



**PORTLAND PARKS BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 3, 2014  
8:00 – 9:30 a.m.  
Lovejoy Room, City Hall**

---

**Board members present:** Mike Alexander, Tonya Booker, Kathy Fong Stephens, Patricia Frobes, Nick Hardigg, Andy Nelson, Jim Owens, Meryl Redisch, Linda Robinson, Christa Thoeresz, Sue Van Brocklin, Mauricio Villarreal

**Board members absent:** Judy BlueHorse Skelton, Kendall Clawson, Dion Jordan, Tony Magliano, Gladys Ruiz, Julie Vigeland

**Staff present:** Mike Abbaté, Eileen Argentina, Galina Burley, Margaret Evans, Art Hendricks, Brett Horner, Warren Jimenez, Todd Lofgren, Kia Selley, Jeff Shaffer, Maija Spencer, Jennifer Yocom

---

**Call to order** Kathy Fong Stephens, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:03.

**Park of the Month** Kathy noted that Kendall Clawson will give her report on August's park of the month, Forest Park, at next month's meeting. Wallace Park at Chapman School is September's park of the month. Mike Abbaté noted that the swifts are here, and encouraged everyone to go out and see them. Kathy added that it's really phenomenal. She asked if anyone is willing to commit to going to Wallace Park to see the swifts, and also report back to the Board on the playground, other issues at the park, and also talk to people in the community. Meryl Redisch volunteered.

**Approval of the minutes** Andy Nelson moved to approve the August meeting minutes, Tonya Booker seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

**Park Foundation Update** Nick Hardigg announced that Jim Owens is the new ex-officio liaison for the Parks Foundation. He noted that the Foundation is currently working to pass a parks replacement bond that doesn't increase taxes, and that he will be in touch with people on a personal level regarding that effort. He noted that there is an event happening on September 9<sup>th</sup>, Tuesday, in collaboration with the Portland City Club. The event, Monthly Civic Drinks, is an opportunity for groups to come together and engage about various civic issues. The event will be at the Oregon Public House on NE Dekum St., Portland's 1<sup>st</sup> non-profit pub. It will be for volunteer and community groups that support parks. Nick noted that the Foundation wants to invite all Parks Board members to join for this informal discussion, 5 – 7 pm on Tuesday. Kathy added that you don't have to be a City Club member, and there is no charge to attend.

Nick noted that there is also a fun contest, "Capture Parklandia" on Instagram to engage people in parks. Winners receive coffee and other fun things. The contest asks people to take a selfie in a park and post it – a viral effort to express love and appreciation for parks. It is a partnership between the Portland Art Museum, PP&R, and the Foundation.

**Work Plan update** Christa Thoeresz distributed the updated draft, and noted that the three focus areas for the Parks Board's role include 1) Informed advising, 2) Advocacy, and 3) Equity. She noted that they have all seen it before, so it's not necessary to talk through each section, but that the hope is that it gives focus to the following things for the upcoming year. Kathy Fong Stephens noted that the subcommittee had talked about how this isn't the formal document, but that the goal for this meeting is to work on getting approval, and have a formal vote to accept the work plan.

Meryl Redisch asked about next steps, and Kathy noted that under each focus area, there are next steps and responsibilities, though this is just a guide for moving forward.

Andy Nelson moved to accept the work plan, noting that he appreciates the work that's been done. He said it is good to have a sense of our priorities, and when thinking about how to respond to issues that come to us, we make sure to carve out time to focus on our priorities, particularly around equity. Andy moved, the motion was seconded, and the Parks Board voted unanimously to accept the work plan.

**Budget Advisory Committee** Kathy Fong Stephens noted that she thought it would be a good idea for the Parks Board to have a discussion about their participation in the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), and to give the new board members a sense of what that process will be. She noted that the BAC falls under informed advising on the Board's work plan, and wanted to take some time to discuss the Board's most affective role in that. Over the past 3 years, she said, the entire Parks Board has served on the BAC, along with labor partners, and representatives from neighborhood coalitions. She noted that through the process, they learn a lot, look at the budget numbers, and weigh in on priorities. She noted that there is an incredible amount of work that staff puts in to the materials presented, and also in explaining it to the BAC.

