



Staff Report

Meeting Date: June 6, 2022

From Shelley Denison, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: 22-011 CPA Revised Parks and Trails Master Plan Adoption

DECISION TO BE MADE:

The decision to be made is whether or not to adopt the revised Parks and Trails Master Plan dated May 2022.

PURPOSE / OBJECTIVE:

The purposes of the revisions are as follows:

- Refresh Census data with 2020 data
- Align the Parks and Trails Master Plan with the Transportation System Plan
- Align the level of service and needs analysis methodology with proposed code amendments

BACKGROUND / CONTEXT:

The current Parks and Trails Master Plan was adopted by ordinance in September 2021. Since then, it was determined that a number of revisions were necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission, the Parks and Trails Advisory Board, and staff recommend that City Council **approve** the Type IV Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the amended Parks and Trails Master Plan by emergency to replace the existing Plan in its entirety.

SUGGESTED MOTION LANGUAGE:

"I move to adopt the revised Parks and Trails Master Plan dated May 2022."

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS/EXHIBITS:

Attachment 1: Staff Report

Attachment 2: Exhibits

Attachment 3: Ordinance

**CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT
TYPE IV COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT PROPOSAL**

DATE: June 6, 2022

FILE NO.: 22-011 CPA

PROJECT NAME: Parks and Trails Master Plan Amendments

APPLICANT: City of Sandy

The above-referenced proposal was reviewed as a Type IV Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The following Findings of Fact are adopted supporting approval of the plan in accordance with Chapter 17 of the Sandy Municipal Code.

EXHIBITS:

Applicant's Submittals:

A. Parks and Trails Master Plan Amendment Summary (May 16, 2022)

Additional Exhibits:

B. 21-035 CPA Parks and Trails Master Plan Adoption Final Order (September 20, 2021)

C. Planning Commission slide deck (April 25, 2022)

FINDINGS OF FACT

General

1. These findings are based on the applicant's submittal received in May 2022. This report is based upon the Exhibits listed above.
2. This application proposes to amend and replace the adopted 2021 Parks and Trails Master Plan (Plan). The Plan was prepared by ESA Associates in partnership with the Parks and Trails Advisory Board and a Technical Advisory Committee. It was adopted by Sandy City Council on September 20, 2021. The Plan provides a framework for managing the continuing growth and maintenance of the City's parks and recreation resources through the year 2035.
3. Three key revisions have been made to the amended Plan:
 1. Align the Plan with the Transportation System Plan update;
 2. Refresh U.S. Census data; and
 3. Align the level of service and needs analysis methodology with proposed Sandy Development Code amendments.

4. The specific amendments made are as follows:

Parks and Trails Master Plan:

1. Cover – Updated report title to “Amended”
2. Footer throughout – Updated report title to “Amended,” updated date to “May 2022”
3. Acknowledgements – Revised to include Rochelle Anderholm-Parsch
4. Table of Contents – Revised to delete Appendix G (Code amendments) which will be addressed under separate cover and adoption process
5. Page 9 – Updated Figure 3 and text with 2020 Census data
6. Page 10 – Updated Table 1 and text with 2020 Census data
7. Page 24 – Updated Table 8 to reflect minor updates to a few existing trail alignments. The net result was a .38 miles reduction in existing trail than in the prior plan, which reduces current level of service slightly and increases the current need. This change was carried through to Tables 9, 10, and C-1.
8. Page 25 – Updated Map 6 to reflect minor adjustments in existing trails
9. Page 29 – Text updated to reflect revised population and level of service calculations
10. Page 30 – Updated Table 9 to reflect 2020 Census data and revised trail LOS calculations
11. Page 33 – Updated Table 10 with 2020 Census data and revised LOS and Needs calculations
12. Page 35 – Updated Table 11 to reflect 2020 Census data and revised LOS calculations
13. Page 39 – Update Map 8 to reflect minor adjustments in existing trails
14. Page 49 – Update Map 14 to reflect minor adjustments in existing trails
15. Page 55 – Updated Table 12 to reflect changes to the Tier 1 Trails CIP list resulting from coordination with the TSP

Appendices:

1. Footer throughout – Updated date to “May 2022”
 2. Page A-1 – Updated Table A-1 to reflect changes to the Trail CIP resulting from TSP coordination
 3. Page A-4 to A-5 – Updated Table A-4 to reflect changes to the Trail CIP resulting from TSP coordination
 4. Updated Table C-1 to reflect minor adjustments to existing trails.
 5. Deleted Appendix G (Code amendments) which will be addressed under a separate cover and adoption process
5. As is required by the Sandy Development Code, the re-adoption of the amended Plan is being processed through two land use hearings in front of the Planning Commission and the City Council as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. A legal notice informing the public of the hearings was included in the Sandy Post on April 13, 2022.
6. On March 9, 2022, the Parks and Trails Advisory Board unanimously recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Plan.

7. On April 25, 2022, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Plan.
8. Since the recommendations of approval were made by the Parks and Trails Advisory Board and the Planning Commission, one correction was made to calculations in the plan related to existing trails (see finding 4.7). However, it was determined that this change did not require an additional hearing in front of the Planning Commission.

17.24 – Comprehensive Plan Amendment Procedures

9. This application constitutes an amendment to the City’s existing Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this municipal code section is applicable.
10. Section 17.24.70 contains two review criteria that must be met. Section 17.24.70(A) states that the change being proposed is the best means of meeting the identified public need. Development Services staff believe that the updates to the Plan meet the need of accurate demographic reporting, best practice level of service analysis, and cohesion with other adopted plans as well as the Sandy Development Code. As Sandy is anticipated to continue to grow in population, this plan appropriately addresses forecasted needs using industry best practices in assessments and recommendations.
11. Section 17.24.70(B) states that the Comprehensive Plan Amendment must conform to all applicable Statewide Planning Goals. The original adoption of the Plan met Goals 1, 2, 5, and 8. (See Exhibit B for further elaboration). However, City staff believes that only Goals 1 and 2 are applicable specifically to the proposed amendments to the Plan.

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement. Goal 1 requires the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. In addition to the many ways input was solicited from the public for the creation of the Plan, this amendment process also meets statutory requirements prescribed by Goal 1. Specifically, public notice and land use hearings are being used to meet these requirements.

Goal 2: Land Use Planning. Goal 2 requires that local governments must have and follow a comprehensive land use plan. Part of this Goal includes procedural requirements related to comprehensive plan amendments. This application has followed those procedural requirements.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission, the Parks and Trails Advisory Board, and staff recommend that City Council **approve** the Type IV Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the amended Parks and Trails Master Plan by emergency to replace the existing Plan in its entirety.



memorandum

File No. 22-011 CPA

date May 16, 2022

to Rochelle Anderholm-Parsch, City of Sandy, Parks & Recreation Director

cc Kelly O'Neill, City of Sandy, Development Services Director

from Maureen Raad, PLA, ESA

subject Amendment to the 2022 Parks & Trails Master Plan

This memorandum summarizes revisions to the 2022 Parks & Trails Master Plan that have been incorporated into the 2022 Parks & Trails Master Plan. Revisions were required to align the PTMP with the Transportation System Plan Update, refresh Census data, and align the level of service and needs analysis methodology with proposed Code amendments.

The following pages were revised:

PTSMP Report

- Cover – Updated report title to “Amended”
- Footer throughout – Updated report title to “Amended”, updated date to “May 2022”
- Acknowledgements – Revised to include Rochelle Anderholm-Parsch and new Parks Board Members
- Table of Contents – Revised to delete Appendix G (Code amendments) which will be addressed under separate cover and adoption process.
- Pg 9 – Updated Figure 3 and text with 2020 Census data
- Pg 10 – Updated Table 1 and text with 2020 Census data
- Pg 24 – Updated Table 8 to reflect minor updates to a few existing trail alignments. The net result was a .38 miles reduction in existing trail than in the prior plan, which reduces current level of service slightly, and increases the current need. Carried through to Tables 9, 10 and C-1.
- Pg 25 – Update Map 6 to reflect minor adjustments in existing trails.
- Pg 29 – Text updated to reflect revised population and level of service calculations. Converted trail level of service calculation from miles to acres.
- Pg 30 – Updated Table 9 to reflect 2020 Census data and revised trail LOS calculations

- Pg 33 – Updated Table 10 with 2020 Census data and revised LOS and Needs calculations
- Pg 35 – Updated Table 11 to reflect 2020 Census data and revised LOS calculations
- Pg 39 – Update Map 8 to reflect minor adjustments in existing trails.
- Pg 49 – Update Map 14 to reflect minor adjustments in existing trails.
- Pg 55 – Updated Table 12 to reflect changes to the Tier 1 Parks & Trails CIP list resulting from coordination with the TSP


PTMP Appendices

- Footer throughout – Updated date to “May 2022”
- Pg A-1 – Updated Table A-1 to reflect changes to the Trail CIP resulting from TSP coordination with the TSP
- Pg A-4 to A-5 – Updated Table A-4 to reflect changes to the Trail CIP resulting from TSP coordination with the TSP
- Updated Table C-1 to reflect minor adjustments to existing trails.
- Deleted Appendix G (Code amendments) which will be addressed under separate cover and adoption process.

Attachments:

Amended City of Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan, May 2022

Amended City of Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan Appendices, May 2022





File # 22-011 CPA

Amended Parks and Trails Master Plan

Planning Commission
April 25, 2022

Request

- Type IV Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Request

- Type IV Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- Amends the Parks and Trails Master Plan adopted in September, 2021

Plan Summary

- Previous plan published in 1997

Plan Summary

- Previous plan published in 1997
- 15-year planning horizon

Plan Summary

- Previous plan published in 1997
- 15-year planning horizon
- Reflects current conditions of parks and trails

Plan Summary

- Previous plan published in 1997
- 15-year planning horizon
- Reflects current conditions of parks and trails
- Recommends locations and types of new parks and trails

Plan Summary

- Previous plan published in 1997
- 15-year planning horizon
- Reflects current conditions of parks and trails
- Recommends locations and types of new parks and trails
- Recommends updates to existing parks and trails

Plan Summary

- Previous plan published in 1997
- 15-year planning horizon
- Reflects current conditions of parks and trails
- Recommends locations and types of new parks and trails
- Recommends updates to existing parks and trails
- Recommends funding strategies for implementation

Amendments

- Align the Parks and Trails Master Plan with the TSP update

Amendments

- Align the Parks and Trails Master Plan with the TSP update
- Refresh Census data with 2020 information

Amendments

- Align the Parks and Trails Master Plan with the TSP update
- Refresh Census data with 2020 information
- Align level of service and needs analysis methodology with proposed Development Code amendments

Review Criteria

- Best means of meeting identified public need

Review Criteria

- Best means of meeting identified public need
- Meets statewide planning goals

Review Criteria: Statewide Planning Goals

- Goal 1: Citizen Involvement
 - Engagement strategy associated with initial Plan
 - Statutory engagement requirements associated with amendment process

Review Criteria: Statewide Planning Goals

- Goal 1: Citizen Involvement
 - Engagement strategy associated with initial Plan
 - Statutory engagement requirements associated with amendment process
- Goal 2: Land Use Planning
 - Procedural requirements related to amending a Comprehensive Plan

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council to adopt the amended Parks and Trails Master Plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.



NO. 2022-11

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING A REVISION TO THE 2021 PARKS & TRAILS SYSTEM MASTER PLAN AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Whereas, the existing Parks & Trails Master Plan for the City of Sandy (the “2021 Plan”) was adopted by Ordinance No. 2021-26 on September 20, 2021; and

Whereas, The City, in coordination Environmental Science Associates, saw a need to revise specific elements of the 2021 Plan, including revisions to align the City’s adopted Parks and Trails Plan with the most recent Transportation System Plan update, refresh data related to actual and projected City growth, and align the level of service and needs analysis methodology with proposed Development Code amendments; and

Whereas, the City provided notice of the proposed amendments to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development as required under applicable law; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to review the revised Parks & Trails Master Plan on April 25, 2022 and forwarded a recommendation to City Council to adopt the revised Parks & Trails Master Plan with certain revisions; and

Whereas, the City Council held a public hearing to review the revised Parks & Trails Master Plan together with the Planning Commission’s recommendation on June 6, 2022.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF SANDY ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS,

Section 1: The City of Sandy Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to include the revised Parks & Trails Master Plan of Sandy dated May 2022, attached hereto as “Exhibit A” and incorporated herein by this reference (the “May 2022 Plan”).

Section 2: The May 2022 Plan hereby supersedes and replaces the 2021 Plan.

Section 3: Ordinance No. 2021-26 is hereby repealed.

Section 4: In support of its decision, the City Council hereby adopts the findings in the Staff report dated June 6, 2022 supporting adoption of the May 2022 Plan.

Section 5: An emergency being hereby declared, this Ordinance shall become immediately upon its adoption.

INTRODUCED, ADOPTED AND EFFECTIVE this 6th day of June 2022.

This ordinance is adopted by the Common Council of the City of Sandy and approved by the Mayor this 06 day of June 2022

Stan Pulliam, Mayor

ATTEST:

Jeff Aprati, City Recorder

DRAFT

EXHIBIT B

SANDY

PARKS & TRAILS MASTER PLAN

| 2022

EXHIBIT B

Amended

CITY OF SANDY PARKS AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN Update

Prepared for
City of Sandy

May 2022



DRAFT

819 SE Morrison Street
Suite 310
Portland, OR 97214
503.274.2010
esassoc.com



Bend	Orlando	San Jose
Camarillo	Pasadena	Santa Monica
Delray Beach	Petaluma	Sarasota
Destin	Portland	Seattle
Irvine	Sacramento	Tampa
Los Angeles	San Diego	
Oakland	San Francisco	

D201900682.00

EXHIBIT B

DRAFT

OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

EXHIBIT B

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

Stan Pulliam, Mayor
Carl Exner
Don Hokanson
Jeremy Pietzold
Laurie Smallwood
Rich Sheldon
Kathleen Walker

PARKS & TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD (PTAB)

Don Robertson
Alexandria Gale
David Breames
Rachel Stephens
Sarah Schrodetz
Makoto Lane
Mary Casey
Will Toogood
Upekala Wijayratne
Laurie Smallwood

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dayna Brown
Kate Holleran
Chelsea Lincoln Lane, Oregon Trail School District
Emily Meharg, City Staff
Sarah Richardson, City Staff
Tanya Richardson, City Staff
Don Robertson, PTAB
Laurie Smallwood, City Council
Kathleen Walker, PTAB (former), City Council

CITY STAFF

Nancy Enabnit, Project Manager
Jordan Wheeler, City Manager
Tanya Richardson, Community Services Director
Rochelle Anderholm-Parsch, Parks & Recreation Director
Sarah Richardson, Recreation Manager
Kelly O'Neill, Development Services Director
Emily Meharg, Senior Planner
Joe Preston, Parks Superintendent
Mike Walker, Public Works Director

DESIGN TEAM

Tracy Johnson, PLA, ESA
Derek Sergison, PLA, ESA
David Reese, PLA, ESA
Adrienne DeDona, JLA
Doug Gabbard, FCS

EXHIBIT B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Chapter 1 Introduction	3
1.1 Plan Purpose	3
1.2 Progress Since Previous Master Plan.....	3
1.3 Related Plans.....	4
Chapter 2 Community Profile	7
2.1 Physical Context and Planning Area.....	7
2.2 Demographics.....	9
2.3 Planning Process and Community Engagement	11
Chapter 3 Existing Park System.....	15
3.1 Organization and Partnerships.....	15
3.2 Park Classification and Inventory	16
3.3 Trail System Inventory	24
3.4 Other Providers	27
Chapter 4 Level of Service and Needs Assessment.....	29
4.1 Level of Service	29
4.2 Park and Trail Needs	33
4.3 Recreation Amenity Needs.....	34
4.4 Planning, Operations, and Maintenance Needs.....	36
Chapter 5 Recommendations	37
5.1 General Priorities.....	37
5.2 Park and Open Space Improvements.....	38
5.3 Trail Improvements.....	48
5.4 Planning, Operations, and Maintenance	51
Chapter 6 Implementation.....	53
6.1 Priorities.....	53
6.2 Capital Improvement Plan.....	54
6.3 Financing Strategies.....	56
6.4 Operations and Maintenance	57
6.5 Funding Sources	59

Appendices

- Appendix A – Capital Project List
- Appendix B – Park & Trail Design Guidelines
- Appendix C – Existing Park & Trail Inventory
- Appendix D – Undeveloped Park Concepts
- Appendix E – Potential Grants
- Appendix F – Preliminary Parks System Development Charge Analysis
- Appendix G – Public Outreach Summary

EXHIBIT B

Figures

Figure 1	Vicinity Map.....	7
Figure 2	Planning Area.....	8
Figure 3	Population.....	9
Figure 4	Age Distribution.....	10
Figure 5	Existing Park System.....	17
Figure 6	Existing Trail System.....	25
Figure 7	Park Service Areas.....	31
Figure 8	Proposed Park System.....	39
Figure 9	Bornstedt Park Master Plan.....	41
Figure 10	Champion Way Neighborhood Park Concept.....	44
Figure 11	Deer Point Neighborhood Park Concept.....	45
Figure 12	Ponder Lane Neighborhood Park Concept.....	46
Figure 13	Sandy Community Campus Phase 1 Concept.....	47
Figure 14	Proposed Trail System.....	49
Figure 15	FY 2021-2023 Budget Parks Capital Funding.....	56
Figure 16	Existing Funding Trend.....	58
Figure 17	Maintenance Staff Levels and Facilities Maintained.....	58

Tables

Table 1	Race and Ethnicity.....	10
Table 2	Language.....	11
Table 3	Mini Park Inventory.....	19
Table 4	Neighborhood Park Inventory.....	20
Table 5	Community Park Inventory.....	21
Table 6	Natural Area and Open Space Inventory.....	22
Table 7	Special Use Area Inventory.....	23
Table 8	Trail Inventory.....	24
Table 9	Level of Service Analysis.....	30
Table 10	Park and Trail Needs Analysis.....	33
Table 11	Recreation Facility Level of Service.....	35
Table 12	Tier 1 Capital Improvement Plan.....	55
Table 13	Capital Funding Estimate.....	57
Table 14	Land Acquisition Funding Estimate.....	57

EXHIBIT B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2022 Sandy Parks and Trails Master Plan provides a framework for managing the continuing growth and maintenance of the City's parks and recreation resources through the year 2035. The document is intended to be reviewed and updated regularly in response to plan progress and changing conditions. The plan is a reflection of the community's values and a significant accomplishment made possible by a collaborative effort involving community stakeholders, City Council, the Parks and Trails Advisory Board, the Technical Advisory Committee, and City staff.

The plan is divided into six sections with supporting material included in appendices:

- Chapter 1 describes the purposes of the plan, reports progress made since the prior plan, and identifies related planning documents that have bearing on Sandy's parks and trails system.
- Chapter 2 characterizes the physical and demographic context of the planning area and summarizes public outreach efforts.
- Chapter 3 outlines the park system's organization, classifies and inventories park and trail assets, and briefly discusses other regional recreation providers.
- Chapter 4 explains the concept of level of service and uses it to identify needs in the existing park and trail resources and set goals for future acquisition, development, operations, and maintenance growth.
- Chapter 5 provides recommendations for general priorities and improvements to existing parks, concepts for existing undeveloped parks and trails, and guidance on potential funding and operations changes.
- Chapter 6 identifies strategies to implement and fund the recommended improvements and includes near term capital improvements projects.
- The Appendices contain full capital project lists, design guidelines, existing park and trail inventories, additional context for the undeveloped park concepts in Chapter 5, and a full description of public outreach during the planning process.

Unlike land-constrained Portland and its suburbs, the City of Sandy is largely surrounded by tracts of natural, low density residential, and agricultural lands. The availability of undeveloped land presents an opportunity for the parks and trails system to be extensive, well connected, and high quality. On the other hand, Sandy is one of the fastest growing communities in Oregon and faces consistent pressure to develop land for residential use. The City must be strategic and forward looking to preserve the unique character and charm of beloved assets like Meinig Memorial Park, the Tickle Creek Trail, and Jonsrud Viewpoint, while continuing to develop a diverse, accessible system that serves all community members.

Future parks will be designed to incorporate amenities, features, and practices which prioritize a diverse, inclusive, accessible, and sustainable park system that incorporates public art where possible.

