



CITY OF OREGON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

**Virtual Meeting
Thursday, October 22, 2020 at 7:00 PM**

This is a virtual only meeting if you would like to participate please contact Kendall Reid at kendallreid@orcity.org.

CALL TO ORDER

INTRODUCTIONS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the September 24, 2020 PRAC Meeting

PUBLIC COMMENT

Citizens are allowed up to 3 minutes to present information relevant to the City but not listed as an item on the agenda. To assist in tracking your time, refer to the timer at the dais. Prior to speaking, citizens shall complete a comment form and deliver it to the Staff Member. When the Chair calls your name, proceed to the speaker table and state your name and city of residence into the microphone. The Historic Review Board Officers do not generally engage in dialog with those making comments but may refer the issue to the City Manager.

GENERAL BUSINESS

2. Regional Parks Comparison
3. Heritage Stand Tree Nominations for Park Place Park
4. Oregon City Film Trail Sign Location Update

MEMBER REPORTS

STAFF REPORTS

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

5. Tyrone S. Woods Memorial Park 12/5/2019
Cost Recovery Training
Regional Comparison of Parks 10/22/2020
Parks and Recreation Funding
Clackamette Park Master Plan
Buena Vista House 01/23/2020

WES Good Neighbor Funds
Joint Operations Center
Willamette Falls Legacy Project
Property Acquisition
Dog Park 9/24/2020
Review Goals 2/27/2020
The Cove
Heritage Tree Stand Nominations 9/24/2020

ADJOURNMENT

PUBLIC COMMENT GUIDELINES

Citizens are allowed up to 3 minutes to present information relevant to the City but not listed as an item on the agenda. Prior to speaking, citizens shall complete a comment form and deliver it to the Staff Member. When the Chair calls your name, proceed to the speaker table and state your name and city of residence into the microphone. To assist in tracking your speaking time, refer to the timer on the table.

As a general practice, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee does not engage in discussion with those making comments.

Electronic presentations are permitted but shall be delivered to the City Recorder 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

ADA NOTICE

The location is ADA accessible. Hearing devices may be requested from the City Staff Member prior to the meeting. Individuals requiring other assistance must make their request known 48 hours preceding the meeting by contacting the City Recorder's Office at 503 657 0891

Agenda Posted at City Hall, Pioneer Community Center, Library, City Web site.

Video Streaming & Broadcasts: The meeting is streamed live on Internet on the Oregon City's Web site at www.orcity.org and available on demand following the meeting. The meeting can be viewed live on Willamette Falls Television on channel 28 for Oregon City area residents. The meetings are also rebroadcast on WFMC. Please contact WFMC at 503 650 0275 for a programming schedule

City of Oregon City
Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting Thursday, September 24, 2020 at 7:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 6:56 pm

INTRODUCTIONS

Members: Brent Haverkamp; Shawn Dachtler; Andy Crump; Doug Neeley; Troy Bolinger; Jeff Sargent; Alicia Hammock; Karin Morey

Staff: Kendall Reid, Parks and Recreation Director; Denise Conrad, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director; Kathy Wiseman, Senior Center Supervisor; Rochelle Anderholm-Parsch, Aquatic and Recreation Manager

Guests: Greg Williams, Library Director; Pete Walter, Community Development Senior Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the August 24, 2020 Regular Meeting

Approval of the minutes was approved and seconded.

All in Favor: Doug Neeley; Karin Morey; Troy Bolinger; Alicia Hammock; Andy Crump; Shawn Dachtler; Brent Haverkamp

All opposed: none

Abstain: Jeff Sargent

Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no citizen comments.

GENERAL BUSINESS

2. Expansion of the 6th Street Library Book Return

Greg Williams, Library Director, provided an update on the 6th Street book drop expansion. Mr. Williams announced that they have expanded the book drop capacity by adding an identical unit next to the existing book drop on 6th Street. There were no code, permit or historical issues with this addition and the City Attorney was consulted prior to installation. The new capacity allows for 24/7 drop off, including over long holiday weekends. Before and after photos were presented. Mr. Williams apologized for not coming before PRAC earlier but noted that he had reached out to Parks and Recreation Director, Kendall Reid.

Doug Neeley moved to approve this expansion; Troy Bolinger seconded.

All in Favor: Doug Neeley; Karin Morey; Troy Bolinger; Jeff Sargent; Alicia Hammock; Andy Crump; Shawn Dachtler; Brent Haverkamp

All opposed: none

Motion passed unanimously.

