for visitors of PIR or golf... Also, Jim added, there are natural habitats at stake at golf courses, and fire hazards. You could readily designate smoking areas. PIR is going through changes now. Jim expressed concern over the possible message to visitors of PIR that we don't care about second hand smoke to visitors there.

Linda Robinson noted that Providence Park is smoke free. It is an open air facility, so why not at PIR? Sue noted that it is not that we can't. Mike Abbate noted that the issue is related but unique. PIR hosts auto races, and auto based exhibitions. A higher proportion of the people who participate smoke, and they are there for several hours. On the golf course, it's the cigar smoking. Jim Owens noted that there are more non-auto events than auto events, including swap meets, and other events.

Andy Nelson said that it is important for the Board to go through the process of making a recommendation. He noted that visceral reactions are important to get out and on record, and it is also important to ask for what information we need to make a decision. We look at everything, think about, and get to a place where we can make some action. He said that it is important to continue to get feelings out on the table, and document, but let's also get a list of information. I want to see how Philadelphia has handled golf courses, or if someone has a race track – get that information. Let's end today, thinking about what other information we need to hear. Does this group need another meeting to gather information? Think about that. Do we need to hear from members of the public, and/or stakeholder groups?

Ultimately, as an individual on the parks board, he noted, you need to have the information, to think about this and make a thoughtful recommendation.

Sue said that the committee will gather information on golf courses, and race tracks. She noted that the litter, and fire danger are well documented problems. Littered cigarette butts are a major concern. State of Oregon Parks have noted that cigarette butts are the largest piece of litter. Fires have occurred at 8 sites in Portland. A number of sites in Portland have been identified as at risk for potential fire. That question was on the table last time, and we did some digging.

Andy noted that another issue on the table is the disproportionate impact on low income communities, and he noted that he would like more information on that. Linda Robinson asked if he is looking for the number of people who smoke. Tricia Tillman noted that it would be interesting to get real data on numbers. She said that it is hard for her to believe that the majority of people who attend PIR events are smokers when only 14 percent of Oregonians are smokers. She said that conversation reminds her of bars' concerns. In actuality, it turned out that non-smokers weren't going because they didn't want to be around smokers. You ban smoking, and other customers come back. Kids go to PIR. By not including PIR in a smoke free policy, we elevate the rights of individuals who smoke over our concern for children. Not just the impacts of smoking, but cultural norms. Sue noted that the committee will try to get a handle on uses of PIR, and collect data on that population.

Judy Bluehorse Skelton noted that she talked with a few people getting ready for Delta Park Pow Wow, which is organized by the Bow and Arrow Club. They pride themselves on picking up all the butts after the encampment. Litter is the problem. It is a smoke free event, but many of our vets smoke, and so there are areas for smoking. Many of the veterans smoke, but also events need to be smoke free. The concern is still that hesitation of demonizing tobacco, when it is a gift from the creator. It is considered very much a sacred plant, and used for communities going to parks. What Portland needs to acknowledge in setting the high mark in recognizing the harm to children and communities, is that this is still a plant, native to this country. Judy distinguished the plant from what is rolled up in the white paper, and noted that American Spirit cigarettes are no better, they are just as bad. She noted that she would be happy to work with the group, just to include a sentence in the policy recommendation. She added that for many of the recent openings and ceremonies, including Cully, elders offered tobacco at that site. She noted that Parks can play a role in bringing back the sacredness of the plant, and she would be happy to work to make sure we recognize the ceremonial role. Of course, she noted that she recognizes that can be co-opted too with people saying "I'm having a ceremony." She said that it is important to note that the ceremony is non-lit. Sue said that this is a lovely idea, and noted that there is a great need to recognize the traditional and ceremonial use of the plant, unlit, unrolled. She said that they can talk with Judy and find a way to incorporate that, so that we can do what we are intending, but not have any unintended consequences that would block ceremonial usage like the one at Cully. Sue said that she would like to work with Judy on phrases that could be used.