This page intentionally left blank

DRAFT

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The City of Sandy, Oregon, is located approximately halfway between the state's largest population center, Portland, and its highest mountain, Mt. Hood. The City is adjacent to its namesake, the Sandy River and surrounded by mountains, forests, streams and rolling foothills. The scenic nature of Sandy's setting makes it an attractive bedroom community to the Portland-metro area. It also serves as the first full service city for those headed west from Mt. Hood.

1.1 PLAN PURPOSE

This update to the 1997 City of Sandy Parks Master Plan was undertaken to address the City's steady population growth, recent expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and completion of most of the projects identified in the 1997 Plan. The update sets the year 2035 as the target planning horizon. The general purpose for the amendment is to:

- Update the previous plan to reflect current parks and trails system conditions
- Identify the type and geographic distribution of proposed new parks and trails to meet the needs of continued population expansion
- Recommend improvements to existing parks to repair or replace older features to reduce maintenance costs and improve user experiences
- Recommend funding strategies for future park and trail projects
- Update the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to help guide priorities over the 15 year planning period.

1.2 PROGRESS SINCE PREVIOUS MASTER PLAN

When Sandy adopted its first Parks Master Plan in 1997, the parks system was limited to a handful of parks and undeveloped parcels and relied heavily on school, church, and regional park facilities to serve the community. To meet growing demand, the City initiated the planning process by inventorying existing facilities, assessing recreational needs, and crafting recommendations for park development. Current and projected demographics and public engagement efforts informed recommendations which highlighted the following goals:

- Upgrade existing park facilities
- Acquire land for future parks, especially larger tracts, to meet community park needs
- Adjust system development charges to provide funding for future park development
- Develop new pedestrian and bicycle trails and provide connections between parks

- Develop new parks alongside residential and commercial development to ensure equitable access to parks and trails for a growing population

The 1997 Plan also prioritized athletic fields, indoor or covered facilities, sport courts, and the preservation of open space and natural areas. The community expressed interest in developing a cooperative partnership between Sandy and the Oregon Trail School District for joint use, maintenance, and funding of facilities.

Since the adoption of the 1997 Plan, Sandy's population has more than doubled and many of the Plan's goals have been achieved:

- Meinig Memorial Park facilities were upgraded
- The City added 5 mini parks, 6 neighborhood parks, a community park, an urban plaza, a skate park, and over 200 acres of natural and open space
- System development charges were established and have been used as a steady source of funding to develop and improve park and trail facilities
- Nearly two miles of the Tickle Creek Trail has been completed
- Park land is acquired via dedication or purchased using fee in lieu of land payments as a condition of development. Fee in lieu and System Development Charge (SDC) money is combined with grants, partnerships, and volunteer labor to acquire land and develop parks to support new residential development.



Basketball Court at Timberline Park

1.3 RELATED PLANS

Sandy Comprehensive Land Use Plan

The Sandy Comprehensive Land Use Plan is the guiding document for all planning and development efforts in the city. Goal 8 of the Plan directs the City to maintain, preserve, enhance, and reinforce its desirable and distinctive characteristics and those of its individual neighborhoods by providing parks and open space for each neighborhood. The Plan outlines policies and goals to guide park planning efforts. These include:

- Ensure new residential development contributes equitably to park land acquisition, development, and maintenance.
- Establish methods to maintain and enhance the quality and quantity of parks, open space, and recreational facilities and services. Ensure that these facilities and services serve the diverse recreational needs and interests of area residents and are accessible to all members of the community.

- Establish viewpoints for natural vistas and protect natural resources.
- Establish user fees for recreation uses and facility reservations.
- Use improvement funds such as transportation SDC's for sidewalk projects and bicycle facilities that implement elements of the Transportation System Plan.

The Plan also identifies the need to:

- Develop a Parks Master Plan outlining park locations, recreational facilities, and services.
- Develop a parks system that provides both active recreation and exercise and passive enjoyment of the outdoors.
- Locate parks near schools and cooperate with the school district on joint recreational facilities.



Trail at Sandy River Park

The Plan outlines funding policies to use system development charges, bonds, grants, and donations for new parks, open space and facilities. It calls for recreation user fees for recreation uses and facility reservations. The Plan calls for the City to consider the dedication of a portion of road construction and improvement funds for sidewalk projects and bicycle facilities and highlights the need for park maintenance volunteers.

Recommended changes to Goal 8 of the Comprehensive Plan are proposed in Chapter 5 of this report. Sandy will be embarking on a Comprehensive Plan update in 2021, with adoption anticipated in 2023.

Sandy Transportation System Plan

The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) serves as the foundation for the construction of arterial and collector streets, helps shape the future development of Sandy, and serves as a valuable resource for staff, policy makers, and the public.

The current plan was adopted in 2011. The Bicycle and Pedestrian components of the plan are currently in the process of being updated with expected adoption in 2022. The update will identify strategies to improve mobility throughout Sandy by addressing bike and pedestrian needs, connectivity, increased traffic volumes, funding opportunities, street design, development conditions, and user preferences. Elements of the current (2011) plan that serve both recreation and transportation needs have been incorporated into this plan, including access way / trails that are not associated with roadway projects, and a proposed pedestrian over crossing of Highway 211.

Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan


The Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) identifies current trends in recreation participation and demand and key planning issues facing communities, and provides state and local recommendations to address these issues. The 2019–2023 SCORP identified five important demographic and societal changes facing outdoor recreation providers in the coming years, including an aging population, an increasingly diverse population, lack of youth engagement in outdoor recreation, an underserved low-income population, and the health benefits of physical activity.

The 2019-2023 SCORP identified Sandy's UGB as a high priority area for families with children and middle old populations (75-84 years). As a high-priority city, Sandy is eligible for potential ranking prioritization when applying for Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) grants.

Individual Park Master Plans

The City of Sandy has completed master plans for a number of parks in the system over the past decade. Elements or initial phases of these plans have been implemented, with future phases remaining incomplete. Those master plans supplemented these planning efforts and are included to identify planned improvements, community needs, and estimated costs. Reference master plans include:

- Bornstedt Park Master Plan
- Sandy River Park Master Plan



CHAPTER 2

Community Profile

The City of Sandy's parks and recreation facilities serve a population that is 2-3 times larger than the 12,612 people within City limits. These areas include residents of the villages of Mt. Hood, Boring, Eagle Creek and Estacada. Sandy manages lands within City limits, while Clackamas County manages lands within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and Urban Growth Reserve (UGR). The Sandy UGB expanded in 2017 and 2020.

2.1 PHYSICAL CONTEXT AND PLANNING AREA

Regional Location

Sandy is separated from surrounding cities and towns by rural reserves. The areas of Clackamas County to the east of Sandy are unincorporated small villages: Alder Creek, Brightwood, Wemme, Welches, Zigzag, Rhododendron and Government Camp. These villages are surrounded by the Mt. Hood National Forest and Bureau of Land Management lands, which offer more than a million forested acres providing a wide range of recreational opportunities. Residents in these villages come to Sandy, to meet many of their shopping and personal needs. The larger towns south and west of Sandy including Boring, Eagle Creek and Estacada, are composed of some denser residential areas and large areas of farm and agricultural nursery lands interspersed with large home lots. Farther west, towards Gresham, the nursery land transitions to a more populated and urban setting.




Figure 1 Vicinity Map

Planning Area

The planning area for Sandy's Parks and Trails Master Plan Amendment is defined as the City's Urban Growth Reserve (UGR), with an emphasis on the areas within the recently expanded urban growth boundary (UGB). The undeveloped areas within the UGB and UGR, but outside the City limits, are currently under the planning jurisdiction and policies of Clackamas County until they are annexed into the City.

Sandy is bisected by two state highways that act as significant physical barriers to community connectivity: Highway 26 provides access from Portland and Gresham to the Mt. Hood National Forest. State Highway 211 begins at an intersection with Highway 26 in Sandy and heads south to Estacada, Molalla and beyond.




Figure 2 Planning Area

Climate and Surroundings

Sandy's climate is fairly mild with wet winters and occasional wind storms, especially east winds along Bluff Road. Temperatures average in the mid 40's in winter and in the mid 60's in summer. Annual rainfall averages over 75 inches.

Land cover of non-urbanized areas within the planning area consists of a mixture of open agricultural fields (berry fields and nursery stock), small patches of forests, and large lots with single family homes. Forest lands are a mixture of hardwoods (alder, big leaf maples, and vine maples) and conifers (Douglas fir, western hemlock and western red cedar). There are numerous small creeks draining to Tickle Creek, Sandy River, and Deep Creek which support salmon runs. Wildlife is abundant in and around Sandy with signs and sightings of raccoons, possum, coyotes, bear, cougars, bobcats, bald eagles, osprey and a variety of birds.

Topography is the most limiting factor for development in Sandy. The north edge of town is defined by the Sandy River canyon and a precipitous drop of nearly 600 feet of elevation. The City sits at 1,000 feet above sea level and elevations generally rise as you head east towards Mt. Hood. Drainages increase south of Sandy and generally flow to the Clackamas River.

2.2 DEMOGRAPHICS

In 2020, there were nearly 4,700 estimated households in Sandy with an average size of 2.77 people. Of those households, 40% had children under the age of 18, and one third included someone over the age of 60. Sandy uses federal census data and population studies conducted by Portland State University.

Population and Age

Sandy’s population grew steadily over the previous decades and is expected to continue this trend through 2035.

Population Growth				
Year	2000	2010	2020	Projected 2035
Population	5,361	9,570	12,612	19,100
Percent Change		79%	32%	51%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Metro, Clackamas County, and Portland State University





Figure 3 Population



The general age group composition remained relatively consistent between 2000 and 2018. Although adults over the age of 55 comprise a smaller percentage of the total population, the older age groups are exhibiting a growing trend which aligns with statewide and national trends. The percentage of adults over age 55 increased from 16% to 22% of the total population.



Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Portland State University

Figure 4 Age Distribution

Race, Ethnicity, and Language

While Sandy remains predominantly white, diversity has been steadily increasing since 2000. The portion of Sandy’s population identifying as Hispanic or Latino increased five-fold since the last parks planning effort. Steady growth of this demographic is expected to continue.

TABLE 1
RACE AND ETHNICITY

Race and Ethnicity		
	2010	2020
White alone	90%	84%
Black or African American alone	0.9%	1.5%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	2.5%	4.1%
Asian alone	2.3%	2.8%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0.6%	0.6%
Some Other Race alone	3.8%	6.6%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	8.9%	10%
Not Hispanic or Latino	87.5%	90%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

An estimated 10% of Sandy’s population speaks a language other than English, and an estimated 97% of the population speaks English only or speaks English “very well.”

**TABLE 2
LANGUAGE**

Language	
Speak only English	90%
Speak a language other than English	10%
Spanish	5.5%
Other Indo-European languages	4.1%
Asian and Pacific Island languages	0.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Income and Employment

In 2018, an estimated 2% of the Sandy labor force was unemployed. Median household income was consistent with state-wide estimates at \$64,296.

An estimated 11% of Sandy residents’ income was below poverty level with those under the age of 18 contributing a higher rate (around 16%) and those over 18 a slightly lower rate (around 9%).

2.3 PLANNING PROCESS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Planning for the update of the 1997 Parks Master Plan has been ongoing for a number of years. A variety of surveys and other community outreach has been conducted both prior to and through the current Parks and Trails Master Plan update process to insure that the final master plan is in line with community needs and desires. A summary of the types of outreach and input received is included below. A more detailed public engagement summary can be found in Appendix F.

Prior Surveys

2013 Community Needs and Perceptions Survey

In 2013, the City issued an online Parks and Trails Survey to City residents with more than 600 surveys returned. Nearly 97% of the respondents had visited a park within the last year with Meinig Park, Tickle Creek Trail, and Jonsrud Viewpoint being the most popular destinations.

One third of survey respondents said they visited a park daily, another 25% visited weekly or bi-weekly, and another third visited a city park at least monthly. Nearly 90% felt that the city parks were in good or excellent condition.

When asked about park types and park features needed in Sandy, the most common responses included restrooms, picnic facilities and off-leash dog parks. Sandy has since added one dog park, but interest in additional dog parks remains high and users desire more amenities at existing facilities.

Most residents felt that park funds should be allocated to maintain existing facilities and construct new facilities on existing park land rather than be used to purchase additional land for parks and trails.

2018 Longest Day Parkway

In 2018, City staff had a booth at the Longest Day Parkway event held in June to reconnect with the public and gather updated information regarding needs and preferences. The event included a series of display boards with a dot-voting exercise and a one-page questionnaire, which was a streamlined version of the 2013 survey. The responses to the questionnaire were fairly similar to the 2013 survey, with the top parks and park features closely aligned. Notably, the number of respondents that visited parks up to twice a month was substantially higher at 84% of Longest Day Parkway attendees, over 61% of survey participants. This could be in part due to the population likely to participate in this type of event. In the dot exercise, spraygrounds, obstacle courses, and natural play equipment were the top choices across age groups. Kids indicated a preference for an updated skatepark, and trails and natural space, while adults preferred trails and natural space, and sports fields and courts to round out their top five priorities. The survey participants included 44 adults and 107 children

2019 Community Survey

In 2019, the City conducted a Parks and Recreation Survey to City residents. Over 5,000 copies were mailed to residents and an online option was also available. More than 1,200 responses were received, 12% online and 88% by mail. The primary purpose of the survey was to solicit feedback from the community on how to use manage the old Cedar Ridge Middle School, pool and grounds which had been recently acquired by the City. Nearly 75% of respondents supported expanding or renovating the existing pool. The survey also asked for preferences for which amenities to include within the park. Top priorities included paths or trails to the river, playground, outdoor sports fields, and dog park.

Other Surveys

In addition to the surveys noted above, Sandy has conducted several surveys to garner input on potential redevelopment of the former Cedar Ridge Middle School and Olin Bignall Aquatic Center complex, also known as the Sandy Community Campus. Specifically, a survey was conducted in 2014 to gauge interest on the City acquisition of the School District facility. More than half of respondents felt that continued operation of the pool was very important and supported a potential monthly fee to help fund it. In 2020, a survey was conducted to investigate the potential of pursuing an Aquatic and Recreation Fee District to help fund pool renovations, operations and maintenance costs. Initial response included

46% “No”, 43% “Yes”, and 11% “Don’t know”. The formation of a recreation district would require passage by voters, and the analysis of the survey results indicated that the Aquatics & Recreation District formation was not likely to pass.

2020 Parks & Trails Master Plan


The City of Sandy began the Master Plan update with an inventory of existing parks. Parks maintenance staff conducted and documented routine facility condition inventories and identified deferred maintenance needs. Staff reviewed updates to the Transportation Plan, participated in the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) planning process, and reviewed updates to national park land standards.

The City conducted a series of stakeholder meetings, technical advisory committee meetings, open houses, and online surveys to collect data on existing park use patterns, desires and priorities. The Parks Board worked with City planners to review population projections and potential City boundary adjustments that would influence future park locations. The Board developed a preliminary needs assessment based on the findings.

The City reviewed the current development code’s role in parks and trails development and noted opportunities for system expansion.

Technical Advisory Committee

The city formed a technical advisory committee to guide and inform the PTSMP update. The committee was composed of one City Councilor, two Park and Trail Advisory Board members, two City staff, one School District representative, and several local community representatives. The technical advisory committee met six times during the course of the project to review public input, comment on draft maps and reports, and review the proposed master plan.



Stakeholder interviews

A series of stakeholder meetings were conducted to collect input from key user groups within the community. Twelve stakeholders were interviewed to inform the PTSMP update. They represented a diverse array of community groups, residents, and special interests. Key topics included special recreational amenities (skate parks, pump tracks, dog parks, community gardens), sports fields, maintenance and operations, accessibility and universal design, the trail system, and balanced distribution of parks and amenities.

Public Open Houses

Several public open houses were held over the course of the project. The first open house was held at the Sandy Community/Senior Center and was intended to gather input on park distribution, needs and desired park amenities. A questionnaire and comment form was collected at the meeting. The second open house was held at the Sandy Vista Apartments Community room. The meeting included the maps and posters from the first open house, translated into Spanish, as well as a translated questionnaire. The second open house featured bi-lingual staff who were able to present materials and answer questions in both English and Spanish. The third open house was held online due to the ongoing public health crisis. The online open house featured a number of stations with survey questions related to the materials embedded at each station. The online open house materials were translated into a Spanish language flyer and distributed at Sandy Vista Apartments as a follow up to the second open house.



CHAPTER 3

Existing Park System

Sandy is among the fastest growing cities in Oregon. To plan a parks system that will adequately serve its future population, the City must first assess its current condition. Department structure, community partnerships, funding sources, and the park facilities themselves all contribute to the success of the system in meeting anticipated growth.

3.1 ORGANIZATION AND PARTNERSHIPS

Organization

The Parks, Buildings, & Grounds Department program maintains and makes minor improvements to the city's parks, open spaces, public spaces, and public buildings. These activities are funded primarily out of the General Fund.

- **Staff and Roles** - Sandy's parks, grounds, trails, and open spaces are maintained by three full-time employees and a seasonal worker employed during the summer months. Parks maintenance staff also perform minor building maintenance for some City facilities. Local landscaping firms are contracted to maintain landscaping at the library, police building, community center, and two landscape island at either end of downtown.
- **Policy and Planning** - Policy for Sandy's parks system is created by the City Council with assistance from a seven-person citizen advisory board. One City Council member is assigned as a liaison between the Parks & Trails Advisory Board and the Sandy City Council. The Parks & Trails Advisory Board is a volunteer board that supports planning and advocacy for the parks system and assists with park improvement projects.

Partnerships

- **Oregon Trail School District (OTSD)** – The City occasionally provides funding for sports fields and court improvements, and the district rents out facilities for youth and adult recreation sport leagues, summer camps, parades, pet shows, and other community events.
- **AntFarm** - AntFarm is a non-profit dedicated to serving community youth including job and environmental skills training through hands-on volunteer work. The City partnered with AntFarm and its YouthCore Crew to construct trails at Sandy River Park and a community garden at Bornstedt Park.
- **Mt Hood Athletic Club** - The City occasionally partners with the Mt. Hood Athletic Club for special events including fun runs and senior activities.
- **Non-profits and For-profits** - The City is finalizing a permit process that includes an application, fee structure, insurance requirements, and permits to formalize the increasing use of City parks and trails for fundraisers and other events.

- **Volunteers** - Sandy has a long history of parks related volunteerism, including a 100-person effort to construct the Fantasy Forest Playground in Meinig Park, fundraising for dog parks and other improvements, and service day outings such as Solv-it in Sandy. However, there is no coordinated parks and trails volunteer organization to provide consistent operations and maintenance assistance.



Fantasy Forest playground at Meinig Park

3.2 PARK CLASSIFICATION AND INVENTORY


Sandy classifies its park facilities according to the Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) developed by Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD). According to this plan,

“The most effective park system to develop and manage is one made up of a variety of different types of parks, open space areas, and recreational venues, each designed to provide a specific type of recreation experience or opportunity. A park system that is classified and used properly is easier to maintain, encounters less conflicts between user groups, and minimizes negative impacts on adjoining neighbors. A good park classification system also helps assess what facilities are available for current use and what types of parks will be needed to serve the community in the future.”

The prior Park Master plan defined nine park and trail classifications, a number of which were owned and/or operated by other regional providers. Under the Parks and Trails Master Plan update, the park classifications were reviewed and streamlined to focus efforts on the key types of parks that the City currently has in its inventory, and the classifications that are likely to be the most beneficial to the community moving forward. The park system has been reorganized to include five primary classifications to meet the needs of the community:

- Mini parks,
- Neighborhood parks,
- Community parks,
- Natural areas and open space,
- Special use areas.

EXHIBIT B



Esri, NASA, NGA, USGS, FEMA; USFWS NWI, Open Street Map, City of Sandy, OR.



Map 5
Existing Park Inventory



EXHIBIT B

DRAFT

[This page intentionally left blank]

The following classifications were developed from the SCORP guidelines and selected as most applicable to Sandy’s park system. Each existing park was inventoried for total land area, area developed, and current amenities.

Mini Parks

Mini parks, sometimes called pocket parks, are the smallest park classification. Mini parks provide basic recreation opportunities on small lots, within residential areas serving an area within approximately 5-minute walking time (approximately ¼ mile) from neighbors. Typically less than one acre in size (¼ to ¾ acre), these parks are designed to serve residents in immediately adjacent neighborhoods. Mini parks provide limited recreation amenities, such as small playgrounds, benches, picnic tables, and accessible paths, and normally do not provide off-street parking. Mini parks should be used sparingly, primarily to fill service area gaps in developed neighborhoods, due to their high maintenance demand and limited service area. Sandy currently has six mini parks, all of which are developed.



Timberline Ridge Mini Park

**TABLE 3
MINI PARK INVENTORY**

MINI PARKS			Existing Amenities																					
Park Name	Total Acres	Developed Acres	Restroom	Drinking Fountain	Playground	Splash Pad	Picnic Shelter	Group Shelter	Picnic Tables	Stage / Amphitheater	Community Garden	Open Field	Baseball Field	Soccer Field	Skate-park	Sport Court	Parking	Benches	Dog Park Fenced	Dog Waste Station	Hiking / Walking Path	Bike Trails	Interpretive Area	Trail Signage
Barlow Ridge Park	0.81	0.81		✓	✓				✓							✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	
Cascadia Park Tot Lot	0.04	0.04			✓				✓											✓				
Hamilton Ridge Park	0.78	0.78		✓	✓				✓			✓					✓		✓	✓				
Knollwood Park Tot Lot	0.60	0.60			✓												✓		✓	✓	✓			✓
Salmon Estates Park	0.77	0.77			✓							✓					✓		✓	✓				
Timberline Ridge Park	0.87	0.87	✓	✓					✓							✓	✓		✓	✓				
Total	3.87	3.87																						

EXHIBIT B

Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks provide close-to-home recreation opportunities, primarily for passive and non-organized recreation activities. They are located within approximately 5-10 minute walking time (approximately ¼ - ½ mile) from local residences, without crossing major roads and/or other structures that can be considered barriers for safe and easy walking and biking. They serve up to a one-half-mile radius, although service areas are also influenced by neighborhood configuration, geographical and transportation barriers, and are generally 2-5 acres in size. Neighborhood parks typically include amenities such as playgrounds, outdoor sports courts, sports fields, picnic tables, pathways, and multi-use open grass areas. They may or may not provide off-street parking. Neighborhood parks can, when practical, be located next to elementary schools in order to provide more efficient use of public resources. Neighborhood parks should avoid inclusion of amenities that could be a draw to people travelling from further distances, such as dog parks, skate parks, and splash pads, unless appropriate support facilities such as restrooms and parking are also provided. Sandy currently has seven neighborhood parks, with four developed parks and three undeveloped parcels.



Deer Point Neighborhood Park

**TABLE 4
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK INVENTORY**

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS			Existing Amenities																					
Park Name	Total Acres	Developed Acres	Restroom	Drinking Fountain	Playground	Splash Pad	Picnic Shelter	Group Shelter	Picnic Tables	Stage / Amphitheater	Community Garden	Open Field	Baseball Field	Soccer Field	Skate-park	Sport Court	Parking	Benches	Dog Park Fenced	Dog Waste Station	Hiking / Walking Path	Bike Trails	Interpretive Area	Trail Signage
Bornstedt Park	5.03	5.03	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓					
Cascadia Park	1.83	1.83	✓				✓	✓				✓						✓	✓	✓				
Champion Way Park	0.99	0.00																						
Deer Point Park	1.41	0.00										✓						✓	✓	✓				
Ponder Lane	2.00	0.00																						
Sandy Bluff Park	8.37	8.37	✓	✓								✓						✓	✓	✓	✓			
Tupper Park	1.66	1.66	✓	✓					✓		✓					✓		✓	✓					
Total	21.29	16.89																						

Community Parks



Stage at Meinig Community Park

Community parks are typically larger in size and serve a broader purpose than neighborhood parks. Their focus is on meeting the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or large sections of the community, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces.

Community parks are typically 10 to 30 acres, depending on the spatial requirements of the facilities provided and the amount of land dedicated to natural resource protection. Community

parks provide both active and passive recreation opportunities that appeal to the entire community serving an area within approximately 15 minutes driving time or three miles. While community parks may be proximate to a neighborhood and can provide typical neighborhood park amenities, they are normally designed to be driven to. Community parks typically accommodate large numbers of people, and offer a wide variety of facilities, such as group picnic areas and large shelters, sports fields and courts, large children’s play areas, swimming pools and splash pads, community gardens, extensive pathway systems, community festival or event space, and green space or natural areas. Community parks require additional support facilities, such as off-street parking and restrooms and can also serve as regional trailheads. Sandy currently has two community parks, one of which, Meinig Park, is developed. Sandy Community Campus includes a few amenities such as fields that are left over from its prior role as a school campus, and it houses the Sandy Skate Park but it is primarily undeveloped. Both parks are at the small end of the potential size range which limits the quantity and size of amenities they can accommodate.

**TABLE 5
COMMUNITY PARK INVENTORY**

COMMUNITY PARKS			Existing Amenities																					
Park Name	Total Acres	Developed Acres	Restroom	Drinking Fountain	Playground	Splash Pad	Picnic Shelter	Group Shelter	Picnic Tables	Stage / Amphitheater	Community Garden	Open Field	Baseball Field ¹	Soccer Field	Skate-park	Sport Court	Parking	Benches	Dog Park Fenced	Dog Waste Station	Hiking / Walking Path	Bike Trails	Interpretive Area	Trail Signage
Sandy Community Campus & Skate Park	14.00	0.25										✓	✓ ¹	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓			
Meinig Memorial Park	10.82	10.82	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓		✓	✓			
Total	24.82	11.07																						

¹ Field is unmaintained and in poor condition

EXHIBIT B

Natural and Open Space

Natural areas are lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, remnant landscapes, open space, and for visual aesthetics/ buffering. They may preserve or protect environmentally sensitive areas, such as wildlife habitats, wetlands, riparian corridors, or unique and/or endangered plant species. Natural areas can vary in size from small parcels (less than 10 acres) to large properties of more than 100 acres, and typically serve the entire community. Public access to natural areas may be limited due to the sensitive nature of the habitats and features. Some nature parks may be managed secondarily to provide passive recreation opportunities. These sites may contain trails, interpretive displays, viewpoints, picnic and seating areas. Sandy currently has six natural areas, four of which include trails and other light passive use. Natural area acreage is not considered developed at the same level as other park classifications, but may include developed areas such as trails and trailheads.



**TABLE 6
NATURAL AREA AND OPEN SPACE INVENTORY**

NATURAL & OPEN SPACE			Existing Amenities																					
Park Name	Total Acres	Developed Acres ¹	Restroom	Drinking Fountain	Playground	Splash Pad	Picnic Shelter	Group Shelter	Picnic Tables	Stage / Amphitheater	Community Garden	Open Field	Baseball Field	Soccer Field	Skate-park	Sport Court	Parking	Benches	Dog Park Fenced	Dog Waste Station	Hiking / Walking Path	Bike Trails	Interpretive Area	Trail Signage
Knollwood Park	5.45	NA																✓		✓	✓	✓		
Sandy River Park	116.28	NA															✓				✓	✓		
Sandy River Park Addition	24.16	NA																			✓	✓		
Sandy Community Campus	7.10	NA																						
Tickle Creek Park	4.92	NA																			✓	✓		
Tickle Creek Open Space Parcels	66.73	NA																						
Total	224.64	NA																						

¹ Natural areas are generally not considered developed at the level of other park types

Special Use Areas



Centennial Plaza

The Special Use classification covers a broad range of park and recreation lands that are specialized or single-purpose in nature. Parks in this category can include waterfront parks, boat ramps, memorials, historic sites, waysides, sites with significant geologic or scenic features, and single purpose such as dedicated sports complexes, dog parks, skate parks, display gardens. Special use parks that have a community or regional draw may


require supporting facilities such as parking or restrooms. Park size is dependent on the special use and can vary from very small to many acres. Sandy currently has four special use areas.

**TABLE 7
SPECIAL USE AREA INVENTORY**

SPECIAL USE AREAS			Existing Amenities																					
Park Name	Total Acres	Developed Acres	Restroom	Drinking Fountain	Playground	Splash Pad	Picnic Shelter	Group Shelter	Picnic Tables	Stage / Amphitheater	Community Garden	Open Field	Baseball Field	Soccer Field	Skate-park	Sport Court	Parking	Benches	Dog Park Fenced	Dog Waste Station	Hiking / Walking Path	Bike Trails	Interpretive Area	Trail Signage
Jonsrud Viewpoint	4.91	0.80	✓														✓	✓					✓	
Centennial Plaza	0.22	0.22	✓	✓			✓			✓														
Community / Senior Center	0.10	0.10	✓	✓													✓							
Veterans Memorial Square	0.04	0.04	✓																				✓	
Total	5.27	1.16																						

3.3 TRAIL SYSTEM INVENTORY

Trails



Bridge on the Tickle Creek Trail

The trail classification encompasses a number of trail types including shared-use and pedestrian, hard and soft surface trails and paths to accommodate a variety of activities such as walking, running, biking, dog walking, rollerblading, skateboarding, and horseback riding. Trails may be located within parks or along existing streets and roadways and can serve as part of the bicycle and pedestrian components of the City transportation system. Shared-use trails are designed for use by pedestrians, bicyclists, skateboarders, wheelchairs, and other non-motorized vehicles. These trails are usually hard surfaced to provide accessibility for people with disabilities and wide enough to accommodate both bicyclists and pedestrians. Hard surfaced pedestrian trails are generally found within

smaller parks and as secondary trails within larger parks. Soft surfaced trails are composed of soft-surface materials, such as soil, crushed rock, hog fuel, and wood chips. Most soft surfaces do not provide accessibility for people with disabilities but are preferable for some recreation activities, such as running and hiking. Trails may include amenities such as directional and control signage, gates, benches, overlooks, drinking fountains, lighting, trailhead kiosks, and interpretive signs.

**TABLE 8
TRAIL INVENTORY**

TRAILS & PATHS WITHIN PARKS

Park Name	Miles of Path / Trail
Sandy River Park	3.85
Sandy Bluff Park	0.70
Cascadia Park	0.16
Timberline Park	0.06
Meinig Park	0.50
Salmon Estates Park	0.07
Barlow Ridge Park	0.21
Hamilton Ridge Park	0.21
Total	5.76


TRAILS & PATHS OUTSIDE PARKS

Associated Feature	Miles of Path / Trail
Tickle Creek	2.10
Sandy High School ¹	0.53
Neighborhood Paths	1.05
Kate Schmidt Trail	0.14
Total	3.82

¹High School trail includes restricted access nature trail not always available for public use.

²Trail outside of parks have been converted from miles to acreage for level of service (LOS) in Table 9, based on an assumed 15-foot trail corridor width. Trails within parks are included in park LOS.

EXHIBIT B



Keynote	Trail Name	Feet	Miles	Keynote	Trail Name	Feet	Miles
E01	Sandy River Midway Trail	732	0.14	E35	Meinig Park Access Kimberly Drive	114	0.02
E02	Ten Eyk Road to Hood Street	169	0.03	E36	Mitchell Court to Davis Street	224	0.04
E02B	Hood Street Connection	97	0.02	E37	Barker Court to Langensand Road	170	0.03
E03	Upper Sandy River Trail	4,011	0.76	E38	Langensand Road to Antler Avenue	751	0.14
E04	Lower Sandy River Trail	1,685	0.32	E39	City Hall to Lower Parking	1,020	0.19
E05	Marcy Street Connector to Sandy River Park Trail	627	0.12	E40	Bathroom Path	429	0.08
E06	Final Jim Slagle Loop Trail	4,995	0.95	E41	Lower Parking to Amphitheater	429	0.08
E07	Jim Slagle Loop Featured Hike	8,129	1.54	E42	Fantasy Forest to Lower Parking	291	0.06
E08	Bachelor Avenue to Golden Rain Street	256	0.05	E43	Bridge Path	156	0.03
E09	Sandy Bluff Park North Sidewalk	1,030	0.2	E44	Ichabod to Katrina	208	0.04
E10	Sandy Bluff Park Pod 4	661	0.13	E45	Sandy Heights Street Seaman Avenue to Beebee Court	164	0.03
E11	Sandy Bluff Park Pod 3	512	0.1	E46	Solso Path	670	0.13
E12	Sandy Bluff Park Pod 2	412	0.08	E47	Salmon Creek Estates Park Entrance	86	0.02
E13	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Connector	66	0.01	E48	Barlow Ridge Trail	307	0.06
E14	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Park West	207	0.04	E49	Barlow Ridge Trail 2	616	0.12
E15	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Park North	270	0.05	E50	Barlow Ridge Trail 3	164	0.03
E16	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Park South	285	0.05	E51	Hamilton Ridge Paths	329	0.06
E17	Kate Schmidt Trail Section	761	0.14	E52	Tickle Creek Trail	8,481	1.61
E18	Golden Rain Street to Olson Street	93	0.02	E53	Salmon Creek Estates Trail	275	0.05
E19	Green Mountain Street to Golden Rain Street	195	0.04	E54	Bruns Road to Tupper Road Connector Trail	457	0.09
E20	Emerald Cascade Street to Green Mountain Street	204	0.04	E55	Hamilton Ridge Tot Lot	124	0.02
E21	Coralburst Street to Emerald Cascade Street	203	0.04	E56	Off Road Trail Hamilton Tot Lot	333	0.06
E22	Coralburst Street to Bell Street	111	0.02	E57	Tickle Creek Trail Entrance by Orr Street	123	0.02
E23	Sandy HS Edge Trail (SHS Owned, Restricted Access)	1,992	0.38	E58	Tickle Creek Trail Entrance near Double Creek	147	0.03
E24	Cascadia Village Park Trail	836	0.16	E59	Sandy Heights Street to Hamilton Ridge Drive	334	0.06
E25	Wall Street Alley Trillium Street to Langensand Road	1,363	0.26	E60	Towle Drive to Dubarko Path	319	0.06
E26	Wall St Alley to Jacoby Road	949	0.18	E61	Rachel Drive to Tickle Creek Trail	363	0.07
E27	Timberline Park Path	324	0.06	E62	Sawyer Street to Highway 211	54	0.01
E28	Bornstedt Road Entrance	356	0.07	E63	Hamilton Ridge Drive to Dubarko Road	793	0.15
E29	Cascadia Village Drive to Redwood Street	200	0.04	E64	Barlow Parkway to Dubarko Road	281	0.05
E30	Galway Street to Highway 211	90	0.02	E65	Barlow Parkway to Highway 211	93	0.02
E31	Haskins Street to Jerger Street	181	0.03	E66	Miller Street to Seaman Avenue	104	0.02
E32	Meinig Park Access McCormick Drive	79	0.01	E67	Miller Street to Dubarko Road	111	0.02
E33	Meinig Park Barker Court Access	143	0.03	E68	Miller Street to Barlow Parkway	149	0.03
E34	Dubarko Estates to Evans Street Path	373	0.07	E69	Crosswalk Ruben Lane near Freightway Lane	67	0.01

Path: U:\GIS\GISProjects\19xxxx\1906682_Sandy_PSMIP\03_MXD\03_Projects\Sandy_PSMIP\Sandy_PSMIP_Report_Figs.aprx_D:\holstad_3/17/2022

Esri, NASA, NGA, USGS, FEMA; USFWS NWI, Open Street Map, City of Sandy, OR.



EXHIBIT B

DRAFT

[This page intentionally left blank]

3.4 OTHER PROVIDERS

Below are some significant parks and natural areas managed by other providers within a ten-mile radius of Sandy.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

- **Sandy Ridge Trail System** – 15+ miles of single track mountain biking trails approximately 10 miles east of Sandy.

Oregon Parks and Recreation District (OPRD)

- **Milo McIver State Park** – 2,000-acre park with developed campgrounds, river recreation and fishing access, hiking and equestrian trails, and disc golf. Situated along the Clackamas River near Estacada.
- **Bonnie Lure State Recreation Area** – 150-acre passive day use nature park along the Clackamas River near Eagle Creek.

METRO

- **Oxbow Regional Park** – 2,000-acre park with developed campgrounds, river recreation and fishing access, hiking and biking trails, playgrounds, and wildlife viewing. Situated along the Sandy River east of Gresham.

Clackamas County Parks

- **Boring Station Trailhead** – Transition point between the Springwater Corridor and the Cazadero Trail. Small park in Boring with playground, restroom, picnic shelter.
- **Eagle Fern Park** – 360-acre day-use park with hiking, creek access, fishing, and picnic shelters.



Barlow Wayside Trail – Clackamas County Parks

- **Barton Park** – 300-acre park with developed campgrounds, hiking, multiple day use and event amenities, and a variety of river recreation opportunities. Situated along the Clackamas River.
- **Barlow Wayside Park** – 180-acre passive day use nature park with trails near the Sandy River and BLM Sandy Ridge Trail System

Portland Water Bureau

- **Dodge Park** – Day use river recreation, fishing, playground, and picnic facilities situated along the Sandy River north of Sandy.

This page intentionally left blank

DRAFT

CHAPTER 4

Level of Service and Needs Assessment

The needs assessment provides the information necessary to make informed decisions on how many parks, trails, and facilities to provide in Sandy now and in the future. The community needs identified will be used as a basis for determining recommendations for system-wide improvements, including acquiring or developing new park sites and improving existing parks.

4.1 LEVEL OF SERVICE

The Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan defines level of service standards as “measures of the amount of public recreation parklands and facilities being provided to meet that jurisdiction’s basic needs and expectations.”

Level of service (LOS) standards are presented as a range and are meant to be flexible in accommodating the unique demographic, geographic, and economic characteristics of communities. LOS is usually represented as the ratio of park acres or trail miles per 1,000 residents.

Current Total LOS

Sandy’s current LOS was calculated to consider both total park acreage and developed park acreage for each classification. The Current City of Sandy LOS was then compared to the Standard that was established in the 1997 Parks Master Plan and the SCORP recommended ranges to evaluate progress since the last plan. The prior plan set aspirational goals to increase the level of service for almost all park classifications. Sandy has made substantial progress since the 1997 plan. The total park acreage LOS is currently 22.08 acres / 1000 population, which exceeds the standard of 17.40 acres / 1000 set in 1997. The total acreage is bolstered by significant increases in natural area and open space acreage. Analysis of the primary park classifications is summarized below:

- Mini parks - Sandy is exceeding the standard for mini parks, and is above average when compared to the SCORP.
- Neighborhood parks - Sandy is slightly exceeding the standard for total park acreage, with a developed park acreage that is slightly below the target City standard, and is in the middle of the SCORP recommended LOS range.
- Community parks – Sandy is below the standard in both total and developed acreage, and is at the low end of the recommended SCORP range.

**TABLE 9
LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS**

Park Classification	Total Acres	Developed Acres	Current Total LOS	Current Developed LOS ¹	1997 Parks Master Plan Standard	SCORP Recommended LOS (Acres) ⁵
Mini Parks	3.87	3.87	0.31	0.31	0.10	0.25 to 0.50
Neighborhood Parks	21.29	16.89	1.69	1.34	1.60	1.0 to 2.0
Community Parks	24.82	11.07	1.97	0.88	2.60	2.0 to 6.0
Natural & Open Space ³	224.64	NA	17.81	17.81	12.00	2.0 to 6.0
Special Use Parks	5.27	1.16	0.42	0.09	1.10	No Guidance
Trails (Acres) ⁴	6.95	6.95	0.55	0.55	-	0.9 to 2.7
Total	286.84	39.94	22.74	20.98	17.40	6.15 to 17.2

¹ Level of Service (LOS) calculated based on Acres / 1000 Population

² Current Population based on U. S. Census 2020 of 12,612.

³ Natural Area level of service is based on total acreage.

⁴ Trail miles have been converted to acreage based on an average 15-foot trail corridor. Trails within parks are included under park classification LOS.

⁵ SCORP Recommended LOS for Trails is 0.5 to 1.5 miles per 1000 Population or 0.9 to 2.7 acres per 1000 based on the 15-foot corridor.

Current Geographic LOS

The geographic service area analysis examines whether residential areas in Sandy are within a reasonable travel distance of mini and neighborhood parks. Service areas for these parks range from 1/4- to 1/2- mile radius, the service areas for existing mini and neighborhood parks are featured in Figure 7.

Because mini and neighborhood parks are generally accessed by walking or biking, major roads, railroad tracks, and natural obstacles such as rivers are considered barriers to access that the service area may not cross. Minor roads, signalized intersections, crosswalks, bridges, under- and over-passes can provide safe crossing, and help to mitigate the access barriers. The following high volume roads are considered barriers:

- **Highway 26** (Pioneer/Proctor Boulevard) is a major regional state highway and bisects the town into north and south. There are multiple signaled pedestrian crossings west of downtown, however some users may feel comfortable crossing in the downtown area where the traffic is divided, the road narrows, and speeds are reduced.
- **Highway 211** begins at an intersection with Highway 26 at the east end of downtown and joins a series of smaller towns along its route to Woodburn. There are no signaled or signed pedestrian crossings, no sidewalks or bike lanes, and traffic flows at high speeds with limited visibility in some locations. This road is a significant physical barrier dividing neighborhoods south of downtown.

EXHIBIT B

DRAFT

[This page intentionally left blank]

4.2 PARK AND TRAIL NEEDS

Communities establish their target park and trail LOS based on community values and goals and the availability of park land. The recommended LOS identified below is intended to balance the distribution of parks by classification to better meet the needs of the community. When compared to the SCORP recommended range, Sandy’s target LOS for the 2035 planning horizon aims at the low end for mini parks, middle range for community parks and trails, high end for neighborhood parks, and a continuation of exceeding recommended acres of natural and open space. Specific figures are established in the table below.

**TABLE 10
PARK AND TRAIL NEEDS ANALYSIS**

Park Classification	Current Developed LOS ¹	SCORP Recommended LOS	Sandy LOS (Acres)	CURRENT	FUTURE	TOTAL
				Current Acres Needed ^{2,3}	Future Acres Needed ⁴	Total Acres Needed
Mini Parks ⁷	0.31	0.25 to 0.50	0.25	-0.72	1.62	0.91
Neighborhood Parks ⁷	1.34	1.0 to 2.0	2.00	8.33	12.98	21.31
Community Parks ⁷	0.88	2.0 to 6.0	3.00	26.77	19.46	46.23
Natural & Open Space ⁵	17.81	2.0 to 6.0	15.00	-35.46	97.32	61.86
Special Use Parks	0.09	No Guidance	-	-	-	-
Trails (Acres) ⁷	0.55	0.9 to 2.7	1.50	11.97	9.73	21.70
Total⁶	20.98	6.15 to 17.2	21.75	47.1	141.1	152.0

¹ Level of Service (LOS) calculated based on Acres / 1000 Population

² Current need based on 2020 United States Census population of 12,612.

³ Acres Needed includes development of existing undeveloped parcels and acquisition to meet current needs.

⁴ Future need based on Sandy Urbanization Study estimated an Average Annual Growth Rate (AAGR) of 2.8%, for a 2035 population of 19,100.

⁵ Natural Area level of service is based on total acreage.

⁶ Total Current parks and acres needed excludes surplus acreage in mini parks and natural areas.

⁷ Parks subject to land dedication or fee-in-lieu to support growth, 6.75 Acres / 1000 Population.



Assessment

While Sandy has made much progress growing its parks and trail system, there is still work to do. Several neighborhood parks such as Champion Way, Deer Point, and Ponder Lane, as well as the newest community park, Sandy Community Campus, remain undeveloped open space which provides minimal recreational opportunity for neighbors. The large natural area of Sandy River Park and newly acquired adjacent parcel are underutilized by the broader community due to inadequate development of access points, trails and support facilities such as parking and restrooms. Over-development of mini parks has strained maintenance resources and resulted in service area gaps between parks.

Based on the recommended level of service target and planning for population growth, Sandy should plan to acquire and develop parks and acreage as noted in Table 10. This roughly equates to 2 mini parks, 9 neighborhood parks, 2 community parks, and nearly 20

miles of trails over the next 15 years. Natural areas will likely be acquired through donation or conservation easement with varying parcel sizes.

Geographic distribution of parks and trails should be equitable and responsive to natural and developed barriers that disrupt service areas. Non-standard amenities, such as skate spots, splash pads, dog parks, nature trails, etc., should also be distributed equitably across the system. This will likely require redevelopment of aging, existing facilities to add or expand amenities to avoid desirable public space clustering around new development.

As noted above, Sandy is currently underserved for developed community parks. This translates to below average access to larger active recreation facilities when compared to SCORP guidelines. Special urgency should be given to the development of community parks to meet demand for active recreation. Sandy's parks system is lacking in sport courts, sport fields, and other active use spaces like disc golf and off-road cycling. These uses are best incorporated into community parks along with a variety of other passive recreation opportunities that appeal to a broad swath of user groups. Amenities such as ball fields, skate parks, and pump tracks are usually located in community parks because they tend to be a regional draw, require adequate space to accommodate the diversity of uses, and need support amenities such as restrooms and parking.

Sandy should also prioritize the development of larger neighborhood parks with programming and space to serve multiple user groups over continued reliance on mini parks which serve a narrower demographic, offer fewer amenities, and require higher levels of maintenance. Larger neighborhood parks could help to improve geographic distribution of a number of elements that are in the current park system, but not at the level necessary to serve all community members. Neighborhood parks can have the capacity to accommodate splash pads, dog parks and community gardens, if sited and distributed appropriately.



With its community garden, splash pad, and parking, Bornstedt Park provides elements with broader appeal than a traditional neighborhood park

4.3 RECREATION AMENITY NEEDS

In addition to park and trail needs, the quantity and distribution of specific recreation facilities, such as picnic tables, basketball courts, and sports fields was assessed. The level of service was determined based on the quantity of each item in the current park system relative to the quantity per 1,000 population.

The resulting level of service was then compared to the SCORP recommended level of service for each facility type. Sandy is doing fairly well in providing access to most of the standard facilities, with a few areas that require attention to address current deficiencies. Facilities that are below the recommended level of service for the current population include volleyball, tennis courts, picnic tables, disc golf, baseball and softball fields. Optional facilities are things that a community may or may not choose to focus on as a priority. A pump track and an indoor swimming pool are the optional facilities that are currently below the recommended level of service and are likely not meeting the needs of the community based on public input. Sandy has one existing indoor pool which is currently closed and was not included as an available facility in the analysis. A non-motorized boat launch could potentially be provided in the future if an appropriate river front site becomes available. Sports fields have not been an historic priority for Sandy. However, multi-use fields could be developed to serve soccer, lacrosse and other field sport needs. While Sandy currently has a skatepark that meets the SCORP recommended level of service for current and future population, it is an older facility which is will be need in renovation or replacement in the near term.

**TABLE 11
RECREATION FACILITY LEVEL OF SERVICE**

Facility Type	Total Facilities in Community	SCORP Recommended Facility LOS ¹	Current Facility LOS ¹	Current Facility Need (Deficit)	Future Facility Need (Growth) ²
Standard Facilities					
Picnic shelters ^{3,4,5,7}	8	0.30	0.63	-4	2
Day-use picnic tables ^{3,4,5,7}	35	10.00	2.77	91	65
Basketball courts / multi-use courts ^{3,4,5}	3	0.20	0.24	0	1
Playgrounds ^{3,4,7}	10	0.40	0.79	-5	3
Soccer fields / Multi-use field ^{4,5}	1	0.20	0.08	2	1
Tennis / Pickleball courts ⁵	0	0.35	0.00	4	2
Off-leash dog parks ⁵	1	0.04	0.08	0	0
Disc golf courses ⁷	0	0.02	0.00	0	0
Volleyball courts	0	0.20	0.00	3	1
Skateboard parks ⁶	1	0.04	0.08	0	0
Amphitheaters	3	0.03	0.24	-3	0
Baseball & Softball fields	1	0.20	0.08	2	1
Optional Facilities					
Pump Track (not in SCORP) ^{3,5,6}	0	0.00	0.00	1	0
Indoor swimming pools ^{3,4}	0	0.05	0.00	1	0
Splash Pads (not in SCORP) ⁶	1	0.00	0.08	-1	0
Community Gardens (not in SCORP) ³	1	0.00	0.08	-1	0
Non-motorized boat launches	0	0.25	0.00	3	2
Lacrosse fields	0	0.15	0.00	2	1
Football fields	1	0.10	0.08	0	1

¹Level of Service (LOS) calculated based on Acres or Miles / 1000 Population

²Future need quantity assumes current need has already ben fulfilled

Top Priorities from Public Input

³PT SMP Open House 1 Dot Exercise top 10, February 2020.

⁶PT SMP Online Open House, October 2020

⁴PT SMP Survey 1 top 10, February 2020.

⁷Longest Day Parkway Input, June 2018.

⁵PT SMP Stakeholders interviews, January 2020.

In addition to the traditional facilities included in the SCORP, there are a number of emerging recreation trends that should be considered for addition to the Sandy park system including pickleball, a pump track, sensory gardens, and nature play. Passive recreation including unprogrammed spaces, natural areas, trails and paths are also priorities.

The priority deficiencies should be a focus that can be addressed as existing undeveloped park land is developed into neighborhood and community parks, as noted in the assessment above.

4.4 PLANNING, OPERATIONS, AND MAINTENANCE NEEDS

Parks maintenance staff consists of three full time equivalent (FTE) positions and two ½ FTE position hired on a seasonal basis that are increasingly difficult to fill. Staff commit approximately 15% of their time to building maintenance at City facilities, in addition to overseeing about 275 acres of park land and nearly 10 miles of trails.

According to the National Recreation and Park Association, Sandy's parks maintenance staff to population ratio is below the lowest end of the national average. Median FTE staffing for jurisdictions serving 20,000 residents or less is 10 per 10,000 residents. With an estimated 2020 population of 11,650 and density of over 3,000 residents per square miles, Sandy's staffing is below the lower quartile of 5 FTE for sparsely populated jurisdictions (less than 500 residents per square mile).



Aging amenities at Tupper Park

Low staffing levels make it difficult to perform anything more than standard maintenance such as mowing, garbage collection, and restroom cleaning and replenishment. Routine maintenance activities that may be deferred due to limited staff resources can result in reduced longevity of park features, resulting in more frequent replacement. Structures for example require power washing, painting, refinishing, and maintenance checks on hardware and connections to prevent compounding damage from weather exposure that can lead to rot, rust, and structural failure.

Park amenities have finite lifespans and must be replaced at some point. Some low cost features, such as benches or tables, can be repaired or replaced as part of regular maintenance. In other cases, the entire park or portions of the park must be redeveloped to meet modern safety and accessibility standards, respond to increased use demands or environmental factors, or simply replace larger, more expensive elements like custom play structures or sport courts. This type of major maintenance is generally not factored into operations and maintenance budgets and should be considered in capital improvement plans.

CHAPTER 5

Recommendations

This chapter summarizes recommendations for the development of new parks and trails and non-capital recommendations for operations and maintenance. These recommendations are based on the combined results of the existing facilities inventory, needs assessment, and public and stakeholder engagement. Several overarching themes recurred frequently during the planning process including the need for walking and biking connections to parks, additional amenities at existing parks, equitable distribution of park programming and recreation types across the city, access to large, multi-use fields, and improvement of existing undeveloped sites.

5.1 GENERAL PRIORITIES

The following are general recommendations that should be considered in Park and Trail planning and development within the City of Sandy.

- Develop one new community park with sports fields
- Improve geographic distribution of key amenities: dog parks, community gardens, splash pads.
- Improve trail connections and pedestrian transportation throughout the city.
- Provide safe pedestrian crossings for Highways 26 and 211, and Bluff Road. Crossings could be signalized, over- or under-passes.
- Fill service area gaps so that all residential areas are served by either a neighborhood or mini park.
- Develop undeveloped park land: Champion Way, Deer Point, Ponder Lane, and Sandy Community Campus.
- Add unique amenities not currently offered in the park system such as a pump track, pickleball courts, a disc golf course, sensory gardens, nature play, sports field(s), and other unique features.
- Develop a new universal access playground that provides for a range of mobility types and user ages. The playground should be inclusive and provide for children with special needs, including fencing, sensory elements.
- Renovate existing parks to update aging equipment, such as playgrounds, sport courts, and paths: Tupper, Sandy Bluff, Meinig.
- Renovate existing paths and trails throughout the system to provide accessible routes to parks and amenities in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessible Design.

- Negotiate a public access easement with the Oregon Trail School District to allow unrestricted access/use of E17 and E23 trails along south edge of the high school.
- Focus on neighborhood and community park development.
- Minimize acquisition and development of mini parks to only highly constrained areas and small service area gaps without options for larger parcels.
- Prioritize neighborhood parks over mini parks when land is available.
- Residential areas should be served by the ¼-mile service area of a mini park or the ½-mile service area of a neighborhood park.
- Incorporate natural areas, wildlife habitat and native pollinator gardens into all park classifications.

5.2 PARK AND OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS

Proposed Parks

The proposed park system is depicted in Figure 8. It identifies general areas where park land might be acquired to help expand the park system. Many of the proposed parks are located in the Urban Growth Boundary or the Urban Reserve Boundary and would serve new areas of the City in the future. The plan provides a conceptual distribution of proposed parks within the planning area to serve the needs of the current and future population. Specific land acquisitions will be determined based on land availability, areas of residential development, and site suitability for park development. Due to potential variability in park land availability and parcel size, a few additional park sites have been included on the map. After acquisition, park sites will proceed through site specific master planning, which may include site analysis, public outreach, and conceptual design, prior to proceeding with permitting, design, and construction.





EXHIBIT B



Keynote Name	
CP1	Community Park North
CP2	Community Park South
CP3	Community Park East
MP1	Orient
MP2	Colorado East
NA1	Tickle Creek Exp
NA2	Ruben
NA3	Tickle Creek Exp Central
NA4	Tickle Creek Exp East
NP01	Kelso 362nd
NP02	Jewelberry NE
NP03	Jarl Rd.
NP04	Sunset
NP05	Gunderson Rd.
NP06	Barlow Trail Park
NP07	Deer Point Park Expansion
NP08	Vista Loop 2
NP09	Trubel
NP10	Vista Loop SW

Path: U:\GIS\Projects\10xxxx\109682_Sandy_PSM\03_MXD\Projects\Sandy_PSM\03_Sandy_PSM\Report_Figs.aprx_D:\holstad_3/1/2022

Esri, NASA, NGA, USGS, FEMA; USFWS NWI, Open Street Map, City of Sandy, OR.



Map 8
Proposed Park System

EXHIBIT B

DRAFT

[This page intentionally left blank]

Existing Parks

Several existing parks within the City include undeveloped or underutilized areas that could better serve the community if they were renovated or expanded to increase the availability of popular amenities.

Bornstedt Park Phase 2

Phase 1 is complete and includes a looped path, splash pad, playground, picnic tables, a community garden, and two picnic shelters. As depicted in Figure 9 below, Phase 2 will include a half-sized basketball court, viewing mound, a community center, and parking, and half street improvements along the north and west sides. This park offers the only splash pad in the city, and even without the planned parking lot, there is ample street parking. These factors combine to make this a destination park and the city should consider including a plumbed restroom as surrounding development continues and use intensifies.



Figure 9 Bornstedt Park Master Plan

Jonsrud Viewpoint

Access to Jonsrud Viewpoint is narrow, and highly constrained by Bluff Road on the west and the steep slope below to the east. It currently functions as single lane pull through drive aisle with a few parallel parking spaces along the side. If a trail connection is developed to connect Jonsrud down the bluff to Sandy River Park, other improvements should be considered at the viewpoint, including accessibility and safety improvements for pedestrian paths, parking reconfiguration, picnic tables, and additional benches.

Meinig Memorial Park

The Fantasy Forest is a wooden play structure, and will require major redevelopment at some point in the future, although maintenance staff estimates at least 10 additional years of use. Although Meinig Park has one plumbed restroom, the City should consider locating another in closer proximity to the heavily used playground and event stage area. An undeveloped portion of the park with informal natural surface trails is separated from the larger park by a small stream and steep slope. This area could be programmed, but consideration should be given to its quality as natural and open space. Trails throughout the park are being undermined by the creek or damaged by tree roots, and may require replacement within the next few years. General park improvements could include delineating circulation and improving structures at event space, adding lighting, and improving paths to meet accessibility standards.



Fantasy Forest Playground at Meinig Park

Sandy Bluff Park

Sandy Bluff Park includes the only dog park in the City, as well as a playground, looped trails, and a bench. Near term priorities for improvement at the park include adding shade structures and other amenities to the dog park, replacing the play structure and improving accessibility to it, and adding picnic facilities and more benches.

Sandy Skate Park

The Sandy Skate Park is currently a standalone special use facility on the edge of the Sandy Community Campus. The skate park is at least 20-years old. There have been significant design and technological advancements in skate parks over its lifespan and its showing its age. A new or revamped skate park was a high priority during public outreach, and is included a potential element of the Sandy Community Campus (SCC) redevelopment. The skate park could be replaced in its current location or combined with the SCC and relocated within the broader planned park improvements.



Sandy Skate Park



Tupper Park

Tupper Park

This aging neighborhood park will require significant redevelopment in the near term. The play structure is at the end of its life span and the sport court pavement is failing. The sport court and much of the lawn are often unusable from poor drainage. Sandy should consider daylighting the creek, adding accessible routes to features, and improving drainage as part of any redevelopment plans.

Sandy River Park

The City should consider implementation of the previously developed Sandy River Park Master Plan. The park currently has no dedicated parking facilities and a few trails. The plan describes an expanded hierarchical trail system, parking and restroom facilities, wayfinding, and riverbank restoration. The plan includes offsite trail connections to other nearby parks including Jonsrud Viewpoint and Sandy Community Campus, which could contribute to an off-street trail network on the north side of Sandy. The plan should be updated to reflect the recent purchase of the adjacent forested parcel to the east and describe the trail connections to the Sandy Community Campus in greater detail.



Jim Slagle Loop Trail at Sandy River Park

Undeveloped Parks

The following concepts present possible solutions for undeveloped parcels that could be developed into new parks. Three of these are classified as neighborhood parks: Champion Way, Deer Point, and Ponder Lane. The Sandy Community Campus is an underdeveloped community park located at the site of the former Cedar Ridge Middle School. See Appendix D for additional details on each of these park sites.

Planning for these new parks should include a focus on filling some of the specific amenity needs within the community, such as a pump track, sport field(s), disc golf, and other features noted elsewhere in this plan.

Champion Way Neighborhood Park

Champion Way is an existing, undeveloped 0.99-acre park located on the west side of Sandy, just south of Highway 26 and the Sandy Cinema. The gently sloping park is bounded by fenced retaining walls on both street frontages, houses and an alley on a third side, and transitions to a steeply sloping forested area on the fourth. The concept would introduce standard neighborhood park amenities including an accessible looped path, playground, open lawn, picnic shelter and tables, and screening planting.




Figure 10
Champion Way Neighborhood Park Concept

Deer Point Neighborhood Park

Deer Point is an existing, undeveloped 1.41-acre park located on the east side of Sandy, just south of Highway 26 and Sandy Vista apartments. The long, narrow, gently sloping parcel is bounded by neighborhood streets on two sides, Highway 26 on a third, and fields with clusters of mature trees to the east. The concept provides standard neighborhood park amenities including an accessible looped path, playground, multi-use field, picnic shelters and tables, and a sport court with the option to expand east into the undeveloped parcel identified as NP 7, Deer Point Expansion on **Figure 8**.



Figure 11
Deer Point Neighborhood Park Concept

Ponder Lane Neighborhood Park

Ponder Lane is a recently acquired, undeveloped 1.94-acre parcel located on the south side of Sandy. The gently sloping park is bounded on the east by a single family residence, Highway 211 to the south, and an under-construction Gunderson Road and neighborhood development to the west and north, respectively. The concept would introduce standard neighborhood park amenities including an accessible looped path, playground, multi-use field, picnic shelter and tables, a fenced off-leash dog park, and a small parking area. See Appendix E for additional detail.



Figure 12
Ponder Lane Neighborhood Park Concept

Sandy Community Campus

This underdeveloped community park consists of school buildings, pool (currently closed), parking lot, and the surrounding land which includes the skate park, football field, track, and trails that connect to Sandy River Park natural area. The pool and buildings will remain closed for the time being and are not considered part of this master plan. City Council is studying options for the Cedar Ridge pool and buildings.

A preliminary concept for redevelopment of the park was created as part of the Aquatic Facility Analysis. The entire park will be too expensive to develop all at one time. The concept was broken into four phases.

The proposed Phase 1 schematic design is below. The final design is likely to evolve, but this concept provides guidance on the type of improvements that could be included in Phase 1. The Phase 1 park concept focuses on redevelopment of the east portion of the park and includes a parking lot, a playground, picnic area, basketball court, and a community garden. Sandy Community Campus will also fill a neighborhood park service area gap for community members within ½-mile of the park. The community expressed interest for prioritizing a pump track and the skate park replacement in Phase 1, while reducing parking.



Figure 13
Sandy Community Campus Phase 1 Concept

5.3 TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS

The proposed trail system map includes potential local and regional trails throughout the city. Some of the trails have also been identified in the Transportation System Plan or other regional planning documents or could be incorporated into the new Transportation System Plan update. The goal of the proposed trail system is to create a looped network of trails that connects parks and neighborhoods, and provides opportunities for alternative transportation and recreation throughout the city.



Pedestrian under-pass under Highway 20 in Bend, Oregon


To achieve this goal, an extensive network of trails has been proposed, as depicted in Figure 14, including several major highway crossings. The proposed trail system provides conceptual trail alignments that are intended to provide an alternative pedestrian network, not to replace the sidewalk network or paths associated with road improvements in the Transportation System Plan. Where proposed trails and roads follow similar alignments, trails may be developed initially as gravel multi use paths to serve current needs prior to eventual replacement with paved sidewalks or pathways associated with planned road improvements. Individual trails will require planning and analysis to refine the alignments to meet design criteria, including accommodating steep terrain, avoiding wetlands, potential creek crossings, and connections with other trails. Trail design criteria are further described in Appendix B.

The plan includes new pedestrian crossings at both the east and west ends of the City to facilitate safe crossing of Highway 26, Mt Hood Highway. The plan also includes three crossings of Highway 211, and one crossing of Bluff Road near the high school. The pedestrian crossings could take a number of forms: mid-block crossings with rapid flashing beacon, signalized street intersection, or a grade separated pedestrian bridge or under-pass.

Many of these crossings would be major multi-agency collaborations involving Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Sandy Public Works, Clackamas County, and others. These projects have been identified in this plan as critical to a safe, linked trail system within the City, but they have been omitted from the CIP list, due to the scale and scope of the projects, combined with the necessary buy-in of ODOT and the likely long range implementation.

Budget estimates for the crossings and assumptions on crossing type have been included in the Capital Improvement Plan. Actual project costs will be determined by the type of crossing that is used, and the extent of permitting, design, and agency coordination required for the project. The crossings may also be included as transportation facilities in the Transportation System Master Plan.

EXHIBIT B



Keystone	Name	Miles	Keystone	Name	Miles
T01	Orient to Bluff Rd	1.7	T28	Tickle Creek Reroutes	0.26
T02	Kelso Park to 362nd	1.1	T29	Tickle Creek to Colorado and Rachel	0.98
T03a	362nd to Bell St (In Progress)	0.82	T30	Sunset Street to Tickle Creek	0.32
T03b	362nd Extension	0.36	T31	Sunset Street to Nettie Connett Drive	0.19
T04	Kelso to Powerline	0.8	T32	Bluff Road to Sandy Heights	0.29
T05	Sunflower to Powerline	0.06	T33	Tupper Park to Gerilyn Court	0.06
T06	Olsen to Powerline	0.15	T34	Tickle Creek to Highway 211	0.3
T07	Orient to 362nd	0.59	T35	Tickle Creek Extension East to Dubarko Underpass	0.26
T08	Sandy Bluff Park to 362nd	0.29	T36	Market Road Public Easement	0.19
T09	Sandy Bluff Park Pond Loop Trail	0.21	T37	Sandy Heights to Meinig Connection	0.29
T10	Bell Street to Sandy Bluff Park	0.28	T38	Tickle Creek to Deer Point Park	0.8
T11	Kate Schmidt to Bell Street	0.12	T39	Dubarko Extension Road	0.19
T12	SHS Trail Easement	0.38	T40	Tickle Creek Extension Dubarko Road East to Jacoby Road	0.42
T13	Meeker to Safeway	0.06	T41	Alleyway to Tickle Creek Trail Connector	0.07
T14	Slagle Loop to Jonsrud Overlook	0.96	T42	Jacoby Road to Tickle Creek Connector	0.05
T15	Sandy River Lower Loop	0.33	T43	Tickle Creek Jacoby Road to Meadows Avenue Extension	0.74
T16	Sandy River North Loop	0.26	T44	Highway 211 to Bornstedt Park	0.14
T17	Community Campus to Sandy River Trail	0.59	T45	Bornstedt Road to Trubel Road	0.72
T18	Park Street to Sandy River Trail	0.16	T46	Village South to Trubel Road	0.91
T19	Park Street to Community Campus	0.05	T47	Jacoby West to Village South	0.55
T20	Fir Drive to Community Campus	0.5	T48	Cascadia to Jacoby West	0.19
T21	Vista Loop to Ten Eyck (In Progress)	0.51	T49	Highway 26 to Jacoby	1.51
T22	Vista Loop to Longstreet Lane	0.56	T50	Highway 211 Parkway	0.57
T23	Tickle Creek Extension within UGR	1.63	T51	Old Barlow Trail	0.28
T24	Orient to Tickle Creek	0.38	T52	Barlow Trail to Tickle Creek	0.06
T25	Champion Way to Tickle Creek	0.1	T53	Barlow Trail to Market	0.11
T26	Barnum to Tickle Creek	0.16	T54	Cascadia to Tickle Creek	0.13
T27	Salmon Creek Park to Barnum Road	0.17	T55	Tickle Creek Connector Sewer Easement	3.93

Path: U:\GIS\Projects\19xxxx\190682_Sandy_PSMIP\Sandy_PSMIP_Sandy_PSMIP_Report_Figs.aprx_D:\holstad_3/17/2022

Esri, NASA, NGA, USGS, FEMA; USFWS NWI, Open Street Map, City of Sandy, OR.



EXHIBIT B

DRAFT

[This page intentionally left blank]

The City of Sandy Trail system also has the potential to extend and connect to the larger regional trail network beyond the City planning area. Regional trail connections should be wide, paved multi user trails such as Class 1 or 2 as defined in Appendix B, the Park & Trail Design Guidelines. Regional trails may not be eligible for SDC's because they extend beyond the planning area. The City should work with regional partners such as Metro, to identify and pursue grants and other funding sources. Regional trails that could connect to or through the City of Sandy in the future include:

- Extending the Tickle Creek Trail west to connect with the Springwater Trail
- Extending east to the Sandy Ridge bike trail system and the extensive trail network in Mount Hood National Forest.
- Extending south along Highway 211 to connect to the Cazedero Corridor.



Tickle Creek Trail

5.4 PLANNING, OPERATIONS, AND MAINTENANCE

The following recommendations pertain to non-capital planning, operations and maintenance needs:

- Revise the City of Sandy Development Code, Chapters 17.32 and 17.86, to reflect new parks policies identified in this plan.
- Update Goal 8 of the City of Sandy Comprehensive Plan to align with recommendations included in this plan.
- Update the System Development Charge Methodology to reflect current demographics, population growth projections, and level of service recommendations identified in this plan.
 - Consider including a reimbursement fee for surplus park classifications such as mini parks and natural areas.
 - Include all capacity increasing improvements in the SDC, including new amenities at Meinig and Tupper Parks that are excluded in the current SDC.
 - Update SDC fees annually during the budget cycle relative to economic indices.
 - SDC should be updated based on official 2020 census data when available.
 - Consider SDC fee estimates with and without a General Obligation (GO) Bond. Adjust the rate accordingly if GO Bond isn't passed within 5 years.

EXHIBIT B

5. Recommendations

- Update the fee in lieu calculations related to parkland dedication as defined in the City of Sandy Development Code, 17.86, and update the fees annually during the budget cycle relative to economic indices.
- Establish a method for acquisition of Community Park land, such as through fee in lieu or SDC.
- Investigate the potential to implement a General Obligation Bond to help fund park development and major renovation projects identified in the CIP.
- Investigate the potential to implement a Parks Utility Fee to help fund park maintenance and operations.
- Investigate applying stormwater user fees to supplement parks maintenance funding.
- Develop an asset management program including a detailed inventory and assessment of existing amenities to help plan for and prioritize life-cycle renovation and replacement for the existing park system.
- Increase Parks staffing levels to match system growth, including adding a park planner, up to two maintenance and operations staff to meet current needs.
- Consider adding a volunteer coordinator position.
- Consider shifting contracted landscape maintenance in-house (with commensurate staffing increase) or consolidating under a single contract to reduce management and coordination.



Light bollard, drinking fountain, and picnic table in various conditions at Timberline Ridge mini park



CHAPTER 6

Implementation

This chapter identifies a strategy to implement and fund the improvements recommended in this Plan. This is a long range plan that is anticipated to be implemented over the next 15+ years. As the economy, population, development, and other factors evolve and change, the plan will need to be reevaluated, updated, and modified to keep pace with current community needs and align with actual population growth. Capital Project Lists and Cost Estimates were developed to reflect Sandy's park needs through 2035. These projects are organized based on prioritization criteria developed to guide future decision making. Non-Capital costs to maintain the park system and available and potential funding sources are also discussed.

6.1 PRIORITIES

Projects in this plan have been prioritized as short term (Tier 1, 1 to 5 years), mid term (Tier 2, 6 to 10 years), and long term (Tier 3, 11+ years) to distribute park and trail development over the length of the planning period. Key criteria to guide this prioritization were developed from public input, the needs analysis, and general parks goals and policies. The list below is ranked in approximate priority order:

- Develop undeveloped park sites to serve existing neighborhoods.
- Acquire and develop new park land to meet current and future needs, with a particular focus on community parks and existing neighborhood park service area gaps.
- Develop trails to improve connectivity throughout the city, including safe separated crossings of Highways 26 and 211.
- Renovate and upgrade existing parks to expand capacity.
- Distribute parks equitably throughout the city.
- Plan for future growth within the UGB expansion areas, prioritize based on projected timing and location of future growth.

Short term projects have been selected based on these prioritization criteria. Final project selection and development will be determined by City staff, the Parks and Trails Advisory Committee, funding availability, and other factors. Community priorities and focus areas may change over the course of the plan. The priorities and the proposed project lists should be reviewed biennially during the budget cycle to ensure that they align with economic and demographic changes.

6.2 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The City's capital improvement plan (CIP) is a combination major renovation, and development projects. The list accounts for the priorities identified above. Projects in the CIP are funded through a variety of sources including SDC's, grants, and donations. A general obligation (GO) bond, if approved by voters, could also be a source to fund significant acquisition and development projects. Partnerships, volunteers and other alternative sources may also assist with funding and executing projects, sometimes in the form of in-kind donations of labor or materials. The City General Fund is primarily reserved for Parks Department planning, operations, and maintenance activities and has not been included as a source of funding for capital improvements. Similarly, the land fee-in-lieu funds have not been allocated within the CIP but could be used for acquisition of a large community park parcel identified for development in the CIP.

Costs used in the Capital Improvement Program were derived from a variety of sources.

- Itemized cost estimates were prepared in association with concept plan development for the existing undeveloped park sites (Champion Way, Deer Point, and Ponder Lane), and are included in Appendix D.
- Cost estimates developed through prior park master plan efforts were reviewed. Costs were escalated to account for cost increases since the year the plan was adopted. (Bornstedt, Sandy River Park, and Sandy Community Campus).
- Park development cost estimates for future parks are based on an average size and cost per acre for that park classification, with the assumption that the site is reasonably flat and developable, and is designed to include all standard amenities, some optional amenities, and some half street improvements scaled to the park size.
- Trail development costs are based on a unit cost per linear foot depending on the trail classification, which defines the surface type and width.
- Soft costs, including survey, permitting, design, and project management costs are included in the cost for each project.
- Land acquisition costs were not included in the cost estimates. Land values are highly volatile, and dependent on parcel size, location, development pressure and other factors. Further analysis is anticipated during the Land Dedication / Fee-in-lieu policy review and update.

These costs should be considered to be preliminary budget-level estimates only. Actual project costs will be established for each site as part of the planning and development process. The capital costs included in Table 12 and Appendix A were developed with the following assumptions:

- Costs are based on Quarter 1 of 2021 dollars.
- Costs derived from other planning efforts have been escalated at 3% per year to the current year.
- Annual operations and maintenance fees are excluded from the estimates.
- Land acquisitions costs are excluded from the estimates.

**TABLE 12
TIER 1 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Map ID	Site	Improvements	Cost
Tier 1 Existing Parks			
NP	Deer Point Park	Design, permitting, & development	\$ 1,442,800
NP	Champion Way Park	Design, permitting, & development	\$ 998,700
NP	Ponder Lane Park	Design, permitting, & development	\$ 1,848,000
NP	Sandy Bluff Park	Dog Park; Playground; Picnic Area	\$ 250,000
CP	Sandy Community Campus - Phase 1	Parking area, playground, picnic, skate park	\$ 3,633,200
CP	Meinig Memorial Park	Path renovations, creek restoration	\$ 100,000
NA	Sandy River Park - Phase 1	Trailhead, trails	\$ 800,000
Tier 1 Existing Park Improvement Cost			\$ 9,072,700
Tier 1 Proposed Parks			
NP 4	Sunset	Fill service area gap on portion of City owned parcel	\$ 1,700,000
NP 7	Deer Point Expansion	Expand existing undeveloped park	\$ 1,700,000
CP 1	Community North	Develop future community park in north	\$ 5,900,000
NA 1	Tickle Creek Expansion - West	Opportunity acquisitions/ donations along creek	\$ -
Tier 1 Proposed Park Improvement Cost			\$ 9,300,000
Tier 1 Proposed Trails			
T03 (P21)	362 nd	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ -
T04	Kelso to Powerline	6' - 8' wide gravel trail	\$ 185,800
T05	Sunflower to Powerline	5' concrete path	\$ 32,500
T06	Olson to Powerline	5' concrete path	\$ 81,300
T08 (P19)	Sandy Bluff Park to 362 nd	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 198,100
T09 (P19)	Sandy Bluff Park Pond Loop Trail	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 143,500
T10 (P19)	Bell Street to Sandy Bluff Park	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 191,300
T11 (P19)	Kate Schmidt to Bell Street	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 82,000
T12 (P19)	SHS Trail Easement 1	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 259,600
T13	Meeker to MH Athletic Club	5' concrete path	\$ 32,500
T17	Community Campus to Sandy River Trail	3' wide natural surface trail	\$ 23,700
T19	Park Street to Community Campus	3' wide natural surface trail	\$ 2,000
T21	Vista Loop to Hood Street	6' - 8' wide gravel trail	\$ -
T28 (P16)	Tickle Creek Reroutes	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 93,750
T30	Sunset Street to Tickle Creek	3' wide natural surface trail	\$ 12,800
T31	Sunset Street to Nettie Connett Drive	5' wide concrete path	\$ 103,000
T32	Bluff Road to Sandy Heights	3' wide natural surface trail	\$ 11,600
T33	Tupper Park to Gerilyn Court	5' concrete path	\$ 32,500
T35 (P17)	Tickle Creek Extension East to Dubarko Underp.	6' - 8' wide gravel trail	\$ 125,000
T38	Tickle Creek to Deer Point Park	5' concrete path	\$ 432,000
T39	Dubarko Extension Road	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ -
T40 (P22)	Tickle Creek Extension Dubarko East to Jacoby ³	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 400,000
T41	Alleyway to Tickle Creek Trail Connector	5' concrete path	\$ 37,500
T42	Jacoby Road to Tickle Creek Connector	5' concrete path	\$ -
T44	Bornstedt Park	5' concrete path	\$ 78,000
T50 (P23)	Highway 211 Parkway	8' wide asphalt trail	\$ 406,250
T54	Cascadia to Tickle Creek	6' - 8' wide gravel trail	\$ 30,200
TX1	Bluff Road Crossing (Mid-block)		\$ -
Tier 1 Proposed Trail Improvement Cost			\$ 2,995,000
Total Tier 1 Cost			\$ 21,367,700


Assumptions:

1. Capital project cost estimates are based on 2021 dollars. Costs derived from other planning efforts include escalation of 3% per year up to 2021 dollars
2. Annual operations and maintenance fees are excluded from the estimates
3. Costs include soft costs (master planning, survey, design, permitting) of 30%
4. Land Acquisition costs are excluded from the estimate

The complete Capital Improvement project lists for the 15-year planning period in this plan is included in Appendix A. Tier 1 or near term projects have been identified and prioritized for development within the next five years. These projects generally fulfill the top priorities identified above.

6.3 FINANCING STRATEGIES

There are numerous funding sources available to address both capital and non-capital funding needs for park and trail acquisition and development. The most commonly used funding sources are outlined below. A summary of additional potential grant options is included in Appendix E. Sandy uses a variety of funding approaches to achieve parkland acquisition and park and trail construction. The existing beginning balance and forecast budget from the primary funding sources (land fee in lieu and SDC's) for the current biennium are depicted in Figure 15. No other funding sources, such as grants, were included in the City budget for Parks and Trails.



Source: City of Sandy Draft Budget Biennium 21-23

Figure 15
FY 2021-2023 Budget Parks Capital Funding

This budget information was reviewed and updated to reflect current available balances and develop capital funding estimates for the next 5 years. Funding levels can be expected to fluctuate from year to year and are influenced by the economic climate, population growth, construction activity and other factors. The Tier 1 capital project list exceeds the available funding from the current funding sources alone. In addition to the funding sources included in the biennial budget, the capital funding estimate includes the assumption that additional funding sources will be leveraged to fulfill the plan

goals. These additional funding sources include grants, donations, volunteers, urban renewal funds, and a general obligation bond. The annual SDC estimate is based on the FY 19-21 biennial budget and is likely to adjust upward with an SDC update and increase in residential development generating more funding than in prior budget cycles.

**TABLE 13
CAPITAL FUNDING ESTIMATE**

Funding Source	Amount
SDC Annual Budget Estimate	\$ 315,000
General Fund	\$ -
Grants	\$ 100,000
Donations / Volunteers	\$ 50,000
<hr/>	
Estimated Annual Revenue	\$ 465,000
<hr/>	
Estimated 5-year Revenue	\$ 2,325,000
Park System Development Charge (SDC) Balance ¹	\$ 1,355,028
Urban Renewal Funds	\$ 3,300,000
General Obligation Bond	\$ 15,000,000
Estimated 5-Year Capital Funding Total	\$ 21,980,028

¹ Fund balance as of 4/27/2021

Currently, the primary funding source for land acquisition has been either land dedication or fee-in-lieu funding. This process is described in greater detail in the following section. Similar to the SDC's, the fees collected have not kept pace with the current cost of land in the area. Due to this, the revenue generation has been below the potential, and is anticipated to improve after Chapter 17.86 of the Sandy Development code is updated. Additional funding sources that could be used for land acquisition in addition to development include grants and bonds. The available balance could be used to acquire new park land to help fulfill needs identified through this planning process.


**TABLE 14
LAND ACQUISITION FUNDING ESTIMATE**

Funding Source	Amount
Land (Fee in Lieu) Annual Budget Estimate	\$ 165,000
<hr/>	
Estimated 5-year Land (Fee-in-Lieu) Revenue	\$ 825,000
Land (Fee in Lieu) Beginning Balance ¹	\$ 1,133,431
Estimated 5-Year Land Acquisition Total	\$ 1,958,431

¹ Fund balance as of 4/27/2021

6.4 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE


Operations and maintenance budgets are currently funded through the City General Fund. Figure 16 below shows a comparison of the parks maintenance funding and the parks capital fund. The parks capital fund is a combination of SDC's and fee in-lieu funds collected. The steep growth aligns with population growth and development in recent years.



Source: City of Sandy Biennial Budgets

Figure 16
Existing Funding Trend

Figure 17 depicts the relationship between the number of full time staff and the number of maintained facilities over the previous 20 years, and closely correlates with the increased capital funding in Figure 16. Nearly half of the park system’s facilities have been added in the past 15 years. As noted previously staff are already stretched to adequately maintain the current parks and trails. As these facilities age, and the park system expands, the maintenance burden will increase. The City should plan for additional staff and increased maintenance costs when drafting future budgets.



Source: City of Sandy Biennial Budgets, Google Earth

Figure 17
Maintenance Staff Levels and Facilities Maintained

Operations and maintenance can be funded through a variety of sources. The general fund provides the current funding, but is stretched by many demands. As the park system grows, other funding sources should be explored. Sources of funding for operations and maintenance are more limited than those for capital projects. Two options to consider to fund maintenance of the growing park system are a parks utility fee and a local option levy.

6.5 FUNDING SOURCES

Existing Funding Sources

Park Land Dedication Policy

The park land dedication policy is defined in Chapter 17.86 of the Sandy Development Code and used to acquire land. New residential subdivisions, planned developments, multi-family or manufactured home park developments are required to provide park land to serve future residents of those developments.

Since the adoption of the 1997 Plan, the City has had the option to choose to require land dedication or collect fee in lieu funds on a case-by-case basis as development occurred. When park or trail land dedication is required, a formula is used to determine the acreage required based on the number of residential units and anticipated population. The land dedication requirement is in addition to SDC's collected for development.

The land dedication generally provides smaller neighborhood parks to serve new subdivisions. Fees collected can be combined to purchase larger parcels, such as community parks.

In addition, developers may propose the designation and protection of open space and/or greenway corridor areas as part of the City platting process. This open space does not count towards parkland dedication requirements. Open spaces may include natural areas of undisturbed vegetation, steep slopes, stream corridors, wetlands, or restored vegetation areas. Greenway corridors may link residential areas with parks and open space areas and may contain pedestrian and bike paths.

System Development Charges

Parks and trails system development charges (SDCs) are one-time fees assessed on new development to cover a portion of the cost of providing parks and trails to serve population growth associated with new development. The fees are assessed as part of building permits and may include two components: 1) a reimbursement fee to recover the cost of eligible existing improvements in the transportation and parks systems that will serve the new development and 2) an improvement fee to contribute to the cost of planned, eligible capacity-increasing park improvements which will serve the new development. Sandy's current park and trail SDC's have not been increased regularly to keep pace with market growth and development pressure, and are currently among the lowest in the region. As

noted in the recommendations in Chapter 5, an SDC methodology update should be implemented as soon as possible, to bring Sandy's rates in line with our communities in the region and insure that new development is paying an appropriate share of the current and future park system.

Potential Funding Sources

Grants

Historically grants have been used to assist in development of some parks in the City of Sandy. A wide array of grants are available from or administered through a number of sources including Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon Department of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Block Grants. They generally require a percentage funding to be matched from another source. The match can be SDC's, donated or volunteered time, or recent prior expenditures such as land acquisitions. Additional detail on selection of specific grants that are likely to be most applicable to the Sandy park and trail system are included in Appendix E.

General Obligation Bond

There are several types of bonds that can be used a variety of public improvements. A general obligation bond can be used to fund capital improvements, renovations, and new facilities if approved a vote. A bond could form the basis for a comprehensive funding package to implement major acquisitions and development. A general obligation bond has been included in the 5-year revenue estimate.

Parks Utility Fee

A parks utility fee could be implemented a fee added to the monthly utility bill. The fee level would be determined by the revenue generation desired to support parks maintenance and operations, or could be divided between operations. The City Council has the authority to impose a fee without a vote of the electorate. A utility fee could be combined with other funding sources to provide revenue for maintenance or to support capital improvements funded through other sources. Implementing a fee of \$3.00 per month per single family residence and \$2.25 per multi family residence could generate adequate funding to support one or two additional FTE positions for operations and maintenance. Revenue generated by a utility fee could also be divided between parks operations and debt service on a bond.

Local Option Levy

A local option levy could be used to generate revenue to fund operations, maintenance, and/or capital projects. It is a tax based on assessed property value and must be approved in an election. The levy period is dependent on the intended use of the funds. An operations and maintenance levy would assess additional property taxes for a fixed period, after which time it would need to be renewed by another round of voter approval.

EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX A

Capital Project List

The full capital improvement plan for the duration of the planning period is included in the following tables. The plan is broken into three tables: existing park, proposed park and proposed trail capital costs.

**TABLE A-1
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY**

Improvement Category	Cost
Existing Park Improvements	\$ 18,214,900
Proposed Park Improvements	\$ 34,980,000
Trail Improvements	\$ 13,313,100
Total	\$ 66,508,000

DRY

EXHIBIT C

**TABLE A-2
EXISTING PARK CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Park Class	Site	Improvement Notes	Cost
Tier 1			
NP	Deer Point Park	Design, permitting, & development	\$ 1,442,800
NP	Champion Way Park	Design, permitting, & development	\$ 998,700
NP	Ponder Lane Park	Design, permitting, & development	\$ 1,848,000
NP	Sandy Bluff Park	Dog Park; Playground; Picnic Area	\$ 250,000
CP	Sandy Community Campus - Phase 1	Parking area, playground, picnic, skate park	\$ 3,633,200
CP	Meinig Memorial Park	Path renovations, creek restoration	\$ 100,000
NA	Sandy River Park - Phase 1	Trailhead, trails	\$ 800,000
Tier 1 Total Proposed Park Improvement Cost			\$ 9,072,700
Tier 2			
NP	Bornstedt Park - Phase 2	Half street, half-sized sport court, and viewing mound	\$ 652,000
NP	Tupper Park	ADA Improvements; Playground; Sport Court; Furnishings; Drainage; Stream daylighting	\$ 750,000
CP	Sandy Community Campus - Phase 2	Site grading, track removal, park trails, informal play area	\$ 2,481,100
CP	Meinig Memorial Park	ADA improvements, lighting, trails, dog park,	\$ 273,200
NA	Sandy River Park - Phase 2	Trails, river bank restoration	\$ 650,000
Tier 2 Total Proposed Park Improvement Cost			\$ 4,806,300
Tier 3			
CP	Sandy Community Campus - Phase 3	Amphitheater and event space	\$ 2,731,700
CP	Sandy Community Campus - Phase 4	Challenge course, bike pump track	\$ 1,104,200
CP	Meinig Memorial Park	Playground Renovation	\$ 500,000
NA	Sandy River Park Addition	Trails included in Community Campus	\$ -
Tier 3 Total Proposed Park Improvement Cost			\$ 4,335,900
Total Existing Park Improvement Cost			\$ 18,214,900

Assumptions:

1. Capital project cost estimates are based on 2021 dollars. Costs derived from other prior planning efforts include escalation of 3% per year up to 2021 dollars
2. Annual operations and maintenance fees are excluded from the estimates
3. Costs include soft costs (master planning, survey, design, permitting) of 25% for NP and CP, 30% for MP



EXHIBIT C

**TABLE A-3
PROPOSED PARK CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Park Key Site	Acres	Land Acq	Improvement Notes	Cost
Tier 1				
NP 7 Deer Point Expansion	2.0	Yes	Include disc golf or pump track?	\$ 1,700,000
NP 4 Sunset	2.0	Yes	City owned parcel	\$ 1,700,000
CP 1 Community North	10.0	Yes	Potential acquisition opportunities	\$ 5,900,000
NA 1 Tickle Creek Expansion - West	TBD	Yes	Opportunity acquisitions/ donations along riparian corridor. See Trail CIP for trail costs.	\$ -
Tier 1 Total Proposed Park Cost				\$ 9,300,000
Tier 2				
NP 3 Jarl Road	2.0	Yes		\$ 1,700,000
NP 2 Jewelberry NE	2.0	Yes	Existing service area gap	\$ 1,700,000
NP 8 Vista Loop	2.0	Yes	Existing service area gap	\$ 1,700,000
CP 3 Community East	12.5	Yes		\$ 6,900,000
NA 3 Tickle Creek Expansion - Central	TBD	Yes	Opportunity acquisitions/ donations along riparian corridor. See Trail CIP for trail costs.	\$ -
NA 4 Tickle Creek Expansion - East	TBD	Yes	Opportunity acquisitions/ donations along riparian corridor. See Trail CIP for trail costs.	\$ -
Tier 2 Total Proposed Park Cost				\$ 12,000,000
Tier 3				
MP 1 Orient	0.5	Yes		\$ 490,000
MP 2 Colorado East	0.5	Yes		\$ 490,000
NP 1 Kelso 362nd	2.0	Yes		\$ 1,700,000
NP 5 Gunderson Road West	2.0	Yes		\$ 1,700,000
NP 6 Barlow Trail	2.0	Yes		\$ 1,700,000
NP 9 Trubel	2.0	Yes		\$ 1,700,000
NP 10 Vista Loop SW	0.0	Yes		\$ -
CP 2 Community South	10.0	Yes		\$ 5,900,000
NA 2 Ruben	TBD	Yes	Potential wetland natural area with boardwalk	\$ -
Tier 3 Total Proposed Park Cost				\$ 13,680,000
Total Proposed Park Cost				\$ 34,980,000

Assumptions:

1. Capital project cost estimates are based on 2021 dollars.
2. Annual operations and maintenance fees are excluded from the estimates
3. Costs include soft costs (master planning, survey, design, permitting) of 25% for NP and CP, 30% for MP
4. Land Acquisition costs are excluded from the estimate
5. Listed recreation facilities could be stand alone development or embedded within larger parks.

EXHIBIT C

**TABLE A-4
TRAILS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

Map ID	Name	Trail Class ¹	Surface	Length (FT)	Cost	Land Acquisition (Acres)
Tier 1						
T03a(P21)	362 nd to Bell ^{2,5}	1	Asphalt	4,330	\$ -	0.00
T04	Kelso to Powerline	2	Gravel	4,224	\$ 185,800	1.45
T05	Sunflower to Powerline	3	Concrete	317	\$ 32,500	0.00
T06	Olson to Powerline	3	Concrete	792	\$ 81,300	0.00
T08 (P19)	Sandy Bluff Park to 362 nd ²	1	Asphalt	1,531	\$ 198,100	0.53
T09 (P19)	Sandy Bluff Park Pond Loop Trail ²	1	Asphalt	1,109	\$ 143,500	0.00
T10 (P19)	Bell Street to Sandy Bluff Park ²	1	Asphalt	1,478	\$ 191,300	0.25
T11 (P19)	Kate Schmidt to Bell Street ²	1	Asphalt	634	\$ 82,000	0.22
T12 (P19)	SHS Trail Easement 1 ²	1	Asphalt	2,006	\$ 259,600	0.00
T13	Meeker to Safeway	3	Concrete	317	\$ 32,500	0.11
T17	Community Campus to Sandy River Trail	4	Natural	3,115	\$ 23,700	0.00
T19	Park Street to Community Campus	4	Natural	264	\$ 2,000	0.00
T21	Vista Loop to Ten Eyck ⁵	3	Concrete	2,693	\$ -	0.00
T28 (P16)	Tickle Creek Reroutes ²	2	Gravel	1,373	\$ 93,750	0.24
T30	Sunset Street to Tickle Creek	4	Natural	1,690	\$ 12,800	0.00
T31	Sunset Street to Nettie Connett Drive	3	Concrete	1,003	\$ 103,000	0.00
T32	Bluff Road to Sandy Heights	4	Natural	1,531	\$ 11,600	0.35
T33	Tupper Park to Gerilyn Court	3	Concrete	317	\$ 32,500	0.00
T35 (P17)	Tickle Creek ExtEast to Dubarko Underpass ²	2	Gravel	1,361	\$ 125,000	0.47
T38	Tickle Creek to Deer Point Park	3	Concrete	4,208	\$ 432,000	1.45
T39	Dubarko Extension Road ⁵	1	Asphalt	0	\$ -	0.00
T40 (P22)	Tickle Creek Ext Dubarko East to Jacoby ²	1	Asphalt	2,243	\$ 400,000	0.77
T41	Alleyway to Tickle Creek Trail Connector	3	Concrete	365	\$ 37,500	0.13
T42	Jacoby Road to Tickle Creek Connector ⁵	3	Concrete	0	\$ -	0.00
T44	Bornstedt Park	3	Concrete	760	\$ 78,000	0.00
T50 (P23)	Highway 211 Parkway	1	Asphalt	3,010	\$ 406,250	0.00
T54	Cascadia to Tickle Creek	2	Gravel	686	\$ 30,200	0.24
TX1	Bluff Road Crossing ⁵		Midblock		\$ -	
Tier 1 Total Proposed Trail Cost					\$ 2,995,000	6.20
Tier 2						
T03b(P21)	362 nd Extension ²	1	Asphalt	1,901	\$ 375,000	0.00
T14	Slagle Loop to Jonsrud Viewpoint	4	Natural	5,069	\$ 38,500	1.22
T15	Sandy River Lower Loop	4	Natural	1,742	\$ 13,300	0.00
T16	Sandy River North Loop	4	Natural	1,373	\$ 10,400	0.00

Table Continued on Following Page

EXHIBIT C

TABLE A-4 (CONTINUED)

Map ID	Name	Trail Class ¹	Surface	Length (FT)	Cost	Acquisition (Acres)
Tier 2 - Continued						
T18	Park Street to Sandy River Trail	4	Natural	845	\$ 6,400	0.00
T20	Fir Drive to Community Campus	4	Natural	2,640	\$ 20,100	0.64
T23 (P20)	Tickle Creek Extension within UGR ²	2	Gravel	8,659	\$ 380,900	1.49
T25	Champion Way to Tickle Creek	4	Natural	581	\$ 4,400	0.00
T26	Barnum to Tickle Creek	4	Natural	898	\$ 6,800	0.00
T27	Salmon Creek Park to Barnum Road	3	Concrete	898	\$ 92,200	0.31
T34	Tickle Creek to Highway 211	2	Gravel	1,584	\$ 69,700	0.27
T36	Market Road Public Easement ^{2,5}	3	Concrete	0	\$ -	0.00
T37	Sandy Heights to Meinig Connection	4	Natural	1,514	\$ 11,500	0.00
T43	Tickle Creek Jacoby to Meadows Ave Ext	2	Gravel	3,923	\$ 172,600	1.35
TX2	Hwy 26 / Vista Crossing ⁵		Underpass		\$ -	0.00
TX3	Hwy 211 / Meinig Crossing ^{3,5}		Overpass		\$ 3,185,000	0.00
TX4	Hwy 211 / Dubarko Crossing (Signal) ⁵		Midblock		\$ -	0.00
Tier 2 Total Proposed Trail Cost					\$ 4,386,800	5.28
Tier 3						
T01	Orient to Bluff Road ^{4,5}	1	Asphalt	8,976	\$ -	0.00
T02	Kelso to 362 nd	2	Gravel	5,808	\$ 255,500	2.00
T07 (P18)	Orient to 362 nd (Bell Street Extension)	1	Asphalt	3,115	\$ 675,000	0.00
T22	Vista Loop to Longstreet Lane	3	Concrete	2,957	\$ 303,600	0.00
T24	Orient to Tickle Creek	2	Gravel	2,006	\$ 88,300	0.35
T29	Tickle Creek to Colorado & Rachel	2	Gravel	5,174	\$ 227,600	1.78
T45	Bornstedt Road to Trubel Road	1	Asphalt	3,828	\$ 495,400	1.32
T46	Village South to Trubel Road	1	Asphalt	4,819	\$ 623,600	1.66
T47	Jacoby West to Village South	1	Asphalt	2,883	\$ 373,100	0.99
T48	Cascadia to Jacoby West	3	Concrete	996	\$ 102,300	0.34
T49	Highway 26 to Jacoby	1	Asphalt	7,973	\$ 1,031,700	0.00
T51	Old Barlow Trail	3	Concrete	1,478	\$ 151,700	0.51
T52	Barlow Trail to Tickle Creek	2	Gravel	317	\$ 13,900	0.11
T53	Barlow Trail to Market	2	Gravel	581	\$ 25,600	0.00
T55	Tickle Creek Connector Sewer Easement ⁴	2	Gravel	20,777	\$ 914,000	0.00
TX5	Hwy 26 / Orient Crossing ⁵		Overpass		\$ -	0.00
TX6	Hwy 211 / Gunderson Crossing ⁵		Midblock		\$ 150,000	0.00
TX7	Tickle Creek Bridge at Market		Bridge		\$ 500,000	
Tier 3 Total Proposed Trail Cost					\$ 5,931,300	9.06
Total Development Cost for All Trail Projects					\$13,313,100	20.54

¹ See Appendix B for trail class descriptions

² Trails identified in the 2011 Transportation System Plan, trail ID from TSP denoted as (P#) under 'Map ID'. Costs include preliminary development to gravel surface. Full development cost including paved surface included in Transportation System Plan.

³ Cost derived from 2011 TSP, escalated for inflation at 3% per year

⁴ Regional trail extends outside of planning area boundary.

⁵ TSP funded project that will fill gap in PTSMP trail network

EXHIBIT C

[This page intentionally left blank]

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

Park & Trail Design Guidelines

These design standards outline general development approaches and criteria for parks and trails in the Sandy park system. Sandy should consider developing additional design standards such as avoiding tree removal and limiting environmental impact, and could also define elements such as graphic sign standards, plant palettes, and specific site furnishing products to create familiarity for park users, and simplify maintenance. The standards should be flexible in order to highlight a park's distinct context and sense of place. For example, a particular site furnishing may be appropriate at both an urban plaza and neighborhood park, but may not be appropriate at a natural area trailhead. Park structures, furnishings, and signage should adhere to applicable sections of "Sandy Style" as described in Chapter 17.90 of the Sandy Development Code.

All City park facilities should be designed to be usable by all people to the greatest extent possible, regardless of age, physical ability, or other segregating factor - an approach known as universal design. Consideration should also be given to the selection and application of the most appropriate set of accessibility standards to a given facility based on legal requirements and environmental context. For example, a neighborhood park playground may need to adhere to stricter accessibility standards than a hiking trail located in a natural area park. The 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design include standards and design criteria that should be included in all public facilities, including parks. These standards include guidance on the design of accessible routes, ramps and stairs, parking, drinking fountains, restrooms, play areas, sports facilities, swimming pools, and outdoor developed areas. In addition, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service has developed Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Guidelines (FSORAG) which provide guidance on trails, beach access, and recreation sites. The FSORAG is intended to guide development on National Forest lands but is widely used by local governments to provide standards for trails in natural areas where application of the ADA Standards would be excessively impactful to the natural environment. Future parks should be planned to comply with ADA Standards, with the exception of natural area trails which may be developed using the FSORAG. More information is included under the trail section.

Parks

The recommendations presented in Table B-1 are the **minimum** development standards for the park classifications described in Chapter 3.2 of this report. Additional or expanded amenities are encouraged where conditions allow or when park programming increases demand. Generally, the park design standards are scaled based on the park size and intended use, with smaller parks including less amenities than larger parks. The first seven amenities are considered 'standard' park facilities and should be included in all mini, neighborhood, and community parks. Inclusion of the 'optional' amenities can depend on a variety of factors including site suitability, public input, community needs, available budget, and other considerations.

EXHIBIT C

Amenities to include in natural areas, open spaces and special use areas will vary based on the specific site characteristics and conditions. Because of the variable nature of these spaces, Sandy should exercise discretion regarding appropriate amenities on a case-by-case basis. All of the amenities included in Table B-1 can be considered ‘Optional’ for these park classifications.

**TABLE B-1
PARK DESIGN STANDARDS**

Amenities	Mini Parks	Neighborhood Parks	Community Parks
Playground	2,000 square feet	3,500 square feet	6,000 square feet
Flat, Irrigated Lawn	3,000 square feet	1/4 acre	1 acre
Trash Receptacle	1	1	1 per 2 acres
Pet Waste Station	1	1	1 per 2 acres
Bicycle Parking	2 stalls	4 stalls	As required per code, but not less than 1 per acre
Picnic Table	1 per 1/4 acre	1 per 1/2 acre	2 per acre
Bench	1 per 1/4 acre	1 per 1/2 acre	1 per acre
Drinking Fountain	Optional	1	1 per 5 acres
Sport Court (half-sized)	Optional	Optional	Optional
Sport Court (full-sized)	Optional	Optional ¹	at least 1
Open Multi-Use Field	Optional	Standard	Standard
Sport Field	–	Optional ¹	at least 1
Looped Walking Path	Optional	Standard	Mulitple
Splash Pad	–	Optional ¹	Optional ²
Dog off-leash area	–	Optional ¹	Optional ²
Picnic Shelter (3-4 tables)	–	Optional ¹	Mulitple
Picnic Shelter (6-8 tables)	–	–	Optional ²
Restroom	–	Optional	Standard
Community Garden	–	Optional	Optional ²
Event Space	–	–	Optional ²
Disc Golf	–	–	Optional ²
Pump Track	–	–	Optional ²
Skate Spot / Park	–	Optional ¹	Optional ²
Natural Area	–	–	Optional ²
Off-street Parking	–	–	Standard

¹ Neighborhood parks should include at least 1 of noted optional amenities

² Community parks should include at least 3 of noted optional amenities

EXHIBIT C



Meinig Park and Centennial Plaza host the only plumbed restrooms in the system

Parks that include destination type amenities shall include permanent public restrooms in the development of the parks. Destination amenities include skate parks, pump tracks, dog parks, splash pads, sports fields, community gardens, or any other park amenity that is likely to attract park users from beyond the ½-mile service area considered walking distance to the park.

Where porta potties are used in lieu of a restroom building, a permanent three-sided structure shall be provided to improve

aesthetics and security of the units. Porta potties and enclosures should be sized and designed to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The use of permanent or semi permanent porta potties should be confirmed with state and local building codes. Restrooms, picnic shelters, porta potty enclosures, and other park structures shall be designed to comply with the “Sandy Style” guidelines.

Trails

Trail standards have been developed to provide guidance for future trail development and maintenance or replacement. The trail standards are intended to provide a range of options to improve trail safety and minimize user conflict. These trail classifications and design guidelines have been used to inform the cost estimates included in the trails capital improvement plan. Some trails may need to be re-classified and improved over time if congestion or high use levels develop. Graphic standards should be developed to unify wayfinding and informational signage at trailheads and along trails.

**TABLE B-2
TRAIL DESIGN STANDARDS**

	Shared Use Path	Shared Use Path	Neighborhood Connector	Natural Area Trail
Users	Pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchairs, skateboards, strollers	Pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchairs, skateboards, strollers	Pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchairs, skateboards, strollers	Pedestrians, bicyclists
Surface	Asphalt	Gravel ¹	Concrete or Asphalt	Natural Surface
Width	10-12'	6-8'	5-6'	3' Minimum
Level of Use	High	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Accessibility Standard	ADA	ADA	ADA	FSORAG

¹ Trails may initially be built as gravel surface and upgraded to paved surface in future phase

EXHIBIT C

The following images illustrate the recommended trail classes based on common conditions:





Figure B-1
Trail Standards – Class 1 & 2

EXHIBIT C




Figure B-2
Trail Standards – Class 3 & 4

EXHIBIT C

[This page intentionally left blank]

DRAFT

APPENDIX C

Existing Park & Trail Inventory

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C

**TABLE C-2
EXISTING TRAIL INVENTORY**

Map ID	Trail Name	Miles	Notes
E 01	Sandy River Midway Trail	0.14	Sandy River Park
E 02	Ten Eyk Road to Hood Street	0.03	Neighborhood Path
E 02B	Hood Street Connection	0.02	Neighborhood Path
E 03	Upper Sandy River Trail	0.76	Sandy River Park
E 04	Lower Sandy River Trail	0.32	
E 05	Marcy Street Connector to Sandy River Park Trail	0.12	
E 06	Final Jim Slagle Loop Trail	0.95	
E 07	Jim Slagle Loop Featured Hike	1.54	
E 08	Bachelor Avenue to Golden Rain Street	0.05	Sandy Bluff Park
E 09	Sandy Bluff Park North Sidewalk	0.20	
E 10	Sandy Bluff Park Pod 4	0.13	
E 11	Sandy Bluff Park Pod 3	0.10	
E 12	Sandy Bluff Park Pod 2	0.08	
E 13	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Connector	0.01	
E 14	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Park West	0.04	
E 15	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Park North	0.05	
E 16	Bachelor Avenue to Sandy Bluff Park South	0.05	
E 17	Kate Schmidt Trail Section	0.14	Undeveloped Right of Way
E 18	Golden Rain Street to Olson Street	0.02	Sandy High School
E 19	Green Mountain Street to Golden Rain Street	0.04	
E 20	Emerald Cascade Street to Green Mountain Street	0.04	
E 21	Coralburst Street to Emerald Cascade Street	0.04	
E 22	Coralburst Street to Bell Street	0.02	
E 23	Sandy HS Edge Trail (SHS owned, Restricted Access)	0.38	Sandy High School Natural Area
E 24	Cascadia Village Park Trail	0.16	Cascadia Park
E 25	Wall Street Alley Trillium Street to Langensand Road	0.26	SE Tickle Creek - 395th Avenue to Langensand Road
E 26	Wall Street Alley to Jacoby Road	0.18	
E 27	Timberline Park Path	0.06	Timberline Park
E 28	Bornstedt Road Entrance	0.07	Deep Creek
E 29	Cascadia Village Drive to Redwood Street	0.04	
E 30	Galway Street to Highway 211	0.02	
E 31	Haskins Street to Jerger Street	0.03	Neighborhood Path
E 32	Meinig Park Access McCormick Drive	0.01	Meinig Park
E 33	Meinig Park Barker Courtt Access	0.03	
E 34	Dubarko Estates to Evans Street Path	0.07	Neighborhood Path

Map ID	Trail Name	Miles	Notes
E 35	Meinig Park Access Kimberly Drive	0.02	Meinig Park
E 36	Mitchell Court to Davis Street	0.04	Neighborhood Path
E 37	Barker Court to Langensand Road	0.03	Neighborhood Path
E 38	Langensand Road to Antler Avenue	0.14	Neighborhood Path
E 39	City Hall to Lower Parking	0.19	Meinig Park
E 40	Bathroom Path	0.08	
E 41	Lower Parking to Amphitheater	0.08	
E 42	Fantasy Forest to Lower Parking	0.06	
E 43	Bridge Path	0.03	
E 44	Ichabod to Katrina	0.04	Neighborhood Path
E 45	Sandy Heights Street Seaman Avenue to Beebee Court	0.03	Neighborhood Path
E 46	Solso Path	0.13	Gravel Road to Creek
E 47	Salmon Creek Estates Park Entrance	0.02	Salmon Estates Park
E 48	Barlow Ridge Trail	0.06	Barlow Ridge Park
E 49	Barlow Ridge Trail 2	0.12	
E 50	Barlow Ridge Trail 3	0.03	
E 51	Hamilton Ridge Paths	0.06	Hamilton Ridge Park
E 52	Tickle Creek Trail	1.61	
E 53	Salmon Creek Estates Trail	0.05	Salmon Estates Park
E 54	Bruns Road to Tupper Road Connector Trail	0.09	Neighborhood Path
E 55	Hamilton Ridge Tot Lot	0.02	Hamilton Ridge Park
E 56	Off Road Trail Hamilton Tot Lot	0.06	
E 57	Tickle Creek Trail Entrance by Orr Street	0.02	
E 58	Tickle Creek Trail Entrance near Double Creek	0.03	
E 59	Sandy Heights Street to Hamilton Ridge Drive	0.06	Hamilton Ridge Park
E 60	Towle Drive to Dubarko Path	0.06	Neighborhood Path
E 61	Rachel Drive to Tickle Ceerk Trail	0.07	Neighborhood Path
E 62	Sawyer Street to Highway 211	0.01	Neighborhood Path
E 63	Hamilton Ridge Drive to Dubarko Road	0.15	to Hamilton Ridge Park
E 64	Barlow Parkway to Dubarko Road	0.05	to Barlow Ridge Park
E 65	Barlow Parkway to Highway 211	0.02	Neighborhood Path
E 66	Miller Street to Seaman Avenue	0.02	Neighborhood Path
E 67	Miller Street to Dubarko Road	0.02	Neighborhood Path
E 68	Miller Street to Barlow Parkway	0.03	Neighborhood Path
Total		9.71	

APPENDIX D

Undeveloped Park Concepts

Champion Way Neighborhood Park

EXISTING CONDITIONS

- The park is bounded by Champion Way on the east and Chula Vista Avenue on the west. An alley between houses connects to the park from the south.
- Retaining walls and fences are located along both street frontages due to the steep transitions between the streets and the park.
- The central portion of the site is gently sloping, with steeper slopes along the transitions from the streets into the park.
- The alley provides an opportunity for an easier park entry point at similar elevation to the central area.
- There is a forested, natural area to the north and west of the park, with a potential trail connection to Tickle Creek Trail.

PARK CONCEPT

- The Champion Way Park concept includes standard neighborhood park amenities:
- Public access would be provided from all three street frontages.
 - A stairway would be provided on Champion Way due to the steep terrain.
 - Accessible paths would be provided from the alley and Chula Vista Avenue.
 - In addition to the accessible path, a stairway would be provided at the Chula Vista entrance to provide direct access up the hill into the park.
- The entries would connect to an internal loop trail in the central area of the park.
- The playground would be located at the north end of the park.
- An open lawn area would be located in the central portion of the park adjacent to the picnic shelter and playground.
- Additional picnic tables would be provided around the park.
- Trees would be planted along the south boundary to provide a buffer for the adjacent houses.

EXHIBIT C



ESA CHAMPION WAY PARK - SITE ANALYSIS
CITY OF SANDY



Figure D-1
Champion Way Park – Site Analysis

EXHIBIT C

**TABLE D-1
CHAMPION WAY PARK DEVELOPMENT COST ESTIMATE**

Item	Notes	Units	QTY	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Erosion Control	Construction entrance, tree protection, etc	LS	1	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000
Utilities	Water meter, backflow, trenching	LS	1	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000
Earthwork	Grading	CYD	2,000	\$ 40.00	\$ 80,000
ROW Extension	Half Street incl sidewalk, asphalt, curb	LF	150	\$ 500	\$ 75,000
ROW Extension	Sidewalk between ex and extension	SF	450	\$ 15	\$ 6,750
Paved Accessible Paths	Concrete Pavement - 6' width	SF	4,700	\$ 15	\$ 70,500
Stairs	Concrete w/ handrail - 7' width	SF	225	\$ 100	\$ 22,500
Picnic Shelter & Pad	Prefabricated - 16'x16'	EA	1	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
Playground Surfacing	Engineered wood fiber& subdrainage	SF	4,000	\$ 10	\$ 40,000
Playground Curb and Ramp		LF	285	\$ 30	\$ 8,550
Playground Equipment	Structure, swings, climber	LS	1	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Picnic Tables	Includes concrete pad	EA	7	\$ 2,000	\$ 14,000
Site Furnishings	Benches (3), bike racks (3), drinking fountain, dog bag dispenser, trash, bollards.	LS	1	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Park Signs	Entry and rules	LS	1	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Irrigation	Lawn and planting areas	SF	21,000	\$ 2.00	\$ 42,000
Open Lawn	Soil preparation and seeding	SF	13,000	\$ 2.00	\$ 26,000
Landscape Improvements	Trees, shrubs, and groundcover, mulch	SF	8,000	\$ 5.00	\$ 40,000
Subtotal of Construction Costs					\$ 605,300
Contingency (for Design Development)				25%	\$ 151,325
Contractors General Conditions (Mobilization, OH & Profit, Bonding & Insurance)				15%	\$ 90,795
Soft Costs (City Project Management, Design & Permitting Fees)				25%	\$ 151,325
Total Construction Costs					\$ 998,745

Assumptions:

1. Costs are in 2021 dollars and do not include escalation.
2. Costs do not include annual operations and maintenance fees
3. Cost estimate is a rough order of magnitude based on a preliminary park concept. Contingency is intended to cover design details to be determined.
4. Poured-in-place rubber surfacing in the playground would be an additional \$15 per square foot

DRY

EXHIBIT C

Deer Point Neighborhood Park


EXISTING CONDITIONS

- The park is easily accessed from the neighborhood to the west.
- The parcel is long and narrow.
- It is bounded by Meadow Avenue on the west and Fawn Street to the south.
- Traffic noise from Highway 26 can be heard in some portions of site.
- The site is gently sloping from south to north.
- Steeper slopes occur along the transitions from the streets into the park.
- There is a potential pedestrian connection to an existing sidewalk along Highway 26
- The park property could be expanded to the east with future development of that parcel.
- Mature trees, particularly in the expansion area to the east, provide shade.
- There is an existing drainage swale on the parcel east of the park.

PARK CONCEPT

- Sidewalks would be built along Meadow Avenue and Fawn Street.
- A paved, accessible trail would pass through the site, forming two loops with the sidewalks along the street.
- A trail connection would connect to the sidewalk along Highway 26.
- A picnic shelter is located in the north portion of the site adjacent to the loop trail and playground.
- A large multi-use field would be located in the central portion of the park.
- A basketball half-court or other sport court would be located at the south end of the park.
- If the park were expanded in the future, the trail loop could expand onto the adjacent parcel along with an additional picnic shelter and picnic areas. There is potential to add amenities such as disc golf, a bicycle pump track and/or more walking trails.

EXHIBIT C



ESA DEER POINT PARK - SITE ANALYSIS
CITY OF SANDY

0' 50'
SCALE: 1" = 50'

Figure D-2
Deer Point Park – Site Analysis

EXHIBIT C

**TABLE D-2
DEER POINT PARK DEVELOPMENT COST ESTIMATE**

Item	Notes	Units	QTY	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Erosion Control	Construction entrance, tree protection, etc	LS	1	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000
Utilities	Water meter, backflow, trenching	LS	1	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000
Earthwork & Site Prep	Rough and fine grading.	CYD	3,000	\$ 40.00	\$ 120,000
Paved Accessible Paths	Concrete Pavement - 6' width	SF	7,020	\$ 15	\$ 105,300
ROW	Half Street incl sidewalk, asphalt, curb	LF	200	\$ 500	\$ 100,000
Stairs	Concrete w/ handrail - 7' width	SF	175	\$ 100	\$ 17,500
Picnic Shelter & Pad	Prefabricated - 16'x16'	EA	1	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
Playground Surfacing	Engineered wood fiber & sub-drainage	SF	4,000	\$ 10	\$ 40,000
Playground Curb and Ramp		LF	255	\$ 30	\$ 7,650
Playground Equipment	Structure, swings, climbers, slide	LS	1	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Sports Court	Half court, backstop (1), benches(2)	LS	1	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Picnic Tables	Includes concrete pad	EA	7	\$ 2,000	\$ 14,000
Site Furnishings	Benches (3), bike racks (3), drinking fountain, dog bag dispenser, trash, bollards.	LS	1	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Park Signs	Entry and rules	LS	1	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Irrigation	Lawn and planting areas	SF	40,000	\$ 2.00	\$ 80,000
Open Lawn	Seeding and soil preparation	SF	20,000	\$ 2.50	\$ 50,000
Landscape Improvements	Shade trees, shrubs & ground cover, mulch	SF	10,000	\$ 5.00	\$ 50,000
ROW Landscape	Street trees & groundcover, mulch	SF	10,000	\$ 5.00	\$ 50,000
Subtotal of Construction Costs					\$ 874,450
Contingency (for Design Development)				25%	\$ 218,613
Contractors General Conditions (Mobilization, OH & Profit, Bonding & Insurance)				15%	\$ 131,168
Soft Costs (City Project Management, Design & Permitting Fees)				25%	\$ 218,613
Total Construction Costs					\$ 1,442,843

Assumptions:

1. Costs are in 2021 dollars and do not include escalation.
2. Costs do not include annual operations and maintenance fees
3. Cost estimate is a rough order of magnitude based on a preliminary park concept. Contingency is intended to cover design details to be determined.
4. Poured-in-place rubber surfacing in the playground would be an additional \$15 per square foot
5. Costs exclude work in potential expansion parcel to the east

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C

Ponder Lane Neighborhood Park

EXISTING CONDITIONS


- The parcel has good potential neighborhood access from Ponder Lane, a future street and Gunderson Road extension.
- Highway 211 is a barrier between the park and neighborhoods to the east.
- The park slopes gently from both the north and south toward a seasonal drainage in the center.
- Mature trees provide shade and screen views of adjacent uses.
- Traffic noise from Highway 211 can be heard within the park.

PARK CONCEPT

- Pedestrian access is possible from Ponder lane in the northeast corner, a future street in the northwest corner, and potentially Highway 211 in the southeast corner.
- A sidewalk would be built along Gunderson Road, connecting to an accessible paved loop trail within the park.
- A playground would be located in the northeast corner, adjacent to the trail and picnic areas.
- A picnic shelter would be located in the center of the park, between the dog park and the multi-use field.
- A fenced off-leash dog area would be located in the south portion of the park.
- All park features would be designed to meet accessibility requirements to the extent possible.
- There could be an opportunity for a crosswalk at Gunderson Road if the street were extended across Highway 211.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C



ESA PONDER LANE PARK - SITE ANALYSIS
CITY OF SANDY



Figure D-3
Ponder Lane Park – Site Analysis

EXHIBIT C

**TABLE D-3
PONDER LANE PARK DEVELOPMENT COST ESTIMATE**

Item	Notes	Units	QTY	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Erosion Control	Construction entrance, tree protection, etc	LS	1	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000
Utilities	Water meter, backflow, trenching, culverts	LS	1	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000
Earthwork & Site Prep	Rough and fine grading	CYD	4,000	\$ 40.00	\$ 160,000
Parking Lot	Asphalt	SF	4240	\$ 5	\$ 21,200
Parking Lot Curb and Ramp		LF	360	\$ 25	\$ 9,000
Paved Accessible Paths	Concrete Pavement - 6' width	SF	4,400	\$ 12	\$ 52,800
ROW Improvements	Half street incl. curb, sidewalk, asphalt				\$ 200,000
ROW Sidewalk	Concrete Pavement - 6' width	SF	3,360	\$ 12	\$ 40,320
Picnic Shelter & Pad	Prefabricated - 16'x16'	EA	1	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
Playground Surfacing	Engineered wood fiber, subdrainage	SF	7,930	\$ 10	\$ 79,300
Playground Curb and Ramp		LF	350	\$ 30	\$ 10,500
Playground Equipment	Structure, swings, slide, climbers	LS	1	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Picnic Tables	Includes concrete pad	EA	6	\$ 2,000	\$ 12,000
Site Furnisings	Benches (3), bike racks (3), drinking fountain, dog bag dispenser, trash, bollards.	LS	1	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Park Signs	Entry and rules	LS	1	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Irrigation	Multi-use field and dog park	SF	61,800	\$ 2.00	\$ 123,600
Open Lawn	Soil preparation and seeding (Multi-use field and Dog Park)	SF	61,800	\$ 2.00	\$ 123,600
Landscape Improvements	Trees, shrubs & groundcover, mulch	SF	12,000	\$ 5.00	\$ 60,000
ROW Landscape	Trees, shrubs & groundcover, mulch	SF	3,400	\$ 5.00	\$ 17,000
Dog Park	Fences, gates, hose bibs	LS	1	15,700	\$ 15,700
Subtotal of Construction Costs					\$ 1,120,020
Contingency (for Design Development)				25%	\$ 280,005
Contractors General Conditions (Mobilization, OH & Profit, Bonding & Insurance)				15%	\$ 168,003
Soft Costs (City Project Management, Design & Permitting Fees)				25%	\$ 280,005
Total Construction Costs					\$ 1,848,033

Assumptions:

1. Costs are in 2021 dollars and do not include escalation.
2. Costs do not include annual operations and maintenance fees
3. Cost estimate is a rough order of magnitude based on a preliminary park concept. Contingency is intended to cover design details to be determined.
4. Poured-in-place rubber surfacing in the playground would be an additional \$15 per square foot




EXHIBIT C

Sandy Community Campus

The City has the potential to use Urban Renewal Agency (URA) and other funds to renovate the school grounds into a park. Based on the needs analysis, the City would benefit from an additional neighborhood or community park in this area.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

- The Sandy Community Campus park site includes an old football field and track from the former school.
- The majority of the park is fairly flat, before sloping up to the former school buildings at the south end.
- The north end of the park transitions into forested slope and connects to the Sandy River Park natural area.
- The Sandy Skate Park is located in the southeast corner of the site.

PARK CONCEPT

- A preliminary concept for redevelopment of the park was created as part of the Aquatic Facility Analysis. The entire park will be too expensive to develop all at one time. The concept was broken into four phases. Below is the full build out concept.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C



Figure D-4
Sandy Community Campus Master Plan

EXHIBIT C

[This page intentionally left blank]

DRAFT

APPENDIX E

Potential Grants

Oregon Park & Recreation Department (OPRD) Grant Programs

OPRD administers a number of grant programs that can be used to support planning, design and development of public parks and trails. These grants focus on capital improvements and do not provide funding for maintenance and operations.

