



Grabhorn Park Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting

July 15, 2021 6:00 pm

Attendees: Cara Heinze, Michael Leipzig, Paul Fidrych, Andrew LaFrenz, Joel Haugen, Isaac Butman, Jim Lykins, Rocky Schwalge, Nicole Ferreira, Monica Ahlers, Kevin Chavez, Unidentified Caller 310-916-8288, Unidentified Caller 503-869-5059, Dina Eaglestone

Absent: Kim Holmes, JJ Duehren, Mary Hindal, Brian Hoag, Ivy Freimuth

1. Call to Order

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

1.1. Review Agenda

Michael made a motion to approve the Meeting Agenda. Kevin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

1.2. Prior Meeting Minutes

Jim made a motion to approve the July 1, 2021 Meeting Minutes. Michael seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

1.3. Public Comment Acknowledgement

Cara stated that there were multiple comments submitted this week, and that she would like to acknowledge the receipt of the feedback. Cara stated that regarding the Shoemaker letter that the Committees' position at this point is that they will recommend the preservation of those trees as they recognize the value of them in various aspects.

Paul stated that he is concerned that the feedback that he heard was that any development by the trees could be detrimental to them. Cara stated that she heard that the arborist mentioned in the letter will likely be making comments about this in the future.

Nicole talked about the critical root zone and offered to forward information about this to the Committee. Nicole stated that the impact of disruption in the critical root zone can significantly impact a trees health, and the recommendation in general is that any impacts to this area be minimized.

Cara stated that regarding the comments about the survey, the survey was initially an internal survey, and one member asked that the survey be released to the public to gather additional information about specific things that committee members wanted to know about. The purpose of the survey is for the Committee to better understand how the public felt after the information at the public forum was distributed. Over 150 responses were received when the survey was released to the general public. The second survey was not to confuse or cause survey fatigue, but to help GPAHC craft and guide their recommendation to City Council.

Cara reviewed some of the survey results noting that some of the feedback regarding softball was that softball groups get supplanted from the fields frequently so that soccer/baseball



groups can use the fields, and there seems to be a discrepancy and large need for fields specifically for this group.

2. Old Business

2.1. Record Correction – City Staff Isaac stated for the record that Roberta Shoemaker, President and CEO of WESCO Shoes wanted to ensure that the record was correct regarding the WESCO property. There are no plans to develop the WESCO property as it met its expansion limitation over 20 years ago. Further, the WESCO property is not adjacent to the Grabhorn Property.

2.2. Public Forum Debrief

Cara stated that there was a great turnout for the Public Forum on Saturday, it was a beautiful day and there was great input and feedback from the community.

A lot of people were against the road in any form, there were several supporters of softball and soccer and the dog park among the people that turned out.

Paul asked if the pictures of the feedback were sent out for the committee to review. It turned out they had not been and Huell sent them out. There was a lot of comments written on the boards, and Cara stated that she has highlights of the comments that she will be providing to City Council during the update on Monday night. There was a lot of support for the splash pad, and not a lot of support for the road. There was a lot of support for turf and lights for all the sports fields.

Jim stated that one of the concerns he heard was that if the dog park was shrunk or moved it may result in dog owners having their dogs off leash in the park generally instead of in the fenced area.

Cara reviewed the survey results in detail. A playground with natural play elements had the most support of all the amenities. Signage was supported broadly, as were sports fields, and turf/lighting for the fields. Trails were also widely supported.

Paul stated that if only one person raised positive feelings about the road, the presentation in the slides does not seem to reflect this, and perhaps if only one person voiced this then it might not be a highlight. Cara stated that that was the one comment she heard about the road. Paul responded that that might be the case, but it seems that many more people were against a road. Paul mentioned that there are any number of alternatives to a road, and the parking could be expanded instead. Cara replied that it might not be a highlight, but it should be something that is part of the conversation. Jim stated that he also agrees that this is not something that he sees as a highlight. Cara replied that she understands this but feels that the feedback should be passed on to Council, and the committee could state that one person gave that feedback. Monica mentioned that perhaps the report to Council should include the number of people along with each response set. Cara asked to change the slide to state, “two citizens”.

Cara stated that multiple smaller dog parks would not fit the needs of the community, and the fish friendly culvert is a potential possibility, but that the impacts of developments like that need to be minimal in nature. Jim stated that he is not sure how a culvert is minimal and stated



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

that it seems like the dog park issue is just as unsolved as before. Paul seconded this comment and mentioned that the report to Council should highlight the fact that there is no other option at this point. Bryan stated that a culvert would also impact the road development in that area. A discussion was had encompassing the road, the dog park, and the maintenance shed, and the conclusion was that all of these things are really undefined and there seems to be no resolution to any of these items.

Cara stated that action items are to walk “Cathead”—Joel volunteered to do this—, they would like the City to consider working with the School District to collaborate on some of the sports field issues, she stated that even if collaboration happens the needs of the sports teams are not being met, and stated that the group would like to see various groups work together and talk about a pool.

2.3. Park Deliberation

There was minimal interest in the pool based on the survey, but lots of interest in the splashpad, and is wondering what peoples’ thoughts about holding the pool discussion for later. Jim stated that for him, the most productive comments were about making the pool a community wide project covering various organizations and a broader tax and need base. Cara stated that she agrees but wanted to see if the group wants to bring the idea of a splashpad up to Council. Jim asked if the splashpad would supplant the concept of the pool. Cara stated that that seems to be the case.

Paul stated that the tree conservation issue pulls the strings of the road and the ball fields, because if a safety zone around the trees is created it would either push the road out removing the possibility of fields or push so far into the fields as to make the fields undevelopable. Paul stated these are the kinds of tradeoffs and information that should be transferred to Council. The group agreed, and Huell stated he would adjust the Council Report to reflect this.

Bryan asked about the possibility of using a gravel road instead of a paved road. Huell replied that there will be a base for any kind of road. Isaac stated that regardless of the road, the utilities will be placed in that area as well. Huell responded that the utilities would need to be placed away from roots regardless. Jim stated that he feels that fixing a bridge would fix the issue with redundancy with the utilities and the access issue with the road.

Paul asked how the 1st street project would impact the utilities and access in that area of the City. Huell stated the 1st street project is not in the 5-year project timeline and is unsure when that project would be undertaken.

Cara asked opinions about having a softball field in the park space. Jim asked if there is room for both softball and soccer. Cara stated that those are both competing needs, and that there may be room for both sport fields. Monica asked about if there should be two softball fields at Grabhorn because there are two baseball fields at Veterans, rather than various amenities at one location would be best.

Paul stated that its not about whether or not we need more fields, but if this is the right place for more fields. Is what the city needs a 20-acre sports complex, versus one field here, and which is the right decision for the city. Cara stated that that is a good point. Cara stated that



SCAPPOOSE *Oregon*

soccer came to the park committee five years ago asking for fields and that she is concerned that those needs aren't getting met and what happens if we wait even longer. Bryan asked about a combined field. Rocky stated that everything is a great idea either a shared field or a divided field, but soccer will take as much as they can get in relation to soccer, but that he is certain that soccer and softball and those interested in all sports will work together to find the best possible solution.

Jim stated that a baseball field and softball field are not the same, and that each sport need their own field and is supportive of that. Jim asked if there is room for both an individual soccer and softball field. Cara stated that it looks like the two fields can be separated, especially if there is not a pool.

2.4. Council Update #2

Cara stated the items she will review at Council regarding the road, the trees, the dog park, and all the other items presented in the slides, and will cover the small items that have a lot of support and stressed that really focus moving forward is the big outstanding issues like the road and fields and placement issues.

Bryan asked about using Middle School space for more tennis courts. Paul replied that there is no shared use/support agreement and that that idea came from the 2017 Parks Master Plan.

Joel urged the Committee to tune in to the next Council meeting as there are many important issues before Council on Monday.

3. Announcements and Next Meetings

3.1. Next Meetings

- August 5
- August 19

Meeting Adjourned at 7:05 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