Jim Owens noted that for golf courses and PIR, he would like to hear from

managers. If we had a park smoking ban, but the ability to designate smoking areas, what would that look like? He said that he would like their input.

Mary Ann Cassin commented that Judy's eloquent words reminded her of her own journey. She said that she doesn't know how she got on the committee (smoke free), but the more she learned, the more important it came to her. The more she learned about the great impact on health, cultural norms... you don't know until you dive in and see what all the tentacles are. As parks board members, she said, the best thing for everyone is a general awareness. Connection to each other connection to nature. She said that as it rolls out (a smoke-free policy), it will be important to combine with awareness.

Kathy Fong Stevens noted that she would like information on two things: 1) The background on Parks' current smoke free policy within 25 feet of a playground (when was this put in place?), and also how smoking came to be prohibited in some parks (Director Park, Pioneer Courthouse Square). 2) How could a policy coincide with smoking rights of current employees? Under a smoke free policy, would smoking be prohibited in the parking lot for your break? What are the City's workplace rules?

Sue noted that when they drafted the policy that was passed out last month, they tried to be forward thinking about when marijuana is legalized. She noted that this will likely happen in the future. For Parks in Colorado, and Parks in Washington. One of those states thought of this before, and included marijuana in their anti-smoking policy, the other did not and is suffering the consequences. She noted that they want to be proactive looking forward.

Andy thanked Sue for taking the lead on this significant issue, and noted that after thoughtful consideration, the Board will move forward with a recommendation. He noted that it will be important to get as much information forward for the board in June. He doesn't want to put them on any kind of deadline. It will be important to be thoughtful in making this recommendation to Mike (Abbaté) and the Commissioner. Sue thanked everyone for a really productive meeting, as well as to all of those members who sent e-mails and comments.

**Equity
Subcommittee
update**

Julie Vigeland reported that the Equity Subcommittee took the comments from two months ago, and have gone through and updated the affirmation of equity with insertions, and deletions where applicable. They also came up with a new format for implementation. She distributed the new draft documents. She noted as a reminder as we go forward, the reality is that we are an advisory group. As with the smoking ban, the Equity Subcommittee made an effort to not be too prescriptive, but they also want to give a push and move this forward.

Dion Jordan asked the Board to first turn their attention to the changes recommended for the affirmation of equity statement. The first change is in the second paragraph: "We look at equity through a conceptual framework inclusive of Race, Geography (the community in which one lives), Socio-economic Status and Disability. Dion noted that there was a suggestion to replace "geography" with "natural areas." He said that the subcommittee agreed natural areas had a place, but decided not here in the conversation of equity. We are talking about people and

not places. Julie added that the suggestion was to add “natural areas,” and that it was not in the original document. The subcommittee decided not to make that change.

Dion noted that the second point of conversation focused on the phrase “systemic racism,” and whether that was the correct wording. There was a question on whether that might bring up some things. Dion noted that Mike Alexander explained quite well the importance of keeping that in there. He noted that not everyone has the conversation and understanding around it, and the subcommittee talked about keeping that phrase.

Julie noted that another thing that was discussed at the last meeting was the insertion of the word “shifting” in the bottom paragraph to read, “As a Board, we will be leaders in reflecting the demographics of the shifting population of Portland.” The decided that “shifting” is the word they want to grab onto. Julie noted that what the subcommittee is bringing today is basically the original document with suggested changes from last time, and they have revised those changes based on the conversation from two months ago.

Tricia Tillman noted that the bigger bulleted middle section includes a section on diversity in hiring staff that exceeds the broad diversity of the populations of Portland, with a focus on the populations that have been historically underrepresented. She noted that this was an addition.

Dion noted that for the second sheet (goals for implementation), they were asked to look at the frequency of how often goals are revisited. He said that it came to their attention that they were a little ambitious. Most if not all, he said, they have changed to annual reports at a minimum. They took out the quarterly, but notice it is a minimum. If we can do more that’s great. He noted that they realized they didn’t have anything on policy in our goals, and felt it was important to highlight. They added a goal: “Strengthening bureau policies and practices to promote fairness and equity.” At the very bottom, they also added new recommendations to 1) Recruit and retain board members that reflect the diversity of Portland, including geographic representation; and 3) Form a standing Equity and Inclusion Sub-Committee. Dion added that a standing committee on this would really show a commitment. There wouldn’t be the lapse. He noted that they recommend adding a bylaw change to have a standing committee, and go through that official process.

