City Parks Advisory Board – Workshop Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.
520 E. Cascade Avenue, P.O. Box 39, Sisters, OR 97759

City Parks Advisory Board Attendees:

Chairman:	Liam Hughes
Board Members:	Dixie Eckford, Robin Holm, David Magaret, Rory Petterson
Council Representative:	Nancy Connolly, Absent
Absent:	Peggy Houge, Greg Johnson
Staff:	Patrick Davenport, Paul Bertagna
Recording Secretary:	Carol Jenkins

I. CALL TO ORDER

Board Chair called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION – None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

IV. UPDATES – Improvements / Maintenance Updates: Barclay Park, Village Green Park, Clemens Park, Fir Street Park, Creekside Park / Campground

Staff discussed the Village Green recommendation from the Board regarding the playground structure and that $100,000 was added to the original number of $55,000. Board Members had previously discussed having a bigger and a fancier structure to replace what is existing there now.

Staff stated that there is a playground retaining wall around the playground structure that has rotted out. It was built out of wood about 20 years ago and they have been patching it together for the last 3-4 years assuming that they would be getting direction on replacing or adding to the existing playground structure. A concrete curb needs to be poured all the way around it to do a permanent fix, but they don't want to do it if the idea is to expand the playground, and they don't want to have to do it twice.

Staff asked for direction from the Board going into Budget on whether or not to pursue a playground improvement project or not. *Staff* stated that they could hold off until that project could get funded and constructed. The Park SDC's are only going to pay for the percentage of the project that creates more growth. If getting it down to the square foot of playground structure and what gets replaced that gets paid for by the General Fund and is eligible for Park SDC's because of increasing capacity. *Staff* stated that part of it could be funded by the General Fund

and part of it through the Park SDC fund and do it in 2016/2017. *Staff* stated that no decision was needed today, but wanted to throw it into the record for the Board to think about it and have it an agenda item for the next meeting. Staff said that Budget starts May 1st and he would need to know by then.

Board Member asked about the SDC's increasing and that they pay for growth – additional capacity, and would a larger play structure qualify under that. If staff just replaced the concrete and didn't do anything else would that come from the General Fund.

Staff stated a percentage of it above what is existing out there today is eligible for SDC's. It would be a something like a 40/60 split. And, if staff just replaced the concrete, it would come out of the Park Maintenance fee.

Staff asked if the Board would like to make a recommendation to move forward with this project and then, take it to the City Council and the Budget Committee.

Board Chair asked if there were any objections to the play structure expansion.

Board Member asked if they moved forward with this project could there be any repercussions for some of the other projects on the priority list such as Creekside Park, Clemens Park restroom, etc. and are they related somehow.

Staff stated yes because they are using City funds. A good guess at the most would be 50 percent of that project would be eligible for Park SDC funding which there is about $ 190,000 in Park SDC's today. Right now, they are looking at $169,620 plus what is brought in this year which could be about $185,000 to $190,000.

Board Member stated that they felt the improvements at Creekside Park are more important at this point and not sure both can be done – the improvements at the restroom and all the things that have been discussed over the past year and a half.

Staff stated that the City just funded $70,000 for landscaping improvements, ADA space, entry way improvements and this was just funded last week out of the General Fund and this will not affect the Park SDC fund.

Board Chair asked if conceivably there would be enough in the Park SDC fund to do the matching portion of the restroom grant and the play structure portion that was eligible.

Staff stated that they believe so. It would pretty much drain it, but yes.

Board Chair stated that realistically if looking at expanding the play structure then, there will be at least a year planning process for that. A playground guy will need to come in, look at multiple different companies for the best product, there would be several meetings because it will take a while, and it is a good project to have on the goals list. Is there a danger element or anything like that right now?

Staff stated that they think they can patch it together enough for one more season, but that is it. If this is included in the budget for fiscal year 2016/2017 which starts July 1st, staff would anticipate construction in the spring of 2017 about one year from now.

The Board were all in agreement to make this recommendation to the City Council and move ahead with the play structure and swing improvements at the Village Green Park in Fiscal Year 2016/2017. Staff said at that point, they will come back to the Board and work through it.

Board Member moved that the Board agree that funding for the play structure and swing improvements at Village Green Park be included in the new Budget Fiscal year 2016/2017. It was seconded and passed.

Staff stated that the other thing that the Board needs to talk about are the two restrooms – Clemens Park and replacement of the restrooms at Creekside Park. There is a grant opportunity coming up and staff would like consensus from the Board on which project they would like to go for grant funding. Clemens Park would be a two-stall unisex restroom and the cost is about $97,000 which includes some site improvements and sidewalk work, etc. The Campground restroom would be increasing a huge amount of capacity doubling the showers, doubling the stalls on a building that was built in the 50's and is not ADA compliant. Again, not a building that the City wants to spend a lot of money to maintain because it is past its useful life. There is a need in both areas.

Staff stated that they would like the Board's recommendation on which direction they want staff to move ahead and which grant to apply for.

Board Chair stated that an old bathroom is better than a porta-potty and that Clemens Park has a greater need since it has no restroom currently.

