

CITY OF OREGON CITY
PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
City Hall Commission Chambers
Thursday, April 25, 2024 at 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Steve Williams called meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

INTRODUCTIONS

Members: Joyce Gifford, Ken Worcester, Tim Wuest (remote), Steve Williams, Erin McClellan (remote), Emily Lisborg

Staff: Kendall Reid, Parks and Recreation Director; Kori Buth, Administrative Assistant; Parks and Cemetery Manager, Tom Kissinger; Aquatics and Recreation Manager, Melissa Sebastian; Pioneer Community Center Manager, Cecily Rose

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 28th, 2024 minutes approved
David Bone motioned, Ken Worcester seconded
Roll call unanimously passed motion

PUBLIC COMMENT

PRESENTATIONS

Tri-City Outfall Project Update – presented by Jeff Stallard with Water Environment Services

Joyce Gifford asked if the tunnel would run under Shari's Restaurant. It does not run under any buildings.

Ken Worcester asked about the location of the outfall and if they are in a spot that scours good. Jeff confirmed that the area has a cobble bottom. Ken asked if WES is still also reserving the outfall above the falls for potential future. Jeff mentioned that they sold the majority of the property but kept the outfall for the future unknowns, even though use of it is not indicated in the ten-year capital plan.

Steve Williams asked how far the diffusers extend above the bottom of the river. Jeff confirmed that the diffusers are about 24 inches tall, and they are the only portion that will stick up into the river. They are designed to break-away if struck by a heavy load, rather than break the pipe underneath them. They are also chained to the pipe in case they do break-away. Steve also talked about collaborating with the I-205 bridge construction. How ODOT is putting in pillars could substantially change the hydraulics and asked how that might impact the flush and flow of the "garbage hole"? Jeff stated that I-205 Project team did a scour analysis, and the diffuser sits outside any of the impact that their analysis modeled and something that WES did verify to confirm it would not be a concern.

Steve mentioned that the current flow of the Willamette River is 14,000 and asked how the outflow amounts adjust to the lowering of flows. Jeff stated that the new pipe will be able to pass 108 million gallons per day and WES has designed their system to account for a 25-year flood elevation.

Bee City – presented by Laura Rost with Xerxes Society

Introduction provided by Emily Lisborg

Both NRC and CIC have recommended to the Commission that Oregon City become a Bee City.

Emily Lisborg mentioned that she is excited to see the growth of this program.

Steve Williams asked Kendall if there was any more discussion that needed to take place on this topic. Kendall mentioned that there are already discussions happening with Tualatin, and Lake Oswego, as well as Public Works and Planning to learn more about the Bee City program. Next steps would be scheduling a meeting with Laura to continue conversations.

Ken Worcester asked if the pollinator garden project at the Pool was still in the works. Tom Kissinger confirmed that plans are moving forward for the Pool location, as well as a pollinator project taking place at River Access Trail. Parks submitted a grant through Xerxes for plants at the Pool. Ken asked if Xerxes was also going to help with garden design, but Tom confirmed that they have a good idea of where to place plants along the hillside so there is no need for design help, but Xerxes has a great plant list.

Emily Lisborg asked if this is a topic that will need to go to Commission prior to being implemented. Kendall mentioned that the Commission is aware of the program, and he has had some conversations with them. It is important that as things move forward, the City Commission is involved to ensure we get clear direction from them.

Erin McClellan mentioned the different options for pollinator garden placements and asked if there has ever been concern over placing them near recreation areas or picnic sites. Presenter, Laura, mentioned that this has been voiced as concern before but there are ways to provide a level of comfort to the public, such as habitat signage. Native plants attract such a diverse variety of species and the more diversity you have in a habitat, the fewer yellowjackets you have. Most bees either can't sting or don't want to sting, so the plants would attract a calmer and more gentle variety of bees. Yellowjackets are mostly attracted to garbage.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Deferred Maintenance Updates provided by Tom Kissinger for Parks, and Kyle Christoph for Facilities. Tom's presentation focuses on how we define deferred maintenance, the types, what exists in parks currently and looking at funding going forward. Kyle's presentation looks at specific projects.

Deferred Maintenance represents things (picnic tables, benches, playground components, shelters, fences, buildings, equipment, etc.) that have reached the end of their life span but there is no current budget to replace/repair them immediately. We used Bureau Veritas North America to perform an assessment of deferred maintenance needs and costs.

Joyce Gifford recalled that Oregon City Construction Class took part in building the structures at Hillendale and Wesley Lynn and wondered if that was still an option to collaborate with them on future projects or for maintenance/repair on the shelters they built. Tom confirmed that those volunteer groups and opportunities would be a great idea and a way to mitigate some of the costs of deferred maintenance. Oregon parks Foundation also has a "We Care for Parks" program they are putting together, where they match skilled volunteers to park projects, to specifically address deferred maintenance.