Kathy said that the only issue is that it consumes about a quarter of the time that the Board gets together. She noted that this may be okay as a foundation for building the Board's knowledge on parks, but said she wants to open it up, and see if the Board might want to consider just some of the Board being on the committee. She noted that the meetings will start in November, and go through January. Mike Abbaté noted that the Bureau turns in our budget the first Monday in February. He said that in past years, the Board tends to continue having our monthly meetings during that time, and they are wondering what people are thinking.

Nick Hardigg noted that he has been on some Boards where people don't want to be on finance committees. He said it seems very important for an orientation element, noting that he learned so much from serving on the BAC. There may be a declining education curve, he said, but early on, it really helped him understand the challenges that PP&R face. He added that he thinks there is real value in the Board's participation.

Mike Abbaté noted that participation on the BAC is time intensive. As a result,

people have to self-regulate. We have the Bureau's perspective, the Commissioner's perspective, and the BAC's perspective. Some people will be there 1/3 of the time, some 2/3 of the time. Mike noted that the BAC formed prior to the past 3 or 4 years, was comprised of people who were nominated from lots of different places, and came together. He noted that the Board is the most knowledgeable group in the city of our budget and our Bureau in general. If there are 4 or 5 meetings, not everyone is able to meet for all of those, but he noted that you do get some consistency. Mike added that he sees value, and he thinks the Bureau is getting what we need – informed advice, and tough/fair questions. That is the big role of the BAC. He noted that this year may be like last year. Though the cut years were harder in terms of the work, he said, there will be good questions about where to ramp up because there are needs everywhere. He added that we want to be respectful of your time.

Jim Owens said that he would lobby for full Board participation, noting that it is one of the few venues that really gives us insight on what the Bureau is doing and how we are spending the budget. He noted, however, that the process is really project centric, and he would like more of a programmatic focus. In the coming year, is the Bureau planning to spend more on maintenance – versus projects? Jim noted that it would be good to see a more wholistic, programmatic approach. He would like to have a better sense of what we are accomplishing. The other point, he noted, is the number of carry over issue we have really wrestled with but not settled, including Bureau pass throughs, and Sun Schools.

Linda Robinson noted that she served on the BAC before she was on the Parks Board, and from her perspective the process of involving the Board was much more productive. In the past, she noted, so many people were starting from scratch, so much more time had to be spent bringing people up to speed. She added that she would go for full Board participation.

Andy Nelson said that he thought the process last year was good and positive, due in part to the pre-work, and prioritizing early in October and November. He noted that he would like to see us tighten that up to 2 or 3 meetings. The other issue, he noted, is that if we have priorities – that should be what we go into each meeting with. What we get is a group of individuals weighing in. There is value in that, he noted, but going in as a Board – with collective priorities may be more valuable.

Mike Abbaté noted that it would be good to have a conversation in October or November on priorities that also speaks to Jim's comment about themes. The Commissioner's office will look for guidance on packages.

Kathy asked if any of the new Parks Board members had questions, and Warren Jimenez noted that we will have a budget 101 session for you all. He said that we will hold that in November, and he and Jeff Shaffer will get you up to speed in a small group.

Kathy said that it sounds like there is consensus in having the full Board participate, noting that this conversation was kind of her way of getting everyone to commit. She said that she recognizes it is a big commitment.

**CIP Review Committee** Kia Selley reported that every year we go through a CIP Review process in preparation for our annual budget. The CIP committee rates all of our capital project, and assigns them to fiscal years. We allocate our resources for the money we receive over that five year period – 1.5 million dollars each year – major maintenance money can be assigned to any maintenance projects. Generally, Kia noted the projects are over 10k, so they are relatively large projects with most ranging from 100 to 200k. The Capital Projects Rating Committee includes members from all across the bureau – services, maintenance, planning and development, as well as Tim Crail and Patti Howard from Commissioner Fritz’s office. Kia asked Parks Board members if anyone would like to participate on this rating committee, noting that the commitment would require a Capital Projects 101 meeting that would be about an hour, a fall meeting – ½ day to full day, depending on the number of projects we have to rate. We also have a meeting mid-year (mid – budget cycle) and then in the spring. Kia noted that a background in capital projects might be useful, but not necessary. Patricia Frobos and Mauricio Villarreal volunteered.

**Nominating Committee update** Andy Nelson reported that the nominating committee is looking at ex-officio members, noting that the Parks Board bylaws allow us to have ex-officio members. He said they are looking to have conversations with everyone, assess where they are at, and potentially bring in a new group. They would like to have a slate next month.