Linda Robinson asked if standing committees have to be named in the bylaws. She noted that in the bylaws she is familiar with, you can have ad hoc or standing committees. Kathy Fong Stevens noted that the standing committee would be responsible for corralling the reports. Andy Nelson commented that otherwise, you have years go by.

Warren Jimenez said that he really appreciates this effort, and noted that a lot of this is data that we are currently collecting. Some may be broken out differently. Some is what we want to start collecting. He noted that we may find as we go through that there may be issues. He noted that he appreciates the subcommittee, and these recommendations as a starting point, and we will go through with due diligence and figure out how we can collect this data. He noted that it will be

important to give flexibility on policy. You want to give the flexibility to achieve a broader goal, rather than pinpoint. Julie Vigeland noted that it was daring just to do this (first draft – affirmation of equity). She added that it is a dance – understand that it is not prescriptive. Mike Abbaté noted that there is nothing on here that we don't want to do. The issue primarily is on how resources are allocated. Those decisions come from City Council and our Commissioner. If the reports to the Board are made by subcommittee – great. If the reports are being made by Parks staff, we may have a problem. Not because of any problem with any of the goals, but over allocating Parks staff. Mike noted that he would like to language in the recommendation that sets up these goals and reports as aspirational, so that the Parks Board seven years from now doesn't say you guys are supposed to be reporting on these 14 goals on an annual basis. He noted that the document needs some clarity. Andy Nelson noted that he thinks what we have today is really good policy and values, and the next layer is process. We can create a standing committee, and then decide how it will report. That is not a difficult thing to fix. He suggested that the Board agree on the goals and measures, and then begin the next step, which will be process.

Meryl Redisch asked Mike Abbaté how he anticipates the Equity and Inclusion Manager interacting with these goals. What will be the potential role there?

Mike noted that the Equity and Inclusion Manager would be the liaison and help lead those conversations.

Meryl asked for clarification on the approval of the Affirmation of Equity statement. Julie noted that they took comments from the last time (two months ago), and updated the original version. Tricia noted that the original version was approved in 2011. This is an updated version that is up for discussion here. Meryl commented that not having environment anywhere in the document is a problem given that we are parks.

Mike Alexander commented that it is an ambitious set of expectations, but he is encouraged that things are underway and being tracked. They can be identified and reported. It's a starting point. For those that fall outside, and not a current practice or process, he noted, it will be important for the Equity and Inclusion Manager to look at those things. Secondly, he noted, will be the lens that the Board looks at and the areas and dimensions that are not being tracked. Not so that everything is here a year and a day from now, but a subset is. Will we know more a year from now, from input from Equity Manager and this Board?

Tricia Tillman noted that it is less about telling staff or the bureau to do work, but rather giving the Parks Board the information we need to advise the director. This is the role that we need. For example, she noted, we weigh in every year on the budget and we hear about what people want. We ask who, and that data is not available. Here's what Parks Managers want in terms of programs. We ask who? We need certain information. We need to know if the voices that need to be represented, are being represented. These are questions that have come up repeatedly from the Parks Board, so we can be informed, and give good advice to the bureau.

Jim Owens thanked the subcommittee. He noted that the performance measures fall into two categories: reporting and recruiting. He suggested adding a 3rd category to consider: learning. For the last few years, he noted, he has participated on updating the City's contract and plan. About every 6 months, the committee for planning and sustainability comes in on language on equity. Every time we've done it, he said, the group wants to do it again. Jim noted that it is an ongoing learning exercise, and could be considered as an additional category. He suggested that the Equity Manager might come in every 6 months, or 1 year, to remind us of the current language of equity, and how we can really use equity in our recommendations to the bureau. Meryl added that that perhaps Dante James could come in to look at bigger City policies, to add and complement that.

