

**City of Rainier
Parks, Recreation and Education Committee Meeting
January 24, 2021
6 p.m.
Rainier City Hall**

Chair Levi Richardson called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Randal Johnstun, Sharon Jump, Gary Rice, Levi Richardson and Denise Watson

Committee Members Absent: Kristi Cole, Scott Cooper, Terry Deaton, Tiffany Hatley, Jason Nulph and Laura Tretheway

City Staff Present: Sue Lawrence, Public Works Director; W. Scott Jorgensen, City Administrator

Flag Salute

Visitor Comments: There were no visitor comments at this time.

Consider Approval of the Consent Agenda

Consider Approval of the November 30, 2021 Parks, Recreation and Education Committee Meeting Minutes—The consent agenda could not be approved due to lack of a quorum.

New Business

- a. Park Plan Presentation by Dave Elkin at Juncus Studio—Elkin said Public Works Director Sue Lawrence invited him to speak about the park master plan process. The committee members have had some good ideas and conducted a poll of city residents. He spoke with Lawrence and City Administrator W. Scott Jorgensen about the city's park priorities. Elkin's background is that he was a landscape architect for 23 years, licensed in Washington and Oregon. He's done work in the private and public sectors, but mostly public. His work has included habitat restoration and environmental services with the City of Portland, as well as doing regional park planning for Metro. The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department has a resource guide for putting together a parks plan. Jorgensen said he could forward the link to committee members. Elkin said the guide's chapters include sections on assets and opportunities. What does the city own? What does it maintain? How costly is it? There's also a needs assessment to determine the level of service and how many parks a community should have for its population. There are national and state standards for that. Another section is Community Vision. What does the community want?

What is working well? Then it's implementation. How do you phase it? How do you fund it? Then you adopt the master plan. Once it's adopted, that opens up funding opportunities. Vice Chair Gary Rice asked how involved the process is. Elkin said a consultant would serve as the project manager and create deliverables and produce documents. The committee can lead community engagement efforts. Those can be lead by the committee or the consultant, but it's better if it's lead by community members. Those deliverables would include an assessment of the city's current parks system. That involves visiting sites and publicly owned land that could have park development potential. It would help determine what those assets are, how big the properties are and the value of the land. There's also an evaluation of older plans and current use. Then you develop a GIS-based map of those assets. Jorgensen said the committee took a tour of city properties as one of its first meetings. Elkin said it should include other open spaces like school playgrounds that could be part of a recreational network, and community assets and trail networks. The needs assessment would compare the city's assets to the national and state standards. Community surveys could be used to see if existing park facilities are functioning as intended. Repairs and renovations can be costly, but it may be cheaper to just fix what you already have. Jorgensen said the community parks survey was conducted after the tour of city owned property. The tour helped inform the options listed on the survey. Elkins suggested that the skate park could be improved. Lawrence said she's seen comments about that on social media. Rice said there needs to be more amenities to support the youth. Elkins said teenagers tend to lose out. Most park amenities are geared towards adults or younger children, but typically not teens. He has worked with the Tony Hawk Foundation on sustainable skate park designs. The foundation has a national grant program and the community fits nicely with the kinds of projects it would like to fund. Having a timeline and a one, five and ten-year plan can help measure the community's success in meeting the goals set out in the Parks Master Plan. All of these things help with funding and go over well with grant committees. There's also an implementation plan, showing what the costs are and identifying strategies of how to fund them. Priorities may also change based on funding opportunities. It's best to have an idea of must-haves, but also a wish list.

