

Villages at Mt. Hood Board of Directors

Concerns Regarding Community Park, Amphitheatre and Recreation Area

Compiled: November 30, 2006

Background:

On September 19, 2006 the Villages at Mt. Hood monthly Board of Directors voted to endorse the Community Park, Amphitheatre and Recreation Area Committee's request to withhold, from the sale of the Cedar Ridge Parcel, 15 acres of land held by Clackamas. It was understood that this land was the desired location for the project this committee is advocating on behalf of. As part of the committee's presentation, the request was made to accept their application as a community Supported Activity. The motion to endorse the land "hold back" was not adequately worded to address the committee's request to become a community Supported Activity.

On October 17, 2006 at the Villages at Mt. Hood monthly Board of Directors meeting, the board of Directors programmed the upcoming agenda for the quarterly Town Hall Meeting. Included in the agenda was a vote on supported activity status for the Community Park, Amphitheatre and Recreation Area. The committee advocating for Supported Activity status was in attendance and left the meeting understanding their project would be up for vote at the November Town Hall Meeting.

On November 6, 2006: Susan Corwin, the Villages at Mt. Hood Vice-Chair attended the Clackamas County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) work session. As the Board Chair was not able to attend, Susan Corwin was representing the Board. Susan pointed out that the motion passed by the Villages at Mt. Hood Board of Directors on September 19, 2006 was not adequate to refer this to the BCC for approval to send it to the November Community Town Hall Meeting.

On November 21, 2006 per the agenda, the Villages at Mt. Hood Board of Director's meeting deliberated the endorsement of the Community Park, Amphitheatre and Recreation Area as a community Supported Activity. Some Directors voiced their opinion that the committee advocating this activity had not answered all of the questions they needed answered. The motion was tabled and the Board Chair, Rick Applegate, requested all Directors forward their concerns to him no later than November 28, 2006 – at which time he would consolidate all of the concerns and forward them to the committee requesting Supported Activity status so they could answer ALL of the Boards remaining concerns at the December 19, 2006 Board of Directors Meeting.

List of Concerns by the Villages at Mt. Hood Board of Directors

Rick Applegate – No Concerns Forwarded
Nancy Dougherty – No Concerns Forwarded
Steve Graeper – No Concerns Forwarded
Shirley Dueber – No Concerns Forwarded
Robert Reeves – No Concerns Forwarded
Barbara Saldivar – No Concerns Forwarded
Don Mench – No Concerns Forwarded
David Lythgoe – No Concerns Forwarded

Susan Corwin: Following Concerns Forwarded

1. Community input

I have yet to see any significant effort to engage the community as a whole. There needs to be support from the people living on Blue Jay Lane, Brightwood, Salmon, Wildwood, Wemme, Timberline Rim, etc that this isn't going to be a big community fight that causes problems and bad feelings for years to come. (and, no, 21 people hanging late at a Town Hall for an unadvertised advisory vote isn't sufficient for project of this magnitude). The Town Hall should not be the only venue and PR pieces in papers are useful but not sufficient.

2. Assessment of Community impact

An 800 car parking lot at the entrance to the community will add Congestion and, likely, a loss of scenic viewshed. 2500 people coming up on Weekends will likely be a problem. Headline shows are likely to attract some People the community would just as soon not see. This is a "rural recreational" area and 2500 person shows would seem to be a problem. What other projects should be dropped to "put the wood behind this arrow" from a county perspective and will the volunteers on those projects actually move to help?

3. Noise

In my discussion with the Bend Amphitheater manager, she mentioned that Many amphitheatres near residential areas were closing due to noise complains.

Given that we are in a reverberating valley and the experiences with fireworks, etc have indicated that sound will travel a long way, how will this be managed

4. IRS

There have been comments that the proposed project generate excess Revenue to support other projects. I believe that the IRS calls this "unrelated business income" and doesn't really like non-profits not paying taxes

on it. The financial basis and management of this needs to be clarified to demonstrate feasibility and legality.

5. Taxes

Who is going to guarantee that the community will not be stuck with the Need for taxes (or an abandoned, hazardous structure) if the finances don't Work out? The structure, as presented utilizing a 501(c)(3), with little capital To work with, would seem to have high probability for running out of funds. This would seem to be a full fledged commercial enterprise that is creating permanent infrastructure/buildings and needs to demonstrate viability and sustainability with more than "...we are highly confident".