

Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee

Meeting minutes

May 28th @ 6:00 pm

Mt. Hood Room – City Hall

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045

Call To Order and Roll Call

Chair Tim Lainhart called the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee meeting to order for Thursday, May 28th, 2026. A roll call was conducted with the following members present: Karen Buehrig, Ken Worcester, Tim Lainhart, Melissa Deyoe, Erin McClellan (online), and Emily Lisborg (online).

Public Comments

Tim Lainhart noted that public comments were received but were specific to agenda items, so they would be addressed during those respective topics rather than during the general public comment period.

Approval Of Minutes

PRAC Meeting Minutes - April 23rd, 2026

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the April 23rd, 2026 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously by roll call vote with all present members voting yes.

Motion: Ken Worcester motioned to approve the April 23rd, 2026 meeting minutes.

Motion was seconded by Melissa Deyoe. Approved unanimously.

Presentations

Revisit Pool Operations Assessment

Parks and Recreation Director, Scott Archer, provided an overview of the pool operations assessment that was presented at the previous meeting. He explained that the City hired an aquatic consulting firm to review the Oregon City pool's operations, including scheduling, functional components, and whether current operations meet community needs. Four major takeaways were identified from the consultant's report: schedule realignment considerations, wading pool concerns, staffing recommendations, and consideration of opening on Sundays.

Archer noted that following the previous month's meeting, the committee had suggested surveying current swim lesson participants to understand their preferences regarding scheduling changes. This survey was conducted and received 363 responses from families who had participated in swim lessons over the past three years.

Melissa Sebastian, the Aquatic and Recreation Manager, presented the survey results.

Committee members raised questions about class sizes (6 students for swim tots/level 1, 8 for level 2 and above, 10 for water babies), concurrent class capacity, and residency requirements for priority registration. Discussion included concerns about the survey methodology and whether questions were clearly worded.

Ken Worcester questioned whether the purpose was revenue generation or getting more children into lessons, noting the pool's significant annual subsidy of approximately \$1 million. Scott Archer clarified that the primary goal is teaching swimming safety skills, with revenue following participation. He explained that the consultant's report indicated the City's programming was out of alignment with its own Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which prioritized swim lessons as category 1 and swim teams as category 3.

Erin McClellan noted feedback from the previous meeting about swim teams providing similar benefits to swim lessons and transportation concerns if swim team times were moved. She suggested the upcoming fee study would be important for reviewing swim team rental rates if they wanted to maintain premium times.

Tim Lainhart expressed that he viewed swim teams and swim lessons as equally important priorities. He suggested looking at ways to expand options without disrupting existing swim team schedules, such as adding Sunday hours or Saturday programming.

Karen Buehrig asked about implementation timelines, with staff noting that while some changes could affect fall schedules, they preferred taking time to get decisions right rather than rushing implementation.

PRAC decided not to make a recommendation at this meeting but requested that staff return next month with more concrete options using the survey data and discussions with swim teams, showing potential schedule scenarios and their impacts.

Additional written public comments were received, acknowledged and will be added to the agenda packet for submission into the official public record.

General Business

Clackamette Park Plan Update

Scott Archer introduced the Clackamette Park redevelopment planning process, emphasizing that this work builds on the adopted 2023 Master Plan rather than repeating the planning process. The goal is to create a shovel-ready development plan for grant applications and funding opportunities. Tom Kissinger presented the development plan, which was organized into five key components: gather, play, boat launch and river/beach access, RV park, and open space.

A virtual flyover video of the proposed park design was shown, followed by a detailed presentation of the plan's goals: more flexible gathering and event spaces, improved river access, expanded recreation opportunities, preservation of green space and

natural character, family-friendly amenities, and interpretation of local ecology and history.

Steve Williams, of Oregon City, provided public comment supporting the boat ramp component, citing survey results showing over 80% support with 65% strongly supporting boat ramp improvements. He argued that the current Sportcraft ramp is insufficient with only 19 parking spots and frequent conflicts between users.

Committee members raised several concerns and questions. Ken Worcester questioned the proposed boat ramp location, expressing concern about current and water flow issues that could make boat loading and unloading difficult. He asked about Marine Board involvement and suggested the location might not be optimal. Staff confirmed they are working with the Marine Board and noted that river conditions haven't been studied since 2015, so current hydrology analysis is needed.