- b. Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Local Government Grant Program—Jorgensen said he received an email from the agency that funding is now available. Elkin said he could help the city with its grant applications. There are capital and planning grants. Planning grants are more competitive. A 15 to 20 percent match is often required for small communities. Jorgensen asked how much Parks Master Plans tend to cost. Elkin said Oregon City has a population of around 12,000 and spent \$100,000 on its plan. St. Helens has a population of 14,000 and

put out an RFP for the same amount. He estimates that a plan for Rainier would cost between \$35,000 and \$50,000. Jorgensen asked if the committee should request that the Budget Committee set aside matching funds for potential grants that require them. Elkin said yes. Rice said that having matching funds helps with grant applications. There was a discussion about whether to apply for capital or planning grants. Lawrence recommended planning. The plan can then be used to apply for capital grants. Chair Levi Richardson said there are things the committee can do before then, including additional surveys and prioritizing projects. Elkin said all that work can be included in the plan. He has contacts at the state that can help with the grant application process. Jorgensen said that even if the planning grants are competitive, there's more funding than usual this year.

- c. Riverfront Trail Completion Event—Jorgensen said the project should be completed around March. A ribbon cutting ceremony was held for the completion of its second phase, but he wants to do more for the third phase completion. Maybe it could be a fun run, a bike ride or both. He suggested it to Lawrence, who said the committee members could help organize it. Richardson asked what date it should be. Lawrence said late April. She'll have a better idea before the committee's next meeting. Richardson said if it's done on a Saturday, there will be baseball games happening at the little league field. There was a discussion about having the event take place all day, with different activities between baseball games.

Richardson adjourned the meeting at 7:11 p.m.

Levi Richardson, Chair

W. Scott Jorgensen, City Administrator

**City of Rainier
Parks, Recreation and Education Committee Meeting
November 30, 2021
6 p.m.
Rainier City Hall**

Chair Levi Richardson called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Kristi Cole, Terry Deaton, Sharon Jump, Gary Rice, Levi Richardson and Denise Watson

Committee Members Absent: Scott Cooper, Tiffany Hatley, Randall Johnstun, Jason Nulph and Laura Tretheway

City Staff Present: Sue Lawrence, Public Works Director; W. Scott Jorgensen, City Administrator

Flag Salute

Visitor Comments: Mike Barnes said he supports the dog park concept at the proposed location under the C Street bridge. He owns the old laundromat property that's immediately adjacent to it and suggests that the street going through there be made a one-way. Public Works Director Sue Lawrence said the area needs to be evaluated. The state recently inspected the bridge and there are things that the city needs to do.

Consider Approval of the Consent Agenda

Consider Approval of the October 25, 2021 Parks, Recreation and Education Committee Meeting Minutes—Denise Watson moved to approve the minutes. That motion was seconded by Vice Chair Gary Rice and adopted unanimously.

New Business

- a. Feasibility of Fox Creek Park Location—Lawrence said the city needs an overarching plan and should consider having a study done. It can contract with a consultant to put it together. That study can include goals and what the city needs to get done. She looked at the parks plan for the City of Scappoose and recommends that the city do something similar. She's done outreach to someone that does parks planning and can show what the costs will be for maintenance and operations. A study was done for the riverfront trail in 2004 and she used that document to get the project completed. Those kinds of plans help when it comes time to put projects out to bid and apply for grant funding. The riverfront trail study helped the city land over \$80,000 in grant funding for the project's third phase. Richardson agreed. He said doing all the planning at once could save the city some money. Lawrence said

having a plan will allow for improvements to be phased in to budgets. Those projects can be extended with change orders. A plan can also help with the process for receiving estimate and bids for improvements. It can include a needs assessment and incorporate work that's already being done, such as the survey. Some cities have system development charges for parks and funds are available for trails because the state sets aside a portion of gas tax proceeds for that purpose. The current park plan is from the late 1990s. A consultant can determine the feasibility of proposed improvements, rank priorities and provide cost estimates to give a road map. Denise Watson asked what information the consultant would need. Lawrence said the park survey and the previous park plan would be a good start. The consultant may look at the locations the committee is examining. There's a waterfront area on the other side of the railroad tracks in city limits. It isn't usable but could maybe have a trail. Jorgensen said the Fox Creek area is one the locations the committee visited during its field trip. It's adjacent to a church, but the pastor is supportive of the concept. Lawrence said the city will need to determine if there would have to be bathrooms there and if so, what kind. Jorgensen asked if the church parking lot would have to be used for a park there. Lawrence said it would. Richardson said there is adequate parking at the site, but some of it needs work. There would have to be an easement agreement. Lawrence said the city could agree to make some of the parking lot improvements as part of an agreement for access to the site. Jorgensen said the trail that the property leads to is maintained by Friends of Fox Creek.

