



Grabhorn Park Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting

May 20, 2021 6:00 pm – 7:00 pm

Attendees: Cara Heinze, Michael Leipzig, Paul Fidrych, Dana Pricher, Mary Hindal, Andrew LaFrenz, Joel Haugen, Isaac Butman, Jim Lykins, Rocky Schwalge, Nicole Ferreira, Monica Ahlers, Kevin Chavez, Dina Eaglestone, Brandon Lesowske, JJ Duehren, Kim Holmes, Bryan Hammond, Brian Hoag

Absent: Huell White, Ivy Freimuth

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 by Chair Cara Heinze.

1.1. Review Agenda JJ made a motion to approve the May 20, 2021 Agenda. Rocky seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

1.2. Prior Meeting Minutes

Rocky made a motion to approve the May 6, 2021 meeting minutes. Monica seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

1.3. JJ stated that some people along CZ trail have been complaining about trespassers on their property. Isaac stated that he will pass this information along to the City.

2. **New Business**

2.1. Group Findings

2.1.1. Amenities: Cara shared the slides that the Amenities group prepared, reviewing their analysis process and the data points that they examined, their major findings, and their initial thoughts and suggestions relating to the Dog Park, Softball needs, and Soccer needs. Kim also talked about different opportunities and threats, as well as the stakeholder groups that may need to be involved with the amenities.

Kim asked if Jim could help define the cost of construction for the existing dog park so the cost/benefits could be analyzed. Jim stated that the small fencing upgrade cost \$2,500, but it would be hard to quantify the total cost for the dog park as much labor, materials, etc. were donated, but not necessarily tracked.

Kim stated that the two sports fields seem to overlap, and so do the play seasons, and asked about the impact of this. Brian answered that it does cause scheduling issues for both groups. It would be ideal to have enough space that both fields can be active at the same time. Rocky echoed Brian's statement and stated that sports are more year-round now due to increased participation. Kim asked if the pool was removed from the plan would there be room to separate the two fields. Brian stated yes.



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

Dana asked how current baseball reservations and fees are handled. Brian stated that for baseball there is an agreement between the little league and the City for first right of use of the fields at Veteran's Park in return for them doing maintenance on the field. Rocky stated that for soccer, they must fill out a form for the City and pay fees if a usage permit is approved. Dana asked what it would take logistically, and what the cost would be, for a soccer field versus a softball field. Isaac stated that there were not separate cost estimates made for each amenity, but that that information may be able to be seen on the engineering design documents. Rocky talked about what Soccer does to create a useable field logistically.

Dana asked if there is an option to convert one of the baseball fields into a softball field. Brian stated that that would significantly impact baseball as during season because the two fields at Veterans are used six days a week. Dana asked if there were other options for softball fields in the City. Brian stated that there are fields at the schools for softball, but those are controlled by the schools, and this limits useability, and that there are no City owned softball fields. Brian stated that there are three fields at the schools for baseball, but only one is reasonably available.

Dana asked about tournaments, and what the groups needs are for this. Brian stated that you can do a small softball tournament with one field and can run a 4-16 tournament over a weekend on a single field. Rocky stated that for soccer they would try and rent the high school fields as there would need to be a larger infrastructure for soccer tournaments as people travel for those and there is a need for greater parking and other amenities that are not available at Veteran's/Grabhorn. Brian stated that if they wanted to host a larger regional tournament, softball would need much larger facilities.

Michael asked about moving the dog park to another park. Cara stated that this is an option being considered as long as it is similar in size and scope, but that there are funding concerns relating to moving amenities around the parks system.

Monica asked about considerations for adding playground equipment and more room to play at the park for children and families. Cara stated that that is something that the group can review but it was not as highly requested or mentioned on the surveying done by the City.

- 2.1.2. Pool and Road:** Kim shared the slides that the pool and road group prepared, reviewing their analysis process and the data that they examined, and options for alternatives to the pool/road as proposed. The purpose of the slides was to consolidate the facts they know and identify where more information is needed.

There was no conversation on this topic after the presentation.

- 2.1.3. Watershed and Environment:** Dana stated that there is a City Ordinance that creates a preservative buffer of 50' from the top of the bank of any stream where no development can happen, and her group intends that to be part of their recommendation. Dana stated that there will need to be a final determination done on the wetlands by the Oregon



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

Department of State Lands to determine if these will be a constraint, but this won't happen for a while.

Dana stated that there are opportunities to enhance the natural features such as the potential wetlands and the creek and associated mitigation work that will be happening.

One of the major constraints for the natural environment is maintenance, and that maintaining anything more than a mowed area—such as items that require hand weeding or other cultivation— will be determined by the parks budget and having a plan for long term funding for these activities will be important to ensuring their sustainability.

Dana mentioned that there is a tributary that flows east across the property, and that this will need to be maintained, and there is a floodway for this tributary as well that would need to be preserved. There are opportunities related to the tributary where people could be encouraged to interact with the stream. Another identified need was shade via trees or covered areas.

Isaac stated that the committee could motion to extend the meeting as it is 7:00. Cara stated that she would prefer to continue the discussion about the work groups at a later time. Cara mentioned that there are two topics that are left to cover and asked the group if they would like to continue meeting tonight. Kevin stated he would like to continue. Kim motioned to continue. Michael second. The motion passed unanimously.

Dana stated that there are natural play opportunities, such as logs and boulders for kids to play on that could be part of the park as well, alongside, or instead of traditional playground structures.

Jim stated that the dog park runs over the tributary, and if there is no culvert there is no dog park in that location. Dana stated she would prefer a bridge. Jim stated that a bridge would impact the space available for the dog park on the proposed plan. Dana replied that a bridge would be easier to permit and stream friendly as it wouldn't impact the flood plain. Jim replied that this could cause hazards for the dogs and dog park users and stated that Dave Sukau the City would run a culvert and fill it in to place the dog park in the proposed location. Dana replied that DEQ and other permitting agencies will likely not permit that. Kevin reminded the group that the proposal is only that, and the group is here to make changes where things don't work. Cara stated that this discussion is good in that it informs where the dog park can go, which seems to indicate that the dog park will need to be relocated.

Paul made a comment that he reviewed the City's 2016 Transportation System Plan, and it looks all the way out to 2035, and that this kind of long-range thinking should be considered as the group moves forward. Cara stated that this is something that her group talked about a little bit in terms of a single dog park not being sufficient currently, and that this is something that needs to be considered as the group moves forward.

2.2. Long range planning Discussion: Isaac made a presentation about grant funding, funding strategy, and the long-range planning relating to the GPAHC's work. Isaac stated that while he



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

was going to talk about a lot of topics, the main thing that he wanted the group to take away from this was that prioritization of their recommendations would be incredibly important, as development of the Park is completely contingent on getting selected for the Grant. He stated that there is very limited budget for parks improvements, and that there is a high likelihood that the City may not get selected for the Grant because the City has been awarded this specific Grant multiple times recently.

Regarding moving amenities to different parks, Isaac stated that the Grant will not cover the costs of these moves. The Grant will only be applicable to develop the one property. While those changes can be considered and recommended, they really are more related to a larger park system plan, like the Parks Master Plan. Isaac stated that that type of thinking is important and did not want to discourage it. Lastly, Isaac stated that due to these factors, thinking about priorities, not just for what the recommendations are, but for the items with the recommendations themselves, will allow the recommendations to be more effective in the case that the City does not receive the Grant, and will help guide the City to develop what it can in that case.

Rocky asked if there were matching dollars for the Grant. Isaac stated that the Grant is not a matching dollar grant where the funder matches donations.

JJ asked what the likelihood of the City getting the Grant are. Isaac stated that this depends on what the Grant funders priorities are for the cycle and what their scoring metric is. Isaac stated that it is very difficult to tell what the actual chance are, as there are many moving parts that will impact this as the process moves forwards.

Kim asked Isaac to review the timeline for the entire process between the GPAHC's work and Grant submittal. Isaac stated that the Grant is due in mid-April 2022 and working backwards it takes around two months to create a competitive proposal, taking the timeline back to mid-February 2022. The City needs a minimum of three months to work through the process of submitting and approving the Master Plan amendment for the Grabhorn property (City Council initiating the process, the Parks Committee working through the Amendment, and City Council Adopting the Amendment), taking the timeline back to November 2021. Before this can happen a 10% engineering design plan would need to be done, which takes a minimum of one to two months, taking the timeline back to September 2021. If everything stays on schedule City Council will be able to hear this Committees recommendation at the earliest on September 7, 2021. Given all of this, and the date at which City Staff was directed to create the Ad Hoc Committee, the City did everything it could to give the GPAHC the most time possible to do its work. The current timeline only allows for one, maybe two weeks of flexibility. Any delay more than this will cause the City to more than likely miss the Grant Deadline.