- Local Government Grant Program (LGGP) can be used for acquisition, planning, development or major rehabilitation of public outdoor park and recreation facilities that are consistent with the goals outlined in the SCORP. A 40% match is required for communities the size of Sandy. The City's share of the match can be composed of a variety of sources including donations, City labor and equipment, general fund, other grant sources, SDC's, cost of land acquisition within the past 6 years, and/or cost of planning within the last two years.
- Recreational Trails Program (RTP) is a federally funded grant program that is administered by OPRD. It can be used to fund a variety of trail project types, including land or easement acquisition, trail and trailhead design, renovation of existing trails, safety improvements, and construction. The required match ranges from 20-40% depending on the size of the grant requested and can include volunteer labor and other donations.
- Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is another federally funded grant program that is administered by OPRD. The grants can be used to fund land acquisition and development of outdoor recreation facilities. Eligible projects need to be consistent with SCORP goals and objectives, the local adopted comprehensive plan or park system master plan, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). LWCF will fund up to 50% of project costs, but unlike the LGGP, prior project costs cannot be used for a match. Use of LWCF funding results in a permanent Section 6(f) resource protection to maintain the site for public recreation in perpetuity. Impacts to a 6(f) protected site require an extensive review and approval process, similar to an environmental impact analysis, and any impacts need to be mitigated to replace the lost recreation area in kind.

In addition, OPRD includes compiled sources of grant opportunities on their website. Links to the documents are below:

Potential Funding Sources for Outdoor Recreation:

<https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/GRA/Documents/GRA-Other-Outdoor-Recreation-Funding-Sources.pdf>

Potential Recreational Trail Funding Sources:

<https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/GRA/Documents/GRA-Other-Recreational-Trail-Funding-Sources.pdf>

EXHIBIT C

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Grant Programs

ODOT's Local Government Assistance program administers transportation oriented grant programs to facilitate transportation improvements throughout the state. Many of these are specific to vehicular transportation, but a selection are available for pedestrian and bicycle safety and connectivity, and can be used for trail systems and crossing safety improvements.

- Connect Oregon Program can be used for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements to ensure that Oregon's transportation system is diverse and efficient. The grant is competitive and requires a 30% match from other funding sources.
- Safe Routes to Schools focusses on bicycle and pedestrian improvements to facilitate safe access between residential areas and schools. Funds can be used for sidewalk, bike lanes, crosswalk safety improvements, including flashing beacons. The funds are limited and highly competitive
- Competitive Construction Grant Program.

DRAFT

APPENDIX F

Preliminary Parks System Development
Charge Analysis

DRAFT

To: Tracy Johnson, Environmental Science Associates

Date: April 23, 2021

From: Doug Gabbard, FCS GROUP

CC: John Ghilarducci, FCS GROUP

RE: Preliminary Parks SDC Analysis


PRELIMINARY PARKS SDC ANALYSIS

This technical memorandum provides a preliminary calculation of a new parks system development charge (SDC) for the City of Sandy (City).

METHOD OF CALCULATION

SDCs are one-time fees imposed on new and increased development to recover the cost of system facilities needed to serve that growth.

In general, SDCs are calculated by adding an improvement fee component and a reimbursement fee component (if applicable)—both with potential adjustments. Each component is calculated by dividing the eligible cost by growth in units of demand. The unit of demand becomes the basis of the charge. Below is an illustration of this calculation:



GROWTH

In a parks master plan, growth is often measured as an increase in population due to new development (including redevelopment) activities. The increase in population causes an increase in parks usage. According to the City’s new parks master plan, population in the city is expected to grow to 19,100 from 11,650 during the planning period of 2020 to 2035. This implies a growth of 7,450 residents during the planning period, which will form the denominator of the SDC calculation.

Further, a growth of 7,450 residents means that 39.01 percent of the 2035 population will be residents that arrive during the planning period. That percentage is called the growth share. The growth share will be useful in the improvement fee section of this memo.

IMPROVEMENT FEE COST BASIS

A project's eligible cost is the product of its total cost and its eligibility percentage. The eligibility percentage represents the portion of the project that creates capacity for future users.

Calculating the eligibility percentage for parks projects can be done in multiple ways. Parks projects can generally be divided into two lists: the expansion list and the infill list. Projects on the expansion list add a measurable quantity of park acres, trail miles, or special use facilities to the parks system inventory. Projects on the infill list add amenities to existing park facilities. Each list requires a different method of determining the eligibility of its projects. Both lists will be discussed in separate sections below and then brought back together to determine the full improvement fee cost basis.

Expansion List

Projects on the expansion list add a measurable quantity of park acres, trail miles, or special use facilities to the parks system inventory. The two tables below show all the parks projects that fit that description. The tables also display the park type of each parks project, the priority tier of each project, its total cost, and the quantity of acres or trail miles added. In addition, the last two columns of **Table 1** shows the number and type of park acres absorbed from other parks.

Table 1: Park Projects on the Expansion List

Park Name	Park Type	Tier	Total Cost	Acres Added	Acres Absorbed	Type of Park Acres Absorbed
Deer Point Park	Neighborhood Park	Tier 1	\$ 1,382,100	0.99	0.99	Undeveloped Park
Champion Way Park	Neighborhood Park	Tier 1	840,600	1.41	1.41	Undeveloped Park
Ponder Lane Park	Neighborhood Park	Tier 1	1,468,200	2.00	2.00	Undeveloped Park
Jewelberry NE	Neighborhood Park	Tier 1	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Ruben	Natural & Open Space	Tier 1	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Vista Loop	Neighborhood Park	Tier 1	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Community North	Community Park	Tier 1	6,562,500	15.00	-	
Tickle Creek Expansion - West	Natural & Open Space	Tier 1	-	-	-	
North Bluff	Mini Park	Tier 2	325,000	0.50	-	
Colorado East	Mini Park	Tier 2	325,000	0.50	-	
Kelso 362nd	Neighborhood Park	Tier 2	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Jarl Road	Neighborhood Park	Tier 2	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Deer Point Expansion	Neighborhood Park	Tier 2	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Vista Loop SW	Neighborhood Park	Tier 2	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Community South	Community Park	Tier 2	6,562,500	15.00	-	
Tickle Creek Expansion - Central	Natural & Open Space	Tier 2	-	-	-	
Tickle Creek Expansion - East	Natural & Open Space	Tier 2	-	-	-	
Orient	Mini Park	Tier 3	325,000	0.50	-	
Martin Road	Mini Park	Tier 3	325,000	0.50	-	
Village Boulevard South	Mini Park	Tier 3	325,000	0.50	-	
Colorado	Neighborhood Park	Tier 3	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Gunderson Road West	Neighborhood Park	Tier 3	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Trubel	Neighborhood Park	Tier 3	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Langensand SW	Neighborhood Park	Tier 3	1,250,000	2.00	-	
Community East	Community Park	Tier 3	6,562,500	15.00	-	
Ruben	Natural & Open Space	Tier 3	-	-	-	
Sandy Community Campus - Phases 1-4	Community Park		9,950,200	14.00	14.00	Undeveloped Park
			\$ 48,703,600	87.90	18.40	

Source: Environmental Science Associates, City staff.

Table 2: Trail Projects on the Expansion List

Trail Name	Tier	Total Cost	Miles Added
Sandy Bluff Park Pond Loop Trail	Tier 1	\$ 45,200	0.21
Bell Street to Sandy Bluff Park	Tier 1	59,600	0.28
Kate Schmidt to Bell Street	Tier 1	26,600	0.12
SHS Trail Easement 1*	Tier 1	82,500	0.38
Community Campus to Sandy River Trail	Tier 1	22,300	0.59
Park Street to Community Campus	Tier 1	1,700	0.05
Vista Loop to Hood Street	Tier 1	467,600	0.92
Tickle Creek Reroutes	Tier 1	57,100	0.26
Tupper Park to Gerilyn Court	Tier 1	28,700	0.06
Tickle Creek to Highway 211	Tier 1	65,300	0.30
Trickle Creek Extension East to Dubarko Underpass	Tier 1	55,900	0.26
Trickle Creek Extension Dubarko East to Jacoby	Tier 1	92,100	0.42
Alleyway to Trickle Creek Trail Connector	Tier 1	35,000	0.07
Jacoby Road to Trickle Creek Connector	Tier 1	26,100	0.05
Kelso Bluff to Orient	Tier 2	1,025,300	1.61
Kelso to Powerline	Tier 2	172,200	0.79
Sunflower to Powerline	Tier 2	28,600	0.06
Olson to Powerline	Tier 2	76,300	0.15
Sandy Bluff Park to 362nd	Tier 2	136,200	0.63
Slagle Loop to Jonsrud Overlook	Tier 2	35,800	0.96
Sandy River Lower Loop	Tier 2	12,500	0.33
Sandy River North Loop	Tier 2	9,900	0.26
Park Street to Sandy River Trail	Tier 2	6,200	0.16
Fir Drive to Community Campus	Tier 2	18,600	0.50
Trickle Creek Extension within UGR	Tier 2	354,600	1.64
Champion Way to Tickle Creek	Tier 2	7,200	0.19
Barnum to Tickle Creek	Tier 2	5,400	0.14
Salmon Creek Park to Barnum Road	Tier 2	87,700	0.17
Sunset Street to Tickle Creek	Tier 2	12,200	0.32
Sunset Street to Nettie Connett Drive	Tier 2	94,900	0.19
Bluff Road to Sandy Heights	Tier 2	10,800	0.29
Market Road Public Easement	Tier 2	95,500	0.19
Sandy Heights to Meinig Connection	Tier 2	10,700	0.29
Tickle Creek Jacoby Rd to Meadows Ave Extension	Tier 2	161,100	0.74
Highway 211 to Bornstedt Park	Tier 2	72,800	0.14
Kelso Park to Orient Park	Tier 3	147,400	0.68
362nd to Kelso Park	Tier 3	96,500	0.45
Orient to Powerline	Tier 3	128,000	0.59
Meeker to MH Athletic Club	Tier 3	32,500	0.06
Vista Loop to Longstreet Lane	Tier 3	514,600	1.02
Orient to Tickle Creek	Tier 3	82,400	0.38
Tickle Creek to Colorado & Rachel	Tier 3	212,000	0.98
Tickle Creek to Deer Point Park	Tier 3	403,200	0.80
Dubarko Extension Road	Tier 3	119,300	0.19
Bornstedt Road to Trubel Road	Tier 3	462,300	0.73
Village South to Trubel Road	Tier 3	582,000	0.91
Jacoby West to Village South	Tier 3	348,200	0.55
Cascadia to Jacoby West	Tier 3	95,400	0.19
Highway 216 to Jacoby	Tier 3	963,900	1.51
Tickle Creek Connector Sewer Easement	Tier 3	853,100	3.94
Total		\$ 8,541,000	26.69

Source: Environmental Science Associates, City staff.

Note that the costs for projects on these two tables do not include land acquisition costs, although those are perfectly eligible for inclusion in an improvement fee (as long as they are not recovered in any other kind of development impact fee).

For projects on the expansion list, eligibility is determined by a level-of-service analysis that quantifies the park facilities that are needed for growth (and are therefore eligible to be included in an improvement fee cost basis). Park facilities can be measured by sorting them into categories, or by considering their respective units of measurement. Further, in either approach, the current or future level-of-service may be targeted. These two separate choices create four distinct and equally defensible ways of calculating the eligibility percentage of each project.

Each method will be examined in the sections below.

Current Level-of-Service (By Category and Unit of Measurement)

Determining SDC eligibility for parks projects using the current level-of-service requires determining the quantity of parks facilities needed to maintain the current level-of-service. Any projects that add facilities in excess of that quantity are ineligible.

The City has seven relevant parks categories for determining its level-of-service by category. These are shown in the upper panel of the first column in **Table 3**. Each category receives its own level-of-service. Using neighborhood parks as an example, the City currently has 16.89 acres of neighborhood parks. Using the 2020 population discussed above, this implies that there are 1.45 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents. The parks project list, when completed, will add 24.40 acres of neighborhood parks. However, based on the 2035 population and the current level-of-service, only 10.80 additional acres of neighborhood parks are needed. So, only 10.80 acres out of the 24.40 acres added by the project list are eligible for inclusion in the improvement fee cost basis, or 44.27 percent.

The same line of reasoning is used to develop the eligibility percentages for other parks categories. Further, calculating eligibility using level-of-service by unit of measurement follows the same approach. The eligibility percentage for each parks category or unit of measurement is shown in the “Eligibility” column of **Table 3**.

Table 3: Improvement Fee Eligibility under the Current Level of Service

	Units	2020 Quantity	2020 Units per 1,000 Residents	Change in Quantity	Additional Needed to Maintain LoS	Eligibility
By category:						
Mini Park	Acres	3.87	0.33	2.50	2.47	98.99%
Neighborhood Park	Acres	16.89	1.45	24.40	10.80	44.27%
Community Park	Acres	10.82	0.93	59.00	6.92	11.73%
Natural & Open Space	Acres	224.64	19.28	2.00	143.65	100.00%
Undeveloped Park	Acres	22.51	1.93	-18.40	14.39	0.00%
Special Use Area	Number	4.00	0.34	0.00	2.56	0.00%
Trail	Miles	9.84	0.84	26.69	6.29	23.57%
By Unit of Measurement:						
Acres of Parks and Natural Areas	Acres	278.73	23.93	69.50	178.24	100.00%
Number of Special Use Sites	Number	4.00	0.34	0.00	2.56	0.00%
Miles of Trails	Miles	9.84	0.84	26.69	6.29	23.57%

Source: Environmental Science Associates, City staff.

Future Level-of-Service (By Category and Unit of Measurement)

To determine SDC eligibility using the future level-of-service, the proposed additional quantity of parks facilities is added to the current quantity of parks facilities. Using the future population, a future level-of-service is then calculated. Then, that level-of-service is compared to the current parks system to determine if any current deficiencies exist against the future level-of-service. Only parks projects that do not cure existing deficiencies are considered eligible for the improvement fee cost basis under this method.

As in the previous section, calculating SDC eligibility based on future level-of-service can be done both when measuring parks facilities by category and when measuring by unit of measurement.

Table 4 below outlines both methods using the future level-of-service. Using neighborhood parks as an example, the City currently has 16.89 acres of neighborhood parks. The parks project list, when completed, will add 24.40 acres of neighborhood parks. This results in a future level-of-service of 2.16 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents in 2035. If that level-of-service was applied to the 2020 population, a minimum of 25.18 acres would be needed. However, there are currently only 16.89 acres. Thus, the difference between 16.89 and 25.18 acres, or 8.29 acres, must be added to the system to cure a deficiency. So, only the remaining 16.11 acres added by the project list, or 66.01 percent of the neighborhood parks projects, are eligible for inclusion in the improvement fee cost basis under this method.

The same approach is used to develop the eligibility percentages for other parks categories. Calculating eligibility using level-of-service by unit of measurement follows the same logic. The eligibility percentage for each parks category or unit of measurement is shown in the “Eligibility” column of **Table 4** below.

When calculating an SDC based on the future level-of-service, it is possible that there may be park facilities eligible for inclusion in a reimbursement fee. This occurs when the future level-of-service for a parks category or unit of measurement is lower than the current level-of-service. If this is this case, and if the future level-of-service is targeted, then it follows that the parks system has an excess of parks facilities. The final column of **Table 4**, “Reimbursable Quantity,” shows the reimbursable quantity of parks facilities by category and unit of measurement which can be used to calculate a reimbursement fee.

Table 4: Improvement Fee Eligibility under the Future Level of Service

	Units	2020 Quantity	Change in Quantity	2040 Units per 1,000 Residents	2020 Minimum Quantity	Eligibility	Reimbursable Quantity
By category:							
Mini Park	Acres	3.87	2.50	0.33	3.89	99.39%	-
Neighborhood Park	Acres	16.89	24.40	2.16	25.18	66.01%	-
Community Park	Acres	10.82	59.00	3.66	42.59	46.16%	-
Natural & Open Space	Acres	224.64	2.00	11.87	138.24	100.00%	86.40
Undeveloped Park	Acres	22.51	-18.40	0.22	2.51	0.00%	20.00
Special Use Area	Number	4.00	0.00	0.21	2.44	0.00%	1.56
Trail	Miles	9.84	26.69	1.91	22.28	53.38%	-
By Unit of Measurement:							
Acres of Parks and Natural Areas	Acres	278.73	69.50	18.23	212.40	100.00%	66.33
Number of Special Use Sites	Number	4.00	0.00	0.21	2.44	0.00%	1.56
Miles of Trails	Miles	9.84	26.69	1.91	22.28	53.38%	-

Source: Environmental Science Associates, City staff.

Infill List

Projects on the infill list do not add park acres or trail miles to the parks system, but they do add amenities to existing park facilities that will be used by both current and future users. **Table 5** displays all projects on the infill list.

If a project adds amenities, those amenities are assumed to benefit both current and future users proportionately. Therefore, that project’s eligibility percentage is assumed to be the growth share discussed in the “Growth” section above. Projects that do not add amenities, but instead repair or renovate existing amenities, do not add capacity for future users and so receive an eligibility percentage of zero percent.

Table 5: Infill List Projects

	Tier	Total Cost	Eligibility	Eligible Costs
Sandy Bluff Park	Tier 1	\$ 125,000	39.01%	\$ 48,757
Sandy River Park - Phase 1	Tier 1	800,000	39.01%	312,042
Bornstedt Park - Phase 2	Tier 2	252,000	39.01%	98,293
Tupper Park	Tier 2	750,000	39.01%	292,539
Meinig Memorial Park	Tier 2	273,200	39.01%	106,562
Sandy River Park - Phase 2	Tier 2	650,000	39.01%	253,534
Meinig Memorial Park	Tier 3	500,000	0.00%	-
Sandy River Park Addition	Tier 3	-	39.01%	-
Total		\$ 3,350,200		\$ 1,111,727

Source: Environmental Science Associates, City staff.

Improvement Fee Cost Basis

Combining the eligible costs identified in the expansion and infill lists creates the full improvement fee cost basis. **Table 6** displays all four methods of calculating the eligible costs of the expansion list. While the eligible cost of the expansion list varies by method, the eligible cost of the infill list does not vary. As shown, the eligible costs for the improvement fee ranges from \$16.6 million when targeting the current level-of-service by category up to \$54.4 million when targeting the future level-of-service by unit of measurement.

Table 6: Improvement Fee Cost Basis

	Cost	Current LoS		Future LoS	
		Eligibility	Eligible Cost	Eligibility	Eligible Cost
By Category					
Mini Park	\$ 1,625,000	99%	\$ 1,608,624	99%	\$ 1,615,012
Neighborhood Park	16,190,900	44%	7,167,062	66%	10,686,831
Community Park	29,637,700	12%	3,475,763	46%	13,680,288
Natural & Open Space	1,250,000	100%	1,250,000	100%	1,250,000
Undeveloped Park	-	0%	-	0%	-
Special Use Area	-	0%	-	0%	-
Trail	8,541,000	24%	2,013,460	53%	4,559,543
Expansion Projects Total	\$ 57,244,600		\$ 15,514,909		\$ 31,791,673
Infill Projects	3,350,200		1,111,727		1,111,727
Total	\$ 60,594,800		\$ 16,626,636		\$ 32,903,401
By Unit of Measurement					
Acres of Parks and Natural Areas	\$ 48,703,600	100%	\$ 48,703,600	100%	\$ 48,703,600
Number of Special Use Sites	-	0%	-	0%	-
Miles of Trails	8,541,000	24%	2,013,460	53%	4,559,543
Expansion Projects Total	\$ 57,244,600		\$ 50,717,060		\$ 53,263,143
Infill Projects	3,350,200		1,111,727		1,111,727
Total	\$ 60,594,800		\$ 51,828,788		\$ 54,374,870

Source: Previous tables.

REIMBURSEMENT FEE COST BASIS

The reimbursement fee collects the cost of existing parks facilities that are available for future users. A reimbursement fee is possible for a parks SDC only when the future level-of-service is targeted. As discussed in the sections above, the parks system does have park facilities available for future use. However, the costs for these park facilities were not calculated for this preliminary parks SDC analysis, and so there is no reimbursement fee cost basis in this memo.

ADJUSTMENTS

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 223.307(5) authorizes the expenditure of SDCs on “the costs of complying with the provisions of ORS 223.297 to 223.314, including the costs of developing system development charge methodologies and providing an annual accounting of system development charge expenditures.” To avoid spending monies for compliance that might otherwise have been spent on growth-related projects, this report includes an estimate of compliance costs in the SDC cost basis. After consultation with the City, we estimate the City will spend about \$28,290 over the planning period on the compliance costs allowed by statute.

Another typical adjustment to an SDC is the deduction of available fund balance from the total cost basis. Existing fund balance of \$1,223,401 was deducted from the improvement fee cost basis.

CALCULATED SDC

Table 7 below summarizes the calculation of the SDC. As shown, the total cost basis ranges from \$15.4 million up to \$53.2 million depending on the method chosen for calculating level-of-service. When dividing by the expected growth in residents during the planning period of 