**Smoke free policy update** Sue Van Brocklin noted that the Board had questions, and some lingering issues related to the smoke free policy. She said that the subcommittee has been looking into these things, and has been investigating what is being done in other cities. After the election in November, she said, they would like to have one more discussion with the Board, and bring back answers to some of the lingering questions, and then have a vote in December. She noted that the assumption is that the marijuana measure will pass, so they would like to try to get ahead of that.

Meryl Redisch asked about the Oregon State Parks policy, and Sue noted that they just passed a smoke free policy. She said that all state parks are smoke free, and they are working on beaches, with a plan to vote in November.

Andy Nelson asked about the timeline for the process, and Kathy said that they will plan for a discussion in November, and then a vote in December, assuming that the Board will be prepared for that once those lingering issues and questions are addressed.

Mike Alexander asked about the next steps after the Board’s vote in December, and Mike Abbaté said that the Board will make a recommendation to the Bureau and Commissioner Fritz. The next step would be a conversation with the Commissioner about her priorities, and how to move that forward. Jim Owens asked if it would require a Council vote, and Mike said yes.

Sue noted that in terms of a process, ours will be minimal. Andy added that Council will likely have a process with hearings and testimony.

**Comprehensive Plan update** Jim noted that the subcommittee will be reviewing a new iteration of the comprehensive plan. Kathy Fong Stephens added that they will be weighing in on the new draft and reporting to the Board.

**SDC committee update** Jim Owens reported that the SDC committee will be meeting later on this month. Not much has happened in last few months. They are focusing on the issue of how to apply SDCs for campus rooms. He noted that it may be a different formula for calculating square footage for housing units. Kathy Fong Stephens added, to clarify, that SDCs are System Development Charges. Kathy asked Jim about the members on the committee, and Jim noted that there are approximately 15 people. He is the only Parks representative. He said that there are some individuals in real estates, development, builders, noting that most are paying, or effected in some way. Mike Abbaté added that there are citizens as well, including representatives from various citizen groups like the League of Women’s Voters. Mike Abbaté noted that we are required to review the SDC methodology every few years. One issue, he said, is that we only collect 75% of the cost of delivering parks – should that be 100%? Jim noted that the other issue we wrestled with was waiving SDCs, and the process for engaging that if it comes up again.

**Loos in Parks** Kia Selley noted that historically PP&R has not put restrooms in neighborhood parks. She said that the reasoning behind this was that visitors to neighborhood parks lived close by, and would be visiting the park for short periods of time. The reality though, she said, is that a lot of people go to neighborhood parks who don’t live close by. We also have to take into consideration the needs of children who need to go at a moment’s notice, as well as accessible needs, and the needs of our homeless population. She said that they are now questioning how and when to put in restrooms. And, should they be loos? She noted that there are several examples of loos in our parks – Parks Board members may have seen these in the Fields Park, Jamison Square, and South Park blocks. Recently, she noted, Parks has taken ownership of the loos – which has given us the opportunity to consider them for our parks. Small buildings that house restrooms range from 300 – 700k or more, loos are 150k.

Brett Horner added that we currently have 6 loos. He noted that the loo is being marketed to other cities across the nation. Brett said that the guidance we are looking for is a threshold question: When we are building a park, should we always plan on putting a restroom in of some type – a loo, a building, or a portable? He noted that there are several things to look at – we always look at size of the park, high use, sports fields, lends self to need for restrooms. He said to look at the duration you think people will spend at the park – if it’s less than an acre with a small playground, maybe we don’t need a restroom, but every park is different. We ask the community about needs for the park, and we don’t have a set policy on restrooms. Brett said that they are interested in the Parks Board’s thoughts, noting that members have seen, and spent time in many of our parks. He said that once the threshold question has been answered, what is the best type? – a built structure with multiple stalls, or is it a minor need – a seasonal/portable could be brought in – maybe we just need one – which lends itself to a loo.

Brett distributed a handout with checklist, noting that the the loo is designed for high use, with high visibility issues. He noted that there are some security issues

that get resolved with a loo. Security staff can see if someone is in there because there is a grill near the feet. It is quite a different experience than using a portable, or built structure.

Meryl Redisch asked where the loo is manufactured, and Brett said that they are made in Oregon. The company, Madden Fabrication, is Portland based. Mike Abbaté added that the loos were originally with the water bureau, then went to BES, now came to parks. Now PP&R will be overseeing the contract with Madden, as well as overseeing all of the loos, whether they are in a park or not.

Kathy Fong Stephens asked about maintenance, and annual operating cost after the initial 150k. Brett said that maintenance runs from 11 to 15k per year, noting that this is a high level of maintenance. The loos are power washed, and they receive a higher level of care than portables. Kathy asked if this maintenance is part of a lease agreement, and Brett said that yes, we have a lease agreement for maintenance.

Nick Hardigg asked about annual costs for a portable restroom, and Brett noted that we would typically build an enclosure for a portable – installation would be around 25k + \$13 – 1400 annually for maintenance. He noted that some portables are only there seasonally.

Kathy Fong Stephens asked about the lifespan for loos, and Brett noted that they are essentially bulletproof, made of steel, and will last at least 50 years, maybe more.

Linda Robinson noted that the loos are an example of crime prevention through environmental design because are constructed with the ability to see someone through it, as well as not being able to lock yourself in. Linda noted that she has not seen a lot of enclosures around portables. Brett noted that we are trying to do that with new parks.

Mike Alexander asked for clarification on what is meant by a neighborhood park, and Brett answered that neighborhood parks are not intended to draw for more than a mile or two. Larger parks – community parks – are like Peninsula or Lents and draw people from all over the city. Neighborhood parks are intended to draw a smaller neighborhood, may have one or two sports field, and typically no parking lot.

Andy Nelson asked about where the request came from, and for clarification on what the problem is that we are trying to solve. Brett said that we needed restrooms in the downtown area for homeless and people who didn't have access to restrooms. The loos addressed a security concern – traditional restrooms with multiple stalls all in one space are very difficult to monitor. The loo is a single stall, intended for one person to be in at a time. Restroom service in a high urban area has been identified as a need, as well as an equity goal. Mike Abbaté noted that with some neighborhood parks – for example, K<sup>h</sup>unamokwst Park is a neighborhood park – and the community identified a restroom as a high need. He said that this is actually a common thing we hear from neighborhoods – noting that a citizen may say, “I may live in the neighborhood, but when my 3-year-old needs to go...”

Andy Nelson noted that the cost is high. Kathy asked if portables are accessible, and Brett said yes.

Meryl Redisch asked if there is a loo at Jamison, and Kia said that yes, we have a loo at Jamison Square and The Fields Park. Art Hendricks noted that there are not a lot of issues at the one at Jamison, and it gets a lot of use. With restrooms, he noted, there are some factors to consider. Where the loos are positioned matters. More eyes on the park usually means decreased issues with that loo.

Mauricio Villarreal commented on the notion of neighborhood parks, saying that Jamison is a perfect example – it's one block, essentially a neighborhood park, but people drive to it for the fountain. On the questions of bathrooms – it is costly to install, but also keep safe, and maintain. He noted that the design is exciting, and it's good to see, to walk around a neighborhood.

Art noted that the police like the loo because they don't have to get out of the car, they can see the feet. He added that officers don't like to get out of the car at 2 am in the morning to check a brick and mortar structure. Kia noted that the loos are very clean, comfortable, and feel safe. Kathy added that the one in the Park Blocks feels very safe.

Jim Owens noted that it has been mentioned several times that the Bureau inherited the loos. He asked about controversy with utility rates, and wanted clarification on how the transfer happen. Mike Abbaté responded with a short background, noting that there was a desire to put a loo in the South Park Blocks. Commissioner Fish was Parks Commissioner at the time. He noted that there can be an enormous impact of not having a loo in a park. If you don't provide a restroom, maybe the park becomes a restroom. We located the one for the South Park Blocks. Prior to that time, no loos had been on Parks property. Previously, they had all been in the right of way. We then carried the idea over to The Fields Park - we needed a restroom, and we value engineered it out because it would have cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. We decided to put a loo in. It has been effective. At K<sup>h</sup>unamokwst Park, we originally planned a porta potty with enclosure, but decided we wanted a higher level of service. So we are using them more. Council now perceives all loos to be a part of parks. The one at Waterfront Park is not actually in the park, it's in the right of way. We did get \$120k per year for maintenance.

Jim asked about the criteria for loos versus porta potty as an equity issue – some saying not in our neighborhood. He noted that it will be important to identify objective criteria.