3. OLDA Pilot Program (Off Leash Dog Area)

Denise Conrad, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director, provided an update on the OLDA that was last discussed in February. The pilot program was planned to be for a one-year test run, although it has gone on for more than 3 years. Ms. Conrad noted that the results to an online survey taken in November 2019 were attached to the Staff Report. Mr. Reid had drafted a recommendation presenting options for PRAC to consider and determine the next steps; form a new dog park sub-committee; increase public outreach; choose a site and create a budget; create a proposal that considers location, funding, maintenance and enforcement.

Doug Neeley moved to form a new sub-committee and include Ms. Conrad's additional recommendations; Jeff Sargent seconded.

All in Favor: Doug Neeley; Karin Morey; Troy Bolinger; Jeff Sargent; Alicia Hammock; Andy Crump; Shawn Dachtler; Brent Haverkamp

All opposed: none

Motion passed unanimously.

Karin Morey asked for a volunteer for Chair of the sub-committee; Jeff Sargent volunteered. Alicia Hammock volunteered to serve on the sub-committee. Ms. Morey recommended that Mr. Sargent reach out to previous PRAC members Bill Daniels and Lisa Novack who had expressed interest in sub-committee service. Mr. Neeley asked if a fenced OLDA was included in the recommendation. Ms. Conrad replied no because they are building a fenced dog park at Tyrone S. Woods Memorial Park.

4. Heritage Tree Stand Nominations

Pete Walter, Senior Planner, discussed a prior nomination of a tree stand in Park Place Park. The topic was last discussed with PRAC in February, but the Planning and Parks Staff are now recommending that PRAC consider a revised proposal to move forward with the nomination of only some of the trees in this area, but not all. Mr. Walter noted that these trees will still be protected under the City Permit requirement for tree removal and also by the draft City Policy for Tree Removal. A map was displayed of the original site plan as well as a list of the trees that were previously nominated. Mr. Walter reminded members of their previous recommendation to move forward with nominating trees with the

exception of those that were in decline, but noted that they don't know the condition of all of the trees in the stand. Staff recommendation is for PRAC to consider revising the Heritage Stand designation to only include trees in good condition, are safely accessible and are visible to park visitors. Mr. Reid summarized that Parks supports this program but feels that specific trees/areas need to be identified for nomination to avoid all of the back & forth with the process. Ms. Conrad added that there are some concerns with the visible Atlas Cedar trees as they sit on a bench with a large elevation drop onto a playground and their position near a road could compact the roots and degrade the trees. Mr. Neeley and Mr. Dachtler pointed out that the significance of a tree should be considered whether or not it is visible. Mr. Dachtler felt that more information was needed and proceeding with the nomination was premature. Ms. Morey recommended that this topic be postponed until next month and then presented with clearer direction. Doug Neeley moved for a continuance for further information; Brent Haverkamp seconded.

All in Favor: Doug Neeley; Karin Morey; Troy Bolinger; Jeff Sargent; Alicia Hammock; Andy Crump; Shawn Dachtler; Brent Haverkamp

All opposed: none

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Haverkamp asked what further information will be coming. Ms. Morey replied they should expect a clearer motion and possibly to hear from Jonathan Waverly, Parks Manager.

5. OC 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Walter discussed updates on the OC 2040 Comprehensive Plan project. The project is in the Community Conversations phase, an outreach that asks a set of simple questions to help Planning Staff and the City Commission understand what people love about the City and what improvements can be made in the future. They are striving to get the broadest input from as many community members as possible. With that goal, Mr. Walters asked members a set of questions in a series of roundtable discussions.

Members were asked why they chose to live/work in Oregon City, what makes OC special and what should be preserved or enhanced. Responses included the unique historical nature of the City, the small town feel while having the convenience of being located near a big metro area, the ease of getting involved in the community and the access to the outdoors.

When asked about what changes or improvements could be made in the future, many members responded that economic development was important as well as finishing projects, such as the Willamette Falls Project, the paper mill, the dump site and the Cove. Of concern to some members were increasing traffic, pedestrian safety, aging parks infrastructure and the need for community involvement.

When asked how they would like to participate in the OC 2040 process and who else should be contacted to make this an inclusive process, members overwhelmingly responded that the seniors and veterans in our community need to be reached, and social media is not necessarily the best way to do that. Members suggested making sure all ethnic groups are included and all different methods of media should be used to access all of these groups. Mr. Walter encouraged members to sign up for the mailing list for bi-weekly updates and noted that updates will also be provided in Trail News publications. He thanked members for their input and informed the group that the PRAC meeting video would be posted on the project website.

MEMBER REPORTS

Ms. Morey: Informed those who were interested in getting blue can/bottle recycling bags that support the Oregon City Parks Foundation that they need to contact her to receive further instructions as there is a specific process.

No other members provided reports.

STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Reid thanked Staff for their response during the wildfires; stepping up to assist with the evacuation sites, working the phone lines and for opening up the Pool for showers. He noted that they worked long hours and he really appreciated their community support. Mr. Reid stated that he is working on a plan for the deferred maintenance assessment, including finding a consultant to help verify the numbers. It is a priority to update the Master Plan, which will help provide direction for investment in growth and maintenance. At the next meeting, Mr. Reid will have more information on how Oregon City staffing and resource management compares to other cities, both regionally and nationally. Mr. Reid noted that all construction projects were placed on hold during the time that air quality was unsafe, and noted that all Staff who worked outside during that time were provided with the proper equipment. He concluded by mentioning that they have also been dealing with the issue of flooding that occurred at some parks and at the Pioneer Center.

Rochelle Anderholm-Parsch, Aquatics and Recreation Manager, announced that the Swimming Pool would be reopening on October 5 for limited pre-registered activities. The Oregon City Swim Team will begin their practices on Sept. 28. The Ermatinger House will be reopening for tours on October 3; pre-registration is required.

Kathy Wiseman, Senior Center Supervisor, noted that the Pioneer Center experienced their largest flood in more than 17 years. Ms. Wiseman expressed her thanks for Ms. Anderholm-Parsch and Mr. Waverly for their help with cleaning things up.

Denise Conrad, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director, gave kudos to the Facilities Staff for their hard work on smoke mitigation and managing various crises. Ms. Conrad noted that they are a small staff that does an amazing job keeping up. She reported that seven days were lost on the current construction projects at Tyrone S. Woods and D.C. LaTourette Parks and they will need to extend the contracts as the time can't be made up. Ms. Conrad also expressed her thanks to the Staff for their willingness to pitch in during the windstorms and wildfires.

Mr. Haverkamp asked Ms. Conrad whether the extensions would lead to an additional cost. Ms. Conrad replied that everything in construction shut down, so there should not be an additional cost, just a time extension.

Mr. Bolinger said, "Nice job, guys!" to City Staff who worked so hard behind the scenes during the wildfires. He also noted that it would be good to have a mechanism to solicit help from the community when it was needed.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

6. List of Future Agenda Items

- Tyrone S. Woods Memorial Park - 12/5/2019
- Parks and Recreation Funding
- Clackamette Park Master Plan – *corrected from "Clackamas"*
- Buena Vista House - 1/23/2020
- WES Good Neighbor Funds
- Joint Operations Center
- Willamette Falls Legacy Project
- Property Acquisition
- Dog Park - 2/27/2020 – 9/24/2020
- Review Goals - 2/27/2020
- The Cove

Ms. Morey stated that the Parks and Recreation Funding item should be broken down into two groups; deferred maintenance and staffing. Ms. Morey noted that she, Mr. Dachtler and Mr. Reid had discussed a plan for an RFP to start looking at the Parks Maintenance Plan and identify deferred maintenance issues as well as staffing. She commented that a Parks Master Plan should be added.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

7. October 22, 2020

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:50pm by Chair Karin Morey



STAFF REPORT

TITLE: COMPARISON OF REGIONAL PARKS' SYSTEMS

PRESENTATION DATE: OCTOBER 22, 2020

AUTHOR: ROCHELLE ANDERHOLM-PARSCH, MANAGER
JONATHAN WAVERLY, MANAGER

PURPOSE & BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this report is to meet the request expressed by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC) regarding a comparison of regional parks system. The presentation is for information purposes only. The intent is not to supply recommendations but to meet the request of PRAC. There is no request for action currently.

DATA & RESEARCH:

Staff reached out to 17 agencies with a population greater than 20,000 but less than 55,500. In total staff compared 15 agencies.¹

Oregon City Parks & Recreation (OCPR) asked a series of 8 questions. For a full list of questions, please see Appendix A: Questions to Ask Each Agency.