Rocky asked about the Grant scoring. Isaac responded that grant funders use a scoring rubric to score grants, and there are certain indicia that make grants more or less competitive. Isaac stated that this is not intended to tell GPAHC what to include or not in their recommendations but is intended to answer the question about how grants are scored.



Bryan Hammond asked if there are amenities that the Grant decision will hinge on. Isaac stated that the pool/road/etc. decisions will need to be made before the Grant is sought as once the grant is submitted, the plan is pretty set in stone as to what is included.

Dana asked if there is a list of what gives more points and what gives less when funders look at scoring grants, and if age group impacts are considered, and if the road would be funded through the grant. Isaac stated that the grant cannot be used to fund the road. Isaac stated that he did not find a specific scoring guide the funders use to rate certain amenities or target age groups, although age is considered as the indicia speak to age groups.

Monica asked about what funds would be used to pay for the road. Joel stated that SDC's—System Development Charges, fees charged when development happens—are used to fund the road. Monica asked if the grant funds could be used to move the dog park since the development is triggering the road construction, and the dog park being moved is being triggered by that. Isaac stated he is not sure and will get back to the Committee on this.

Jim stated that there are utilities that are planned along the same route as the road. Isaac stated that that is correct, and the purpose of this is to create much needed redundancy and talked about some of the particular context around installing underground utilities.

Dana asked about if the trees along the current adjacent property owners' driveway would be impacted by the road. Isaac stated that it is hard to tell, and the Committee could recommend that the impacts be minimized to the trees or adjacent property owners.

- 2.3. Public forum planning:** Cara stated that at the last meeting the group voted to hold public comment at a separate public forum and there were a few suggestions about how to do this. One would have the public speak towards the group for set amounts of time. There could also be more interactive options where the group could suggest plans and get feedback directly on them and wanted to get a feel from the group about what they think.

Dana replied that she thinks that it would be more constructive to have more focused input from the public based on the work being done by the committee (list of priorities, or feedback on plans), rather than just an open forum, based on where the committee is at in terms of the process of creating recommendations. There have been many opportunities for public comment, and there is always the opportunity to submit public comment to the GPAHC for the meetings, and a more guided and targeted experience may garner more useful feedback.

Kim stated that another option would be to provide all the information being created by the GPAHC process to the public, and then the opportunity to provide additional information and weigh in on preferences for options the groups are highlighting. Kim stated she likes the idea about adding some guidance structure to the open forum and could help the committee get more useable information.

Kevin stated he likes Kim's idea about how this could move forward, and that having the information available is important to understand the process, the information the group has and has found, and what the groups are thinking, and could help provide transparency to the process.



Cara asked what Kim's thoughts about distributing information to the public were and stated that she assumed that everything presented at the meetings is public record. Isaac stated that is correct. Jim stated that offering a complete set of minutes for the public to look at could be overwhelming but having summaries of what the groups are doing on the City website could be more productive. Cara agreed, and stated that having it all available is important, presenting it in a more accessible manner is also important and may necessitate creation of infographics or smaller, more descriptive documents, and presenting it in an accessible form will be important for the community discussion. Kim stated that being able to show how the committee got to where it is, is just as important as getting feedback about specifics that the groups are considering.

Cara stated that there seemed to be more interest in having the public forum be a more focused endeavor, providing information, a mocked-up plan, and being a feedback opportunity for where the GPAHC is now in the process, and stated that at the next meeting the group should determine a date and build out the specifics of what to present during the forum.

3. Announcements and Next Meetings

3.1. Next Meetings

- June 3, 2021
- June 17, 2021
- July 1, 2021

Meeting Adjourned at 7:36 pm.

For questions about these minutes, contact Isaac Butman, 503.543.7184 ibutman@cityofscappoose.org
The EDC conducts its meetings in an ADA accessible room. If special accommodations are needed, please contact City Recorder Susan Reeves at 503.543.7146, ext. 224 TTY 503.378.5938