Tricia noted that this is a good idea, and can get fleshed out as part of the standing equity and inclusion subcommittee. She said that she would like the Board to take a vote and adopt the revised Affirmation of Equity statement, recognizing that it is a living document that can be revisited. The standing committee can continue to review, come back, learn more over time and make adjustments.

Julie Vigeland asked if we can we adopt the affirmation of equity, without voting on the reporting piece. Andy said that the affirmation of goals, and frequency of reporting can be handled separately, noting that he doesn't want the Board to get stuck. Tricia noted that the documents go together, the memo – recommendations. The language talks about proposed frequency, but nothing is a mandate. She noted that she didn't hear any problems with the goals, and suggested that they adopt the what (the goals) today, and figure out the how (frequency) later. Jim motioned to approve, Linda seconded, and the Board unanimously passed the Affirmation of Equity and Goals.

Kathy Fong Stevens noted that for the future, subcommittees should make sure to add "draft" to these proposed documents because it is confusing to show adopted in 2011 in the title. She noted that if it goes in her binder, and then pulls it out at a future date, it looks like an approved document.

Budget update Mike Abbaté reported on the proposed Mayor's budget. In general, he said, Parks did well. However, we didn't get many of the things we asked for. We did get funding to convert 20 seasonal positions to permanent. We got funding for the GRUNT program. Not at the level we requested (we asked to expand), but enough to keep it at its current funding. Linda Robinson asked if funding for GRUNT is ongoing. Mike answered yes, now it's ongoing. It was previously funded through a grant that was about to expire. Mike added that we asked for \$500,000 in major maintenance, and we got 250,000. Additionally, Sun pass through is in the budget. There are notes on how O&M should be spent, and we are having conversations on that. The loos throughout the city will move to our responsibility, regardless if they are in the Parks or not. Mike noted that we will take them in exchange for reduced or free for parks by not having to pay the franchise fee. The big issue, he noted, is the tree code. In the mayor's budget, it is funded at about half the level we requested at a minimum. He noted that Commissioner Fritz is absolutely committed to getting full funding for that, and she is working with her peers on that.

Jim Owens asked as this moves forward, if there are a couple of items at risk, could

we lobby with individual members. Mike noted that the big issue is the tree code. Partial funding doesn't get anything except expectations here (hand gesture up high), and reality of getting things done here (hand gesture low). Meryl Redisch noted that the Urban Forestry Commission has talking points for the tree code that they would be happy to share.

Mike noted that there will be no money for improvements to maintenance facilities. We asked for a package for Delta Park and Mt. Tabor. The Mayor says he will push for a parks bond this November 2014. Mayor has said this four different times in two weeks, and he has asked Commissioner Fritz about the possibility. Jennifer Yocom added that this would be a replacement bond. Mike noted that a bond measure is about to expire. The Mayor's idea is to have a bond measure focused on emergency needs. Linda Robinson asked if this will mostly be repairs and not new construction, and how that will affect the east Portland parks we've been waiting for. Mike noted that funds from SDCs have allowed us to move forward in some areas. However, there are critical needs for some things that are about to fall. Jennifer Yocom noted that a key thing for this bond will be no tax increase. Tim Crail noted that another consideration for Commissioner Fritz is that this will not preclude us from going for a larger bond later.

Director's update Mike reported on the Equity and Inclusion Manager search, noting that amazing people have applied for that position. He also noted that there will be an exhibition coming up this summer at the Portland Art Museum called Art of the Louvre's Tuileries Garden. How does it affect us? The exhibition will explore the relationship of a park to the relationship of a city over time. PP&R and PAM staffs are talking about a whole host of events, not just to support the art museum, but to have a dialogue on the importance of parks in a community. Randy Gragg is doing a speaker series, and Mike noted that he will be speaking in July. He said that he is very excited, and we will send out more information on events as they are announced.

Adjourn Andy adjourned the meeting at 9:30 am.