Board Member stated that the Creekside Campground gets a lot more use all summer long and is a more important option right now. A porta-potty and the people that use it at Clemens Park are little kids, etc.

The Board discussed the Priorities I, II, and III, grant funding, options for the restrooms, ADA requirements/access, risk management, usage at Creekside Park, events, and the park being an income generator.

Staff stated that they will be putting in an ADA space and paving the closest space to the restroom for an actual ADA campsite.

Board Member made a motion to request a grant and put the money towards the new restroom facility at the Creekside Campground. It was seconded. *Board Chair* opposed.
Motion carries 4-1.

Board Chair stated that he's not opposed to the project and thinks it's a great project, but feels when building a community park that should have been on the initial docket, and the rest of it shouldn't have gone in without the restroom being a part of the initial push.

A discussion took place regarding the parks that are going to be donated to the City and the issues associated with having to provide restrooms or not, prioritization of the restrooms, and the community park versus a neighborhood park, etc.

Staff stated that it is time to take a final look at the Parks Master Plan. There are a few edits to make and then, it will go before the City Council to adopt at the end of May. The Parks SDC's become effective July 1, 2016. They have been noticed properly and that there is a State Code that gives them a 90-day notice. The Park SDC will be charged for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) as if it were a new dwelling.

Staff stated that the total cost of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2,298,804 – basically 2.3 million dollars for the next 20-years. The Parks SDC methodology and revised Park SDC fee charges includes future residential units and future lodging units, Buildable Land Inventory of 1,477 future residential units, future lodging units assumed – 150 units, Proposed Park SDC fee of $ 1,368 applicable to future residential and future lodging units.

Staff said that they are working on fees for Affordable Housing developments, and already have in the City Charter that an Affordable Housing developer can request a waiver of SDC fees including parks if they keep it affordable for at least 50 years.

A brief discussion took place regarding an analysis done by the City Engineer on building a single family home with a 2-bedroom, 2-bath, 1850 square footage and coming in around $10,000 to $11,000 with all of the SDC's, building review fees, permit fees, etc. Staff stated that they can look at the different areas on their Park SDC's such as Silverton, Hood River, Cannon Beach, Jacksonville, Apple Gate, Seaside, and get back to the group with this information.

V. City Parks Master Plan: Final review and recommendation to City Council for Adoption

Board Member moved to make a formal recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Parks Master Plan. Motion was seconded. Motion carries 5-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Grant application endorsement to Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Local Government grant program.
b. Discuss future park naming policy

Staff stated that the Board wanted to look at park naming policies and a formal park policy is not needed at this time, but would like the Board's ideas on where to go with this because there are some potential new facilities coming forward.

Board Member stated that they looked on-line to see how the other jurisdictions did this and looked at Portland's plan which is a very well developed plan. It seems like in this little town there is this theme the City is trying to maintain, and maybe consider coming up with names consistent with the theme of the town, or parks, and not naming them after individuals. A discussion should take place before naming the parks after individuals, and there should be rules in place if naming the park after somebody who may be historical, deceased by a certain number of years, etc.

Board Chair stated that it is a good idea and has heard in the parks industry that they recommend that. By naming the parks after deceased people that will stay the same likely - forever.

Board Members stated maybe after old west people and pioneers – the names of pioneers as long as there is information as to why they are being recognized.

A brief discussion took place regarding the current park names, the people being honored, and how they came to be. The Board stated that maybe having public input in the newspaper would be a way to get the community involved in the park naming process.

The Board stated that they would like to have on one of the Agendas - the idea of the "Song Bird" stage naming proposed by Paul Bennett so they could make a motion and get it approved at some point.

Staff stated that there are some opportunities in this calendar year to have some chances to put the 'naming policy" to the test, come up with some criteria, and make the recommendation to the City Council for approval. Some of the ideas – names consistent with the town theme, if naming after an individual there should be some local significance in some sort of history related and/or the donation of land itself if naming it in that sense, it should be as a memorial – historical or deceased. Also, advertise in the newspaper for suggestions and public input.

A discussion took place on the current parks, the themes for them, different uses and different criteria's that may be used for a little City park.

Staff asked the Board how they felt about branding of capital equipment such as Ray's grocery store chipping for a half of a play structure, etc., a community member wanting to help out like the Kiwanis does for different projects, etc. There would be a centralized place such as a kiosk addressing corporate donations and how certain people get recognized using plaques, benches, etc.

Staff asked the Board if they would like to skip the March 2nd meeting and move ahead to April 6th. The Board was in agreement to skip the March meeting.

The next meeting will be Wednesday, April 6th at 4:00 pm.

Staff stated that they will be forming a Housing Policy Advisory Board focusing on housing and if they know anyone interested in housing and lives in the City limits to let staff know. Also, there will be an opportunity of work and serve on the Transportation System Plan (TSP) – a Technical Advisory Committee starting this summer.

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Recording Secretary

VIII. City Parks Master Plan: Final Review and Recommendation to the City Council of Adoption.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Grant application endorsement to Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Local Government Grant Program
b. Discuss future park naming policy

X. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 4.20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Recording Secretary