To provide the most accurate comparison there were 9 data points compared. This report includes a breakdown of following:

1. Population
2. 2018-2019 Adopted Budget
3. Number of Parks
4. Total Acreage
5. Expenditures per Acre to Maintain
6. FTE per Agency
7. Seasonal Hires per Agency
8. Acres per FTE
9. Acres per FTE Plus Seasonal Employees

Please see Appendix B for the complete unabridged data report.

¹ A reference page is at the conclusion of this staff report to track emails and conversations with the agencies that responded. The rest of the references will be reflected in subsequent footnotes.

REGIONAL COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS:

1. Population

Population			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Happy Valley	22,553		
Redmond		30,834	
Albany			55,338

Average	Oregon City
33,921	37,346

Oregon City is slightly above the average population of cities studied in this comparison.²

2. 2018-2019 Adopted Budgets

Adopted Budget FY 2018-2019			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Forest Grove	\$849,099		
Redmond		\$1,660,162	
Lake Oswego			\$3,541,000

Average	Oregon City
\$2,186,607	\$2,242,206

Oregon City is \$1,298,794 below the maximum adopted budget. Lake Oswego holds the highest adopted budget. Oregon City is \$55,599 above average. Oregon City operates and maintains a cemetery. The City of Albany and Redmond both operate and maintain a cemetery. Albany's adopted budget is \$2,338,800 which is \$96,594 larger than Oregon City's, and Redmond's adopted budget is \$1,660,162 which is \$582,044 less than Oregon City's.

3. Number of Parks

Number of Parks			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Happy Valley	17 parks		
McMinnville		21 parks	
Lake Oswego			40 parks

Average	Oregon City
25 parks	38 parks

A park is defined as "an area of land, usually in a largely natural state, for the enjoyment of the public, having facilities for rest and recreation, often owned, set apart, and managed by a city, state or nation."³ Oregon City has 38 parks. Lake Oswego has 40 parks. Oregon City has 13 parks above average and the 17 parks above the median. According to national standards the, "typical park and recreation agency manages 20 parks comprising of 437.1 acres." Furthermore, national standards state that a typical agency has 1 park for every 2,281 residents.⁴ In terms of Oregon City, OCPR should have 16 parks, but OCPR operates and supports 38. That is one park for every 982 residents.

² U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States 2020

³ Park Definition. (n.d.). Retrieved October 8, 2020, from <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/park>

⁴ National Parks & Recreation Association, 2020 NRPA Agency Performance Review 2020 p. 8

Total Acreage

Total Acres Operated & Managed			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Woodburn	110 acres		
Roseburg		428 acers	
Albany			936 acres

Average	Oregon City
433.5 acres	300 acres

Total acres operated and maintained per parks system vary. OCPR owns and maintains approximately 300 acres. OCPR is comparable to other regional cities whose total acres range from 225 acres to 348.6. These cities include Wilsonville, Keizer, and McMinnville. Regarding national standards, “The typical park and recreation agency manages 9.9 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents.”⁵ OCPR manages 8.03 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents.

4. Expenditures per Acre to Maintain

Annual Cost to Maintain an Acre			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Albany	\$2,499		
Keizer		\$4,889	
Woodburn			\$8,753

Average	Oregon City
\$4,691	\$7,474

Albany’s annual operating expenditures per acre of park and non-park sites is \$2,499. The City of Woodburn has the highest annual cost to maintain an acre. The City of Woodburn spends \$8,753 per acre. Woodburn’s budget is around \$1.0 million dollars, and their acreage is low. OCPR spends \$7,474 per acre, but most of OCPR sites are developed, and OCPR operates and maintains a cemetery, which is highly unique and time consuming. Two other cities in this comparison operate a cemetery, the City of Albany and Redmond. Albany spends \$2,498 per acre but has a total of 936 acres to maintain, 450 developed, and 486 undeveloped. Redmond spends \$3,120 per acre and has a total of 532 acres, 260 developed and 272 undeveloped. Regarding national standards, “The Median operating expenditure is \$7,160 per acre of park and non-park sites.”⁶ OCPR falls in the realm of median when looking at National standards, but higher when evaluating regional comparisons. This is partly due to the standard of care required at the Cemetery, including burials, and the uniqueness of managing an RV park. Furthermore, OCPR manages and operates two boat ramps. OCPR is also unique in that the City is comprised of a three-tiered geological topography. This dynamic increase time maintaining varies parks sites around the City. Lastly, OCPR maintains historic and aged properties. These aging parks and amenities require additional care and upkeep, resulting in higher expenditures per acre. Funds have been adopted to address some of the deferred projects, and in previous years have rolled over from one Fiscal Year to the next. OCPR adopted budget has also assisted in the development of new structures in the parks system, also a capital improvement to the park sites.