Emily Lisborg mentioned that the deferred maintenance cost for Waterboard Park being so high. Tom confirmed that it does reflect the cost that would be needed to restabilize the road. The dollar amount is a placeholder for now, as we consider the future of Waterboard Park.

Ken Worcester asked how sprinkler heads are listed as deferred maintenance and if those are not currently serviced. Tom clarified that keeping a system functioning properly, efficiently, and up to date is what is being referred to as deferred maintenance. Ken asked if that would be considered more of a capital project if those large items needing replacing. Tom stated that it would potentially be a capital project. Ken asked what the threshold is for capital outlay. Tom stated that Finance considers anything over \$10,000 as capital but not sure what the typical lifespan is considered. Kendall then confirmed that the capital threshold is actually at \$5,000. Ken mentioned that titles are important, Tom agreed, and confirmed that the day-to-day repairs and maintenance are going to be handled and fixed as they arise. Ken asked what a roof or skylight replacement would look like or be considered. Tom stated that depending on the size of the building, it could fall into the capital category. Tom mentioned the painting of the cemetery offices and it was brought up that at a threshold of only \$5,000, everything is capital.

Tom wanted to make sure to provide a definition of their deferred maintenance so that the group could all be on the same page when we start strategizing on how to fund these large needs.

Ken Worcester wanted to clarify that the Local Government Grant and the Land & Water (federal program) are both coordinated through state parks, while the Metro Local Share grant are separate. ORPA might have a program that would be able to help put up a playgroup. Tom mentioned that if we are able to establish local vendors that are able to donate time and/or resources, that is a great way to come up with a match for some of these applicable grants that require it.

Emily Lisborg mentioned that it looks like everything on the deferred maintenance list is mostly abiotic elements. Is there a comparable analysis that accounts for the biotic elements? Example, there has been a lot of ivy and blackberry work at Singer Creek but is there opportunity for getting a deferred maintenance assessment for all parks. Tom says we don't currently have any documents that reflect this, but one of the major components of the Metro Nature Bond is restoration, so Tom stated we are working on it. The restoration side takes more time to plan out since we don't currently have a document to work off for this side of natural maintenance needs. We hope to become more forward-thinking and put the work in now to avoid loss of the tree canopy.

Kyle Christoph referred to Ken Worcester's previous comment regarding small items as deferred maintenance and stated that everything becomes deferred if there is no money or manpower to handle them. Kyle explained that his work happens City-wide, not just within Parks and Recreation and budgets are determined with each department Director or Manager to establish the financial plan for both deferred maintenance and compliance (sprinkler systems, elevator permits, etc.) funding. The Parks Department recognizes the importance of maintaining their assets and spaces. Part of that comes from the fact that Parks is such a public-facing entity that more thought goes into caring for those areas. Some of the important deferred maintenance items that have been able to be addressed over the last year have taken place at the aquatic center, such as replacing the UV filtration system, refinishing the pool shell, boiler and pipe repairs and hazardous sidewalk repairs. Unfortunately, some deferred maintenance items are overlooked because they are not visible needs. It is a testament to the pool and parks staff who see the needs that might not be flashy but are important. Some additional deferred maintenance work done in the parks has been the lighting at the Cemetery mausoleum, Cemetery restroom replacement, City Hall air handler units, and End of the Oregon Trail HVAC unit repairs. Upcoming projects include a porch rebuild and exterior painting at Ermatinger House, new flooring at the Carnegie Library (estimated closure time will be hard on the Library so a timeline is not yet established), Access control system and security cameras at Pioneer Center, as well as bathroom renovations and lighting and electrical upgrades at Community Development. Kyle also went over the deferred maintenance projects that were not approved in the budget. Kyle is currently gathering quotes for the deck repairs, but that will have to come from an alternative funding source. The Pioneer kitchen remodel is currently funded, but on hold to ensure it is the best use of money.

Steve Williams asked how many of the unapproved items can also be classified as safety issues. Kyle would certainly classify the deck replacement at EOT as a safety hazard. There is currently 40% of one of the decks blocked off from the public. Steve asked how safety issues are prioritized in the budget and list and projects. Kyle confirmed that safety always comes first when it comes to triaging scenarios, but it still comes down to full funding issues.

Ken Worcester asked how the decision is made when you are faced with an option to spend \$10k to repair or \$50k to replace, in reference to the HVAC units are EOT. Kyle responded by saying that there was not \$50k in the budget and it was at the point that the system was going to fail and the timeline for getting Commission approval and replacement of the unit in December was not feasible so that group decision was made to repair instead. Kendall added that direction was given for Kyle to gather some estimates to present to City Commission and Kyle gave his input that a shorter-term repair may be the best way to go, given the timing and the fact that it has to be taken into account that some of these facilities are approaching their end of life. There will need to continue to be repairs made, of course, but the Facilities Master Plan may help address some of these facilities moving forward, as community involvement increases, and the public provides feedback on what they hope to see. Ken asked if, since Facilities Department doesn't have its own dedicated fund, Kyle is just advising other departments how to spend their money. Kendall responded by saying that the division was created in hopes that would change how the maintenance budget is laid out. The deferred maintenance assessment was done to call out the immediate needs, to be able to share that information with City leadership and Department Heads, so that budget season approaches, those needs can be considered in funding. Beginning with this most recent budget biennium, there has started to be more separation and clarity on funding specific to maintenance projects and needs.