Tim Lainhart expressed concerns about the boat ramp's proximity to the river overlook area, worried that boat traffic and waiting lines would interfere with family use of that space. He suggested considering relocating either the boat ramp or the overlook to reduce conflicts.

Emily Lisborg questioned the RV park component, noting that previous discussions indicated it wasn't economically viable and that most grants wouldn't fund RV park reconstruction. Staff explained that the current plan reduces spaces from 36 to 18 but improves amenities, and that funding for the RV park would need to come from different sources than other park improvements.

Regarding the playground, Tim Lainhart felt the proposed design was insufficient for a signature park, comparing it unfavorably to other regional playgrounds like Cook Park. He suggested the playground needed more structures and better connectivity to other park areas to truly serve as a legacy amenity that would draw families.

Ken Worcester raised concerns about the amount of pavement in the design and suggested exploring pervious surfaces or alternatives to reduce stormwater impacts. He also noted potential conflicts between preserving green space and the extensive road network shown in the plan.

Erin McClellan was surprised to see the RV park prominently featured given previous discussions about its viability and asked what would replace it if removed (likely additional parking).

The committee expressed general support for the pickleball courts and appreciated the overall vision while requesting consideration of their concerns about boat ramp placement, playground size, RV park necessity, and connectivity between park areas.

Emerald Ash Borer

Tom Kissinger provided an update on the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) response planning. Staff has been surveying parks and water quality facilities to identify at-risk ash trees, focusing first on developed areas where falling trees could impact people or property. Approximately 400 at-risk ash trees have been identified so far using tree inventory software provided by Oregon Department of Forestry.

Cost estimates for addressing EAB impacts include \$668,000 over 10 years for complete removal and replanting of identified ash trees, or \$73,000 over 10 years for treatment injections every two years. The treatment option slows the pest but doesn't guarantee long-term tree survival.

Staff plans to present a finalized response plan at the next meeting for committee review before City Commission consideration. The plan will likely include code changes to remove ash from approved planting species lists and potentially expedited permitting for ash tree removal.

Ken Worcester suggested proactive replanting in areas where ash trees will eventually need removal, using tree mitigation funds from development fees to establish replacement canopy before ash trees die.

Bee City USA

Tom Kissinger presented the six-year project list for pollinator habitat development required for Bee City USA certification, which is a City Commission goal. The plan calls for increasing pollinator habitat by approximately 10% annually. Current habitat totals about 7,200 square feet across five gardens, requiring 730 square feet of new habitat annually.

Proposed locations include Stafford Park (likely first project due to neighborhood association and Parks Foundation support), Hillendale Park, Singer Creek Park, Chapin Park, Wesley Lynn Park, and Rivercrest Park. Projects would typically create about 2,000 square feet of habitat each.

Emily noted opportunities at Chapin Park's drainage area that floods annually, suggesting plants that could help with water management while providing pollinator habitat.

Other Project Updates

Scott Archer announced two upcoming open houses: June 23rd for the future Aquatic and Recreation Facility planning at Libke Public Safety Building, and June 30th for End of the Oregon Trail site planning at the interpretive center.

Tom Kissinger provided updates on other projects. Wesley Lynn Dog Park construction bidding will begin shortly with substantial completion targeted for fall. Chapin Park playground survey is receiving good response rates, and staff is applying for a \$200,000 local government grant with City match for that project. Metro Community Choice Grant voting is open through June 15th for various park projects.

Tim Lainhart asked about the downtown courthouse park donation project. Scott Archer reported ongoing discussions with the developer regarding SDC eligibility and reimbursement, with the developer seeking to use park SDC credits in exchange for park development work.

Member Reports

Tim Lainhart proposed conducting a field trip meeting in August or September to visit various parks discussed during meetings, including Clackamette Park, Chapin Park,

and the dog park construction. The committee expressed unanimous support for this idea, with Kori noting it would be a meeting without formal minutes. The field trip would allow committee members to see parks in person and better understand the projects being discussed.

Next Scheduled Meeting - June 25th, 2026

The next meeting was confirmed for June 25th, 2026.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.