⁵ National Parks & Recreation Association, *2020 NRPA Agency Performance Review 2020* p. 8

⁶ National Parks & Recreation Association, *2020 NRPA Agency Performance Review 2020* p. 19

5. FTE Per Agency

Full Time Equivalent			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Happy Valley Wil, WL, Red, OC	2	7	
Lake Oswego			19

Average	Oregon City
8.26	7

OCPR has 7 full time employees, the average is 8.26. Lake Oswego has 19 full-time employees, and second to this is Tigard with 13 FTE's. National standards point to number of acres maintained as related to FTE's: "250 [acres] or fewer – 15.9 FTE"⁷ However, a regional comparison does not reflect this finding. For instance, OCPR operates 300 acres and there are 7 FTE's. Wilsonville operates and maintains 225 acres and has 7 FTE's. Keizer operates and maintains 225 acres and has 4 FTE's. The national metric found in the 'NRPA Agency Performance Review' includes parks and recreation staff combined and does not divide out parks specifically.

6. Seasonal Hire per Agency

Seasonal Hires			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Forest Grove Rose, Wil, Red, OC	0	5	
Albany, LO			15

Average	Oregon City
6	5

Seasonal hire data per agency is highly influenced by the uniqueness of each agency. Forest Grove does not hire seasonal employees, and Albany and Lake Oswego will hire approximately 15 seasonal employees. Wilsonville, Roseburg, and West Linn hires approximately the same number of seasonal employees as OCPR, 5 seasonal employees. The total amount of acreage of these 3 agencies is comparable as well, ranging from 300 to 428 acres. Keizer has a total acreage of 225 and hires 3 seasonal employees. McMinnville has a total acreage of 348 acres and hires 3 seasonal employees.

7. Acres per FTE

Acres to Maintain per Full Time Employee with no Seasonal			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Woodburn	18.3 acres		
Tigard		45 acres	
Albany			104 acres

Average	Oregon City
54.4 acres	42.9 acres

OCPR maintains 42.9 acres per FTE. This amount falls directly in line with regional averages, and close to the median. To calculate this data and show this metric, the total amount of acres was divided by total full-time

⁷ National Parks & Recreation Association, 2020 NRPA Agency Performance Review 2020 p. 16

employees. In some cases, agencies provided FTE data, which was converted to full time employees to calculate and analyze this data as consistently as possible.

8. Acres per FTE Plus Seasonal Employees

Acres to Maintain per Full Time Employee Plus Seasonal			
Agency	Minimum	Median	Maximum
Woodburn	13.8 acres		
McMinnville		28 acres	
West Linn			47.8 acres

Average	Oregon City
30.6 acres	25 acres

Acres to maintain per FTE changes when agencies hire seasonal employees during the busy season. During the busy season OCPR staff maintain just slightly under the regional average, as well as the median. The nuances of each agency should not be overlooked. An agency might have more undeveloped natural spaces, or a parks agency might operate and maintain a golf course. Or, like OCPR, who maintains and operates a cemetery and a RV park. Each community is unique and requires a different standard of care and that standard of care is dependent on the site and the desires of the community.

UNIQUE SITES AND THE NUANCES:

During research and data collection it would be remiss if the nuances and uniqueness of each parks system were not taken into consideration. Of the 15 agencies, there are a few notable differences that make each regional park agencies unique in what and how they operate and maintain parkland and natural spaces. These nuances, when looked at more closely, will affect the analysis of the raw data.

Unique sites operated and maintained by a park system:

- 3 / 15 cemetery
- 3 / 15 golf course (2 agencies contract with a third party, and 1 agency runs and maintains the course)
- 1 / 15 RV park and dump site

More common amenities that a park system operates and maintains include:

- 13 / 15 spray parks and spray pads
- 8 / 15 community gardens
- 4 / 15 have an IGA with the school district to maintain school district owned properties
- 15 / 15 dog parks or dog areas
- 4 / 15 wedding venues
- 13 / 15 river access or boat ramps

CONCLUSION:

SPECIFIC TO OREGON CITY'S PARKS SYSTEM:

Oregon City has a few notable sites and situations unique to its operations. OCPR operates a Cemetery, 2 boat ramps, transient boat dock, boat pump dump station and a RV park. These sites have a high standard of care and require more staff time. When there is a need to perform a burial, it requires 4 of the 7 staff to be present, which results in lost time maintaining other sites. In addition, the RV park is a popular amenity, but it is also a hot spot for Oregon City's homeless population. In the comparison OCPR was the only park system to manage and maintain a RV park, and only three out of the 15 agencies manage a cemetery. OCPR is also responsible for the care and maintenance of several memorials.

CHALLENGES:

OCPR faces several challenges and this comparison has underscored a few of those faced by staff. First, the City is unique in that it sits on geographically challenging terrain. As mentioned above, this takes additional time in the parks and for sites that land on one of the City's beautifully unique three-tiered geographic areas. Second, Oregon City is rich with history, as well as the parks and cemetery. Aging amenities such as the Promenade need additional care and time, and upkeep is costly. Thirdly, a significant amount of staff's time is spent cleaning up after the homeless population. Which ties into another challenge, OCPR staff has a diversity of roles that help serve other departments across the City. OCPR staff is happy to help, but at times are stretched thin serving in multiple capacities..

Regarding the FTE comparison, although OCPR falls in line with the median, there are several unique situations which should not be overlooked and in the future, will pose as a challenge. OCPR is faced with an equipment deficiency and aging equipment. When a piece of equipment breaks down there is not a backup and work is done less efficiently. As OCPR continues to develop park lands more duties will be divided amongst the staff; eventually there will be a need to increase staff levels to effectively maintain new and old amenities.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

In spite of the challenges, OCPR is also making positive movements forward. As PRAC is aware, OCPR is in the process of developing three new parks. With an added FTE in 2019 and the restructure of the parks division to add a lead, progress has been made and OCPR will continue to move forward. In the future, as OCPR continues to develop parks and as the City develops properties that fall under OCPR care, there will be a need to hire additional staff, including seasonal employees.

Teamwork. The OCPR staff never fails to come together to address a challenge. Staff works together to make Oregon City a better place where people want to come to recreate. The team is cohesive and works hard. There is an understanding that what OCPR does will directly benefit the community. The Parks team also does an excellent job managing community events and special events located in parks. This is a meticulous job, and OCPR takes its responsibility seriously as a steward of the community's property and promotes activities that bring people together.

OCPR fosters, promotes and values its community partners. OCPR valued partners (to name a few) include the Oregon City Parks Foundation, Parents of Murdered Children, Veterans, JROTC, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts Solve, Down the River Cleanup, and Oregon City Youth Sports.

In conclusion, OCPR is proud to report that we are working hard to meet community care standards and will continue to do so.

REFERENCES

- Ammerman, K., Supervisor, Roseburg, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 2).
- Camble, T., Manager, Forest Grove, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 2).
- Crabree, J., Maintenance Supervisor, Woodburn, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 4).
- Creighton, C., Parks Supervisor, Newberg, Chehalem District, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 2).
- Giordano, W. Super Intendent, Grants Pass, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 4).
- Johnson, R., Manager, Keizer, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 8).
- Little, D., Admin. Assistant, Albany, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 8).
- McKnight, M., Supervisor, Tigard, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 5).
- McVay, A., Director, Redmond, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 13).
- Muir, S., Director, McMinnville, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 7).
- Munro, J., Asst. Director, Lake Oswego, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 2).
- National Parks & Recreation Association, N. (2020). 2020 NRPA Agency Performance Review. Retrieved October 12, 2020, from <https://www.nrpa.org/siteassets/nrpa-agency-performance-review.pdf>
- Schul, D., Manager, Wilsonville Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 2).
- Sliwka, C., PW Supervisor, Happy Valley, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 8).
- U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States. (2020). Retrieved October 1, 2020, from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>
- Warner, K. Director, West Linn, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 1, 5).
- Waverly, J.. Manager, Oregon City, Parks System Regional Comparison Interviews [E-mail & Telephone interview]. (2020, October 1 - 9).