Kathy asked where do we go from here – do we study this issue more and make a recommendation, or form a committee? Mike Abbaté said that whatever comments you have today, if you want to continue discussion, we can carry it into next month. He noted that the Board's input is very helpful.

Mike Alexander noted that one of the most painful decision we had to make in the budget process was closing functioning restrooms. The porta potty as a permanent use is ineloquent, particularly for a neighborhood park. He added that access to

restrooms is a priority.

Kathy Fong Stephens asked if people feel like we need to discuss further.

Mike Abbaté noted that the general idea seems to be that in neighborhood parks, unless very small, should have some type of restrooms, and that the preference would be not a porta potty.

Linda Robinson said she would rather see the loo, particularly for security, noting that homeless sleep in restroom buildings. She said for that reason, the loo would be preferable to a building. If there's nothing, she said, she would prefer to have at least a porta potty. The use pattern might be different if there is a restroom available. There may be people who would use a park more if there was rest room available.

Andy Nelson agreed that the loo is ideal, but noted an obligation to look at cost for tax payers. They (loos) are really cool and neat, but he noted that he would advise PP&R to look at costs. Mike Abbaté noted that the porta potty is an alternative that might make sense in certain areas.

Christa Thoeresz commented that if there is nothing in between the loo and the porta potty – that seems like an amazing business opportunity for someone.

Mike Abbaté noted that the cost includes the building, but also sewer and water. Kathy added that one of our principals is equity, and she is glad that Linda and Jim brought that up.

**Equity & Inclusion  
Manager**

Mike Abbaté introduced PP&R's new Equity & Inclusion Manager, Art Hendricks, noting that he has been our security manager for the past 3 years. He added that you may think of him as the security guy, but that his background is extremely diverse, and he is uniquely qualified for this position.

Art Hendricks talked about his background, noting that for most of his professional career, he has been involved in different endeavors that have focused on equity and inclusion, and issues of diversity. He attended the University of Oregon, and Marylhurst University and has a degree in counseling. He started out working with youth in mental health counseling. He noted that he moved to Portland, and worked at the King Neighborhood Facility in NE Portland, and most of his clients were gang affected youth. He worked with the community around cultural competency and equity. There was concern from the community about a white agency coming in and telling African American families how to live. He worked with many community leaders – Charles Ford and other community advocates, and did extensive work in the NE community. In 1994, the organization was recognized by then Governor Roberts for their approach.

Art said that he moved to Seattle in the 1990s – where he met his wife. They have 4 kids, mine, hers and ours, noting that he has a 29 year old daughter, 15 year old son, and two step sons. Art said that one of his sons is special needs, and developmentally disabled. He noted that he bring an understanding not just around race, but also special needs. In a community – when we look at how we deliver

services, bring voice to voiceless. In the 90s, Art noted, he worked for a company in Seattle – youth development programs, youth disparities, health disparities, disproportionate minority. They looked at the conditions that lead to disparate health outcomes, and how African American and Latino youth are being disproportionately incarcerated. Working with organizations, programs, policies, how they were delivering services to communities of color.

He moved back to Portland when his son was going to be born, and worked as the crime prevention program coordinator for the City. He focused on how to improve our services, focusing on increasing our capacity – how neighborhood associations serve our communities.

Most recently, he said that he worked for PDC, and then the Housing Bureau - operation home focus on homeownership and looking at the gap in homeownership for people of color. Historical gap, people of color, compared to whites. Work with lenders. Delve into issues of equity. He Came to work at Parks 3 years ago, and really felt like he found a home in parks – He said “I’ll either be the safest Equity and Inclusion Manager, or the most diverse Safety Manager.” Art noted that he looks forward to working with the Equity and Inclusion committee, and the Board,

**Parks Proposal  
Process**

Kathy Fong Stephens noted that they have already started working with the Equity and Inclusion committee on an issue that came up last month on the parks proposal process. Kathy noted that Art met with the equity committee, laid out issues, and gave them a lot of great background. The equity committee wanted more conversation, and will meet on Sept. 24<sup>th</sup>, and bring a recommendation and vote for that process at our next meeting.

Mike Abbaté noted that we have a parks proposal process in which citizens suggest things. We want a new playground, or bark chips, and we’ll raise the money. We’ve been looking at that process – Maija Spencer who is here oversees that process. We look at if there is a way to fund it, does it make sense in that particular park, is it part of master plan? In some neighborhoods, people will come with money to make it happen. That poses a question – if that were the only thing we did in parks, those neighborhoods that can gather those resources could get things done in their parks, but those without resources, couldn’t. We’ve allocated money for parks in east Portland, we’ve looked through an equity lens, where is the gap, low income areas, high needs. Do we look at parks proposal process as a separate thing, or do we look in the same way?