Emily Lisborg asked for clarity on the floors in the original building at the library and if that would impact the entirety of the building. What will be the duration and type of closure? Kyle stated that the original floors can't continue to be sanded and there is a wood floor in the new building that is not wearing well, so that plan is to make it a cohesive design between the two spaces. There would potentially be about a three-week closure, so deciding on the best time for that to happen and the ability to offer alternative services is being considered.

Steve Williams wondered what PRAC could do to help and offer support. Kendall mentioned that the next step is May 7th at the joint work session with city commissioners to discuss the CIP and alternative funding. Steve asked if there was a document available to PRAC to review prior to that meeting. Kendall mentioned that he has a meeting on Monday to finalize that document and will then distribute it to the group.

Wesley Lynn Fenced Dog Park Proposal – Tom Kissinger

There were three parks considered to identify a location for a new fenced dog park – Barclay, Stafford, and Wesley Lynn Parks. They are all currently unfenced dog parks. Wesley Lynn's terrain seemed like the best fit. Tom went through the details of the plans and design of the fencing, plantings, and wetland restoration. Funding will come from Metro Local Share Grant funds. It qualifies

for this grant due to the habitat restoration aspect. The next steps would be public outreach and then start putting together the funding application.

Steve Williams asked about the drainage plan at the site. Tom mentioned that there is a particular wetland area where drainage would need to be considered in the design. Steve also mentioned that this was a site we stopped at during our PRAC tour and the idea was mentioned at that time to run a single fence along the length of the field/sidewalk to pose a separation from the neighborhood and wondered if that was considered as an alternative to a full fenced-in area. Tom mentioned that it could certainly be an alternative, as the amount of fencing would probably be able to do the same. Thinking of user conflict, it is typically better to have a fully fenced space so that dogs can be free to roam, but there is always the challenge of having too many dogs in the fenced area. Ideally, we would still have the off-lease unfenced area that exists adjacent to the proposed fenced location.

Ken Worcester asked how big the fenced area at TSW is and mentioned this area at Wesley Lynn is still under an acre. Emily Lisborg mentioned that the space at Wesley Lynn is significantly bigger and doesn't seem to get quite as wet. Fencing will concentrate the use so what will be the plan for that during winter. Tom mentioned that the design including two entry areas will hopefully minimize wear and then chips will be laid around the concrete plazas at those entry points to help with the transition space.

Joyce Gifford asked if one of the next steps was to meet with the Hillendale neighborhood association. Tom confirmed that public engagement would be that next step prior to finalizing the application.

Steve Williams mentioned that he visited the site before the PRAC meeting and was greeted by three community members who had options both ways, the fenced-in space, and the more open concept.

It was confirmed that both TSW and the proposed fenced space at Wesley Lynn are both $\frac{3}{4}$ acre. Total dog space at Wesley Lynn is likely closer to 1.5 acre.

Ken Worcester asked if there were any ideas for this space that were displayed in the Master Plan, knowing that people also want a space to take their pets but wanted to consider future use. The space is not the right size for much else, such as another ball field.

Emily Lisborg was curious about the motive for breaking up the space to include a fenced space as well as still an off-lease space. Tom stated that cost was considered and then discussion moved towards the drainage issue and how that naturally split the space up. From a maintenance perspective, the small grassy section at the 45-degree corner can't get mowers to it anyway so it will be restored, built up and increased natural drainage. Tom mentioned adding some educational signage in the space.

Ken Worcester asked if Oregon City provides licensing of dogs or if it's Clackamas County. Confirmed that it is Clackamas County.

STAFF REPORTS

Kendall provided announcements regarding the Public Engagement Event happening on May 6th at the Pioneer Community Center.

May 7th is the joint work session with City Commission. That will potentially take the place of our PRAC meeting later in May.

Steve Williams mentioned that, in the past, when there has been a joint meeting, it has been considered the PRAC meeting for that month. Ken Worcester also mentioned that our normally scheduled date would be right before Memorial Day weekend, which might be busy for some people. The consensus is that we adjust timing of next meeting but leave open for other options.

Tom Kissinger provided an update on Pickleball costs. Bid results were gathered for surrounding areas over the last couple years. We could potentially apply for a grant but would have to come up with a 50% match and we do not have a budget for that.

MEMBER REPORTS

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING – May 7th, 2024 - Joint Work Session

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting ended about 8:20 p.m.