- b. Feasibility of Dog Park at C Street Location—Barnes said parking for that location could even be on the property itself. The city could add a bathroom and fencing for the dog park. Lawrence said a land survey would have to be done. She's not sure what the city owns. A survey would cost between \$2000 and \$3000. Jorgensen said most of the dog parks he's seen have separate areas for large and small dogs. Rice said they typically have sets of double gates. Lawrence noted that the stream channel there has changed over the years. There are funds available to develop dog parks. Issues involving mowing, cleanup and garbage would have to be sorted out before that park could be developed. Jorgensen said the survey results showed strong support for a dog park. There are frequent clashes in small towns between on and off leash dog owners. Survey respondents indicated they did not want a dog park near peoples' houses. Lawrence said many dog owners currently use the little league field at the city park and she would like to see that change. Rice said survey respondents don't want to see a dog park at the city park.
- c. Feasibility of Mini Golf Putting Green at Various Locations—Jorgensen said he was surprised at the level of support for this concept in the survey results. Lawrence said the putting greens could even be placed at multiple locations throughout the city. Jorgensen said the first one

could be installed at the city park as a pilot project. Terry Deaton said there are many golfers in town. Committee members agreed to have the next meeting January 24 at 6 p.m.

Richardson adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Levi Richardson, Chair

W. Scott Jorgensen, City Administrator

DRAFT



February 18, 2022

Sue Lawrence

City of Rainier
106 West B Street
Rainier, OR 97048

RE: City of Rainier Parks & Recreation System Master Plan

Dear Sue,

We are excited to have the opportunity to work with the City of Rainier on this project. Based on recent meetings and conversations it is our understanding that you are looking for our assistance with developing a comprehensive Park & Recreation System Master Plan (PRSMP). The focus of this effort will establish a baseline inventory of existing recreational facilities, Levels of Service and to engage the Park Planning Committee and citizens of Rainier to develop a long-term plan to guide future recreational improvements.

To complete this project, we've broken the project into several tasks which are described in the following pages.

Thank you again for this opportunity.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "DEK", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Dave Elkin, PLA, ASLA, CPSI
Principal
dave@juncusstudio.com
Phone (503) 415-0760

PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

Task 1 - Project Management and Meetings

Project management includes coordination with Client, project kick-off meeting, and bi-weekly project team meetings. Task also includes attendance at Park Planning Committee meetings (as necessary) during the project.

Assumptions: 4 in-person meetings with Park Planning Committee

Deliverables: Electronic copy (PDF) of invoices will be sent monthly.

Task 2 - Recreational Facility Inventory & Mapping

Map existing and future recreation facilities and amenities within the study area. Identify condition of existing facilities and understanding of community profile.

Task 2.1 Establish Service Area and existing park sites

We will work with the City of Rainier (COR) to determine the PRSMP service area boundary. This boundary will establish the limits of the PRSMP study limits. Tentatively, the boundary is understood to be the city limits including Urban Growth Areas. Using taxlot data, we will identify the location of existing park facilities and undeveloped sites for the map.

Assumptions: COR GIS data will be available for use

Deliverables: Electronic (PDF) copy of the PRSMP Planning Boundary Exhibit

Task 2.2 Facility Inventory

In coordination with COR we will compile a recreational facility inventory. The inventory will document all currently developed and undeveloped recreational facilities within the PRSMP service area. We will perform a site visit of the existing park facilities to take inventory photos and equipment quantity. The inventory will include address, parcel identification, size, and ownership.

Deliverables: Recreational facility inventory spreadsheet (Excel format)

Task 2.3 Community Profile

We will gather statistical information related to COR population demographics, growth trends and other background information needed to craft PRSMP that is responsive to community needs.

Assumptions: We will rely on existing census data and COR data for profile

Deliverables: Electronic (PDF) copy of the Community Profile summary document

Task 3 - PRSMP Analysis & Visioning

Identify future vision of the park system based on community engagement and prioritization. Preparation of a capital improvement and implementation plan.

Task 3.1 Park Classification

We will assist COR in establishing a park classification system for existing and future recreational facilities. This classification system will be based on Oregon State Parks standard recommendations and examples from similar communities.

Deliverables: Park Classifications and Definitions

Task 3.2 Assistance with Community Survey

We will assist COR in drafting a PRSMP recreational survey to solicit community input and comments on desired recreational facility planning & development. COR will determine final format of the community survey (e.g., online via "Survey Monkey" or other web service provider), direct mailing, etc. Juncus will compile and summarize survey results for inclusion in the PRSMP

Deliverables: Draft community survey questions and summary conclusions.
Assumptions: COR will manage hosting and sending of survey questionnaire.

Task 3.3 Needs Assessment / Facility Prioritization

Following inventory, and community outreach, we will evaluate and characterize community comments, and feedback. This information will be used to identify gaps in the existing recreational facility inventory and catalog desired future improvements. A prioritization of facility type, improvement class, and or program will also be drafted as part of this effort.

Deliverables: Needs Assessment & Conclusions Narrative

Task 3.4 Visioning, PRSMP Goals & Objectives, and Strategies

We will assist COR and the Planning Committee in articulating a COR Parks & Recreation System vision statement, Goals & Objectives, and actionable strategies to achieve the desired outcomes of the PRSMP.

Deliverables: PRSMP Vision Statement, Goals & Objectives, Strategies Document

Task 3.5 Capital Improvements Plan / Implementation Plan

Using directives established in Task 4.3 we will develop an implementation plan for PRSMP. The plan will list desired capital improvements and include project scope, preliminary cost estimate and desired implementation schedule. Because current funding is unlikely to be sufficient to support desired improvements the implementation plan will include a summary

of potential funding sources and possible partnerships that may be explored to complete planned improvements.

Deliverables: PRSMP Implementation Plan

Task 3.6 City Council Presentation

We will assist COR in preparing a presentation to inform decision makers of the PRSMP effort. We anticipate attending one (1) council meetings for this task to introduce the planning effort, expected outcomes, tentative schedule, and to answer questions about the process.

Deliverables: Attendance at one (1) City Council meeting, presentation materials, & meeting minutes

Task 4 - PRSMP Documentation

Document information developed in Task 2 and 3 into a final report to be referenced for future grant opportunities with potential funding agencies.

Task 4.1 Draft PRSMP

We will compile a draft Park & Recreation System Master Plan (8 ½" x 11" format) that summarizes the findings of previous task work into a consolidated plan document. The content will include written narrative outlining plan elements and include supporting graphics, maps, tables, and figures.

Deliverables: Electronic copy (PDF) of the Draft Park & Recreation System Master Plan

Task 4.2 Final PRSMP

Based on comments provided by COR we will make edits to the draft PRSMP and submit a final plan to COR.

Deliverables: Final Park & Recreation System Master Plan

Task 4.3 City Council Presentation

We will assist COR in preparing presentations share the draft PRSMP and summarize what was recreational facilities are most desired by community members.

Deliverables: Attendance at one (1) City Council meeting, presentation materials, & meeting minutes

Fee Schedule

Juncus Studio's proposed budget is summarized below. We will perform the services on a time-and-expenses basis at the billing rates described below.

Tasks 1 - Project Management and Meetings	\$4,820.00
Tasks 2 - Recreational Facility Inventory & Mapping	\$8,445.00
Tasks 3 - PRSMP Analysis & Visioning.....	\$16,565.00
Tasks 4 - PRSMP Documentation	\$4,495.00
Expenses	\$750.00
Total Estimated Project Fee	\$35,075.00

Billing Rates

Principal	\$175 / hr
Senior Landscape Architect.....	\$150 / hr
Landscape Designer.....	\$85 / hr