Maija Spencer reported that in an average year, PP&R receives 2 dozen proposals. About ½ we give an immediate no because the project is not suitable, not safe place, etc. She noted that we get a lot of proposals for dog parks. Maija noted that ½ do get approved, and ½ of those do get implemented right away. These projects are mostly small scale – 10k range, often come with community group grants. Small number are larger than that. Projects might be informational kiosks, art pieces like the one at Marquam Park, nature play areas. The proposals come with some community fund raising, but a lot of grants.

Sue Van Brocklin noted that she wasn’t here in August, but wanted to give a big thank you to Jennifer Yocom and Mike Abbaté for the work on the Alex Rovello

Memorial Courts – a community group raised over 100k. Sue noted that the work that Jennifer put in to support the family, as they raised the money, managed the construction, was an amazing accomplishment. Jennifer Yocom added a big thank you to Sue, noting that she handled all the media outreach, which was very successful.

Andy Nelson noted that the Parks Proposal Process might look a lot like school fund raising, and Kathy agreed that this is one of the points the committee brought up. There are underlying equity and inclusion issues – community initiated need to have in place. Framing issues – discussion continues. Mike noted that there is some urgency, as several proposals are pending. One has been pending for months related to fencing a dog off-leash area. The committee will meet again – if Parks Board could give direction next month.

Linda Robinson noted that they have a dog park in east Portland that was supposed to be fenced, and is only partially fenced. Do we have to raise the money to get the rest of ours fenced. If someone else raises the money to have theirs fenced, will they get theirs first? Linda added that the fence was promised when we agreed to have an off-leash dog area.

**Director's update** Mike Abbaté gave an update on Parks response to the auditor. Progress report. Many of the things are in place, or scheduled as part of our strategic plan. He noted that he is happy to answer questions the Board may have about that.

Mike noted that when we promoted Art to Equity & Inclusion Manager, it opened a position for a Security Manager. Again, we had a phenomenal response. Art made it seem like a completely sweet job with no conflict. Thanks Art – we had a stellar candidate pool. Judy Bluehorse Skelton was involved in the interview panel. Galina Burley was hired back in August. Galina has a Master's degree in Public Administration. She spent time in Norfolk, Virginia. Mike noted that he called the Parks Director, who wasn't on her reference list, and he said oh my gosh, she's amazing. She has done a wide variety of things. Qualified in FEMA's incident command. She oversaw security at community centers in Norfolk. Originally comes from Sochi, Russia. She is bilingual, and active in the Russian community in Portland.

Galina noted that she worked for the City of Portland 10 years ago, and worked with Art in crime prevention where she had the opportunity to do a lot of community outreach. She said that she sees a lot of opportunity in her current position. She has been visiting a lot of our parks, noting that a lot has changed in the past 10 years since she worked for Art. She noted that her background is in safety and social services. Lens to collaborate and problem solve with community members, police, multiple partners. A lot of issues are not issues we own so to speak and so it is important to partner with other groups and social services. Galina noted that her grandpa worked for the forestry ministry – and she has a history of respecting the land, noting that she grew up doing a lot of family things in parks, and open spaces.

Meryl Redisch asked Mike about the audit response, noting that she did not see anything related to park trees – how trees are planted and protected. Meryl asked why that is, and suggested working with PP&R to figure out a way in developed

parks, or parks that will be coming on with master plans to look at trees – and perhaps form a committee to inform and influence how trees are selected, planted and protected. Mike answered that we are required to make a response to the auditor’s report. The auditor didn’t bring up trees, so we didn’t include that.

Kathy noted that there are some budget considerations. In the last BAC process – we did have a budget package for asset management that was not funded. We were funded in a maintenance position – asset management. Particularly when you look at what commissioner and mayor have said about asset management, think it will be a high priority going forward. Jim was going to ask about cycling back to asset management for next budget process.

Mike – mike alexander will be speaking at the Portland building at noon.

**Meeting adjourned** Kathy – adjourn at 9:27, noting that at the next meeting we will talk about Washington Park Reservoirs and there will be an update on Tabor.