

CITY OF SILVERTON  
**PARKS AND RECREATION TASK FORCE MINUTES**

---

Silverton Community Center – Council Chambers – 421 South Water St.

April 16, 2019, 6:30 p.m.

**I. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman Kyle Palmer called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and introductions were made.

Present	Absent	
X		Kyle Palmer
X		Dave Ullan
X		Becky Ludden
	Excused	Brandon Lemon
X		Charles Baldwin
X		Chuck White
	Resigned	Cindy Jones
X		Colin Scott <i>arrived at 6:36 pm</i>
	Absent	Ray Hunter
X		James Rise
X		Ty Boland
	Excused	Richard Schmidt

Staff Present:

City Manager, Christy Wurster; Public Works Director, Petra Schuetz; Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu; and Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Angela Speier

Mayor Palmer explained the purpose of the Parks and Recreation Task Force and introduced Dr. Kent Robinson with Portland State University. Dr. Robinson introduced Christian Smith and Kelly Sherbo.

**II. DISCUSSION FACILITATED BY PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICES**

**2.1 Review background, work performed to date and forms of governance – Kent Robinson, PhD**

Dr. Robinson reviewed the agenda for the meeting and explained the first half of the meeting would be PSU listening to the members about the current parks and recreation programs in Silverton. The second half will be a review of the election process and a look at comparable situations. He explained that this presentation is meant to be a dialogue session to gather information from the Task Force in order to build a factual base of understanding on the situation and issues. First, the members were asked to share their issues and concerns regarding City parks and facilities.

The following concerns were identified:

- Shortage of facilities
- If a district is formed would it be possible to contract with the City for maintenance
- Outdated facilities
- Repair and maintenance of new structures
- Currently there are more dog parks than youth sports facilities
- Trail development for bikes and pedestrians
- School district ownership and maintenance of facilities verses City or some other entity

- Capacity of the City to handle additional park facilities
- Concern for closure of City pool
- Lack of natural areas
- The reservoir is currently being under used and could be a great resource for parks and recreation opportunities
- Question of fairness – out of city users
- Coordination difficulties with an additional agency and lack of efficiency
- Additional resources would need to be acquired for park maintenance
- Transparency in how the school district uses the revenue it receives from the City
- Consistency on how facility users are being charged both in district and out of district
- High dependence on the school district for recreation fields and scheduling issues
- Parking at Coolidge-McClaine Park during special events

Audience members identified the following:

- Safety concerns for all facilities
- Research and consideration for future non-traditional sports that are on the rise

Task Force members and staff were asked to place three dots next to the issues that they feel are the most important.

Members were asked to identify what works well with the parks and facilities:

- Coolidge-McClaine Park is an amazing park with a lot of history in the community
- Parks are well maintained
- Play structure upgrades at Coolidge-McClaine Park
- Skate park
- Pool
- Overall usage of the parks
- Community support
- Coolidge-McClaine is the central hub of the community and is host to a number of special events

Members were asked to identify what changes they would like to see happen:

- More athletic fields
- Increase personnel for parks maintenance
- Sustained funding
- Trails
- The formation of a parks and recreation district, because it isn't the core mission of the City or the school district
- Adult recreational opportunities
- Need more courts (i.e. pickle ball), exercise equipment, and facilities for adults
- Rails to trails on the railway
- Recreational equipment rental kiosk at Marine Park
- Regional connectivity – such as a multiuse path between Mt. Angel and Silverton
- Driving range
- At the new City Hall dedicated space for recreational classes and/or a gym and sports courts
- Help facilitate and navigate the spacing needs of youth sports (general coordination)
- Have staff at the district act as a liaison and capacity building
- Integrate the arts into the scheduling

Audience members identified the following:

- Bike trails
- Tent camping
- Potential for special district with a full service menu of activities
- Need for additional gyms, indoor athletic space and multiuse covered space

Task Force members and staff were asked to place three dots next to the issues that they would like to see changed.

## **2.2 Discussion on Proposed District Boundaries – Kent Robinson, PhD**

Dr. Robinson explained how local governments fund parks and recreation based on what is allowed under Oregon law. He explained that the first option would be to stabilize the current program and carry on in the same manner. One of the issues identified by the members tonight was fairness and equity, Dr. Robinson explained in ambulance service it is fairly common for them to sell memberships to people who live outside the ambulance district, perhaps a similar tool could be set up in this situation. Another option could be to expand the pool levy for programming use.

The second option would be to leave the system as is, but to add more recreation programming. This would mean the City would need an additional 1.0 to 1.5 FTE which would cost approximately \$130,000 annually.

The third option would be for the City to buy the services through an intergovernmental agreement from a provider. This is not uncommon in the public safety arena, a number of cities contract with the County or another city for police services. This would cost approximately \$120,000-\$140,000 annually.