APPENDIX A

Questions to Ask Each Agency

1. How many acres does your agency operate and maintain? Of the agencies total acreage how much is developed and non-developed?
2. How many park sites does your agency maintain?
3. Do you maintain and operate any of the following? If yes, are they included in your total acreage?
 - a. Golf course?
 - b. Cemetery?
 - c. RV park?
 - d. Spray parks? How many?
 - e. Dog parks? How many?
 - f. Skate parks? How many?
 - g. Community gardens? How many?
 - h. School sites
 - i. Wedding Venues
 - j. Boat Ramps/Launches and river access, docks?
4. Are there any unique properties that you maintain and operate, (not listed above) and is that included in your total acreage?
5. How many full-time employees do you have?
6. How many seasonal employees do you hire? What is the duration of time you have your seasonal employee's work?
7. What are your total parks' operating budget? Can you please provide the approved budgeted amount and your actuals for FYI 2018-2019?
8. Can you supply your parks department organizational chart?

APPENDIX B**Full Data Report**

City	Population	2018-2019 Adopted	(# of parks)	Total Acreage	Expenditures per Acre to	Acres to Maintain per	Seasonal (FTE & seasonal)	Full time	Seasonal
Happy Valley	22,553	\$453,000.00	17	160.0	\$2,831.25	80.0	40.0	2.00	2.0
Roseburg	23,479	\$1,500,000.00	20	428.0	\$3,504.67	42.8	28.5	10.00	5.0
Wilsonville	24,058	\$0.00	18	225.0	\$0.00	32.1	18.8	7.00	5.0
Forest Grove	25,553	\$849,099.00	19	147.0	\$5,776.18	26.7	26.7	5.50	0.0
Chehallem PD	26,000	\$7,523,966.00	38	882.7	\$8,523.00	88.3	43.7	10.00	10.2
Woodburn	26,078	\$962,800.00	18	110.0	\$8,752.73	18.3	13.8	6.00	2.0
West Linn	27,445	\$1,811,000.00	25	550.0	\$3,292.73	78.6	47.8	7.00	4.5
Redmond	30,834	\$1,660,162.00	26	532.0	\$3,120.61	76.0	44.0	7.00	5.0
McMinnville	36,338	\$1,328,774.00	21	348.6	\$3,812.07	36.9	28.0	9.45	3.0
Oregon City	37,346	\$2,242,206.00	38	300.0	\$7,474.02	42.9	25.0	7.00	5.0
Grants Pass	39,127	\$2,225,939.88	20	446.0	\$4,990.90	55.8	27.9	8.00	8.0
Lake Oswego	39,809	\$3,541,000.00	40	625.0	\$5,665.60	32.9	18.4	19.00	15.0
Keizer	41,424	\$1,100,000.00	18	225.0	\$4,888.89	56.3	32.1	4.00	3.0
Tigard	53,428	\$3,075,745.00	27	587.0	\$5,239.77	45.2	25.5	13.00	10.0
Albany	55,338	\$2,338,800.00	30	936.0	\$2,498.72	104.0	39.0	9.00	15.0
<u>Totals</u>	508,810	\$30,612,491.88	375	6502.3	\$70,371.13	816.6	459.2	123.95	92.7
<u>Averages</u>	33,921	\$2,186,606.56	25	433.5	\$4,691.41	54.4	30.6	8.26	6.2
<u>Meidan</u>	30,834	\$1,660,162	21	428	\$4,889	45	28	7	5



CITY OF OREGON CITY

Staff Report

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

To: City Commission **Agenda Date:** 10/22/2020
From: Senior Planner Pete Walter & Parks Operations Manager Jonathan Waverly

SUBJECT:

Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee: Heritage Stand Nomination for Park Place Park

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the PRAC consider revising the Heritage Stand designation to only include trees that are in good condition, safely accessible and visible to park visitors.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Planning and Parks staff are recommending a revised proposal to move forward with nomination of some of the trees in Park Place Park and propose that the others would not be nominated due to various issues. In addition, we wanted to recognize that the trees which staff were not proposing to move forward on (such as those surrounded by poison oak) would be protected under the draft policy which includes elevated levels of investigation of alternatives to removal and approval for public trees which qualify.

BACKGROUND:

PRAC reviewed the original recommendation on February 27, 2020. The Park Place nomination includes 27 trees, consisting of 19 Oregon White Oaks, 2 Douglas Firs, and 6 Atlas Cedars. PRAC recommended that the nomination be approved for all trees that are not in a state of decline. Additional information about tree conditions, and the development of the new tree removal and notification policy for trees on city-owned land necessitate a revised recommendation.

Any tree removal on or abutting city-owned land is subject to a Type I Site Plan and Design Review process for tree removal. This permit requires a detailed examination of the tree condition prior to removal and require mitigation pursuant to OCMC 17.41.

In addition, the City Commission is considering the Additional Permitting and Notification Process for City Tree Removal. This policy applies to City removal of trees:

- On City or Urban Renewal owned property; or
- Within the right-of-way.

The purpose of this policy is to reduce unnecessary tree removal by the City and provide public notification of such removal.

The codes, permitting requirements and policy provide sufficient protections and public notification for trees on park property. Heritage tree designation does not provide any further protection for trees that is not already embodied in the current code and draft policy.

Furthermore, several of the trees in the Park Place Park nomination are in areas that:

- Are in areas of poison oak
- Within the Geologic Hazard Overlay District, which further regulates tree removal
- Are not publicly accessible or visible.

Parks staff are responsible for managing trees to assure public safety with an extremely limited budget, and it is imperative that they be able to do their jobs without subjecting tree removal to politicized and discretionary processes. The existing code and proposed policy assure an objective and reasonable standard that assures professional and expert consideration of alternatives to tree removal and notification by the public.

For these reasons, staff is recommending that PRAC consider revising the proposed nomination.

"Heritage stand" means a group of two or more trees that have been designated by the city as having unique importance, subject to the heritage tree regulations of OCMC 12.32.

"Heritage tree" means a tree that has been designated by the city as having unique importance, and subject to the heritage tree regulations of OCMC 12.32. Where a grouping of two or more heritage trees has been so designated, the term "heritage stand" may be used.

OCMC 12.32.040.A. Nominations for trees or tree stands on city-owned property, other than right-of-way, may be submitted by any citizen of Oregon City and the City Commission shall make the final decision following the general procedure identified in subsection 12.32.030 above. If the nomination is for a city park, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee shall also review the nomination and provide an advisory opinion prior to the Natural Resources Committee recommendation to the City Commission.

To be nominated as a heritage tree or stand, trees must meet the requirements in OCMC 12.32 (Attached). The criteria are:

- A. Heritage criteria (at least one heritage criterion must be met):
 - 1. The tree or stand of trees is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of Oregon City's history; or
 - 2. The tree or stand of trees is associated with the life of a person or group of historic significance to Oregon City; or
 - 3. The tree or stand of trees represents a significant and distinguishable presence within Oregon City; or
 - 4. The tree or stand of trees has age, size, or species significance (horticultural or ecological), which contributes to Oregon City's heritage status;
- B. Site and Condition Criteria (all criteria must be satisfied):
 - 1. The tree species is not listed as invasive on any regionally accepted plant list;
 - 2. If the proposed heritage tree or stand is located on private property or on public property owned by a public agency other than the city of Oregon City, the property owner or, if the tree or stand of trees is located on a public right-of-way, the abutting private property owner consents to the designation and agrees to sign a protective covenant.



CITY OF OREGON CITY

Staff Report

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

To: Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee **Agenda Date:** 10/22/2020
From: Tourism Development Program - Matthew Weintraub

SUBJECT:

Oregon City Film Trail Site

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Give approval to place a sign on the Oregon City Promenade overlooking the Blue Heron Mill where Twilight and Grimm scenes were filmed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

We are hoping to place a sign on the Oregon City Promenade overlooking the Blue Heron Mill where Twilight and Grimm scenes were filmed. The Promenade was also used to film several scenes in other shows. The signs consist of two panels, usually attached to a post. They measure 24" x 19" x .5" and 20" x 8.3" x .5". Where post mounting is not feasible, attaching to an existing structure is preferred. My request would be to mount the sign to the railing on the Promenade.

BACKGROUND:

The Oregon Film Trail is a statewide network of recognizable trail markers, placed in many iconic filming locations across Oregon. By stitching together these locations, communities, and films, a forum has been created, both virtual and real, in which we can retell stories, and celebrate Oregon's rich contribution to filmmaking since 1904.

OPTIONS:

1. Provide feedback.
2. Do not provide feedback.

BUDGET IMPACT:

Amount: To Be Determined

FY(s):

Funding Source(s):

OPTIONS:

3.