The Task Force members discussed these concepts and Member Ludden voiced her concern regarding the level of uncertainty that comes with the pool levy every five years and would like to see stable funding. Member Dave Ullan said that he doesn't see these options alleviating very many problems. Member Baldwin said that these options are non-starters, because they do not fix the non-equity issues between those using the facilities and those paying for them.

Another option under ORS is to form a joint government entity to provide services. The governing body would be comprised of two councilors from each City. This option is most commonly found in 911 districts. The entity would be an independent organization that delivers service through revenue contributed by each local government involved. Member Palmer explained that a few surrounding cities were approached about the idea of a Parks and Recreation District and they were not willing to participate financially in this process, which shows a lack of interest on their part. He said that there is a level of reluctance for a community to be helping fund something that is happening in the other jurisdiction, so he doesn't think this option would be successful in the Silverton area. Member Baldwin said this idea will be required when it comes to funding Rails to Trails, because there are five cities located along the rail line that will be impacted and they will all need to participate.

The next option would be the creation of an Independent Special Service District to provide recreation services. The district boundaries would need to be defined and residents would vote on the formation and the permanent property tax rate. The district would have its own board of directors who would be responsible for the administration and setting the fee for service. In this scenario the City and school district would still be in charge of the facilities, but the district would provide recreation/programming services. Dr. Robinson reviewed districts that have a similar operation and how much their annual operating budget is.

The final option reviewed was the creation of an Independent Special Service District that would own the facilities and provide recreation programming. The district would be in the business of capital development and there would likely be a transfer agreement between the City and the district. Dr. Robinson reviewed examples of these types of districts and their annual budgets. Member Palmer asked if a long term lease would be an option, because he does not want to see the City sell their park facilities. Portland State will study these examples further and provide a report to the Task Force.

## **2.3 Process for Parks and Recreation Special District Creation – Kelly Sherbo**

Kelly Sherbo reviewed the process for forming a special district and the timing for each step of the process, those steps include:

1. City gives consent and performs a feasibility study to determine the tax rate.
2. Petition components get developed and the prospective petition is filed with the county.

3. Gather signatures (15 percent of the electors residing in the proposed district).
4. Final Petition filed with the county (at least 180 days from the election).
5. Initial hearing (30-50 days after Final Petition is filed and last up to four weeks).
6. Final hearing and order for formation by the county (20-50 days after initial order).
7. Election on the formation, tax rate, and board of directors (May or November election).

Dr. Robinson reviewed a number of maps that showed potential district boundaries. He explained that not every facility has to be managed by the district and that certain parks could be carved out of the district and continue to be maintained by the City. Another possible boundary would be to use the Silver Falls School District boundary, which was attempted before and failed. Dr. Robinson explained that the property tax would be based on the property's assessed value and he also explained that agricultural land would be taxed differently, based on their taxable status and property type. The Task Force discussed using the Library District as a possible boundary. The boundaries can be configured in a way that the Task Force thinks would be favorable.

Discussion ensued regarding the online survey that PSU is planning on sending to residents and how to make sure that households in the proposed boundary receive it as well. Member Baldwin said that he thinks it's important to have the boundary defined prior to the survey being released. He would also like to review the questions. Staff noted that the survey was sent to the Task Force members, but questions will likely be added thus the members need to take the survey again. Mr. Baldwin would like to see PSU work closely with City staff to determine the most appropriate boundary for the district. Discussion ensued on ways to cap the assessed value on larger properties outside the city limits or to modify the rate for properties zoned as exclusive farm use. City staff will use the County Assessor's website to better identify the geographic area of the district. The members decided to wait to send out the survey until the boundary is more defined and asked Director Gottgetreu to prepare several district boundary scenarios and give the rationale for each. Those boundaries will be reviewed and one will be chosen at the next Parks and Recreation Task Force meeting. Member Ludden asked if the boundary could be based on area code and include addresses with the 97381 zip code, because those expand outside city limits.

Staff indicated that this Task Force needs to make a recommendation to the City Council on what you would like to see implemented in regards to funding parks and recreation. The Council will get to make the ultimate decision, but if it is decided to pursue a parks and recreation district, the Task Force is going to have to be the body that carries that forward. A PAC will need to be created and citizens will need to move the petition through the process, because City staff cannot participate in the petition process.

Member Baldwin asked about the timing. City Manager Wurster explained the agreement with PSU expires June 30, 2019 and given the election process this likely wouldn't qualify for the ballot until May or November 2020. Member Baldwin reiterated that the geographic boundary must be defined prior to releasing the survey. Staff will make sure that all members receive the survey and urged them to provide feedback to PSU on the questions. At the next meeting members will review the proposed boundaries and a third meeting might need to be scheduled to review the survey results and make a recommendation.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/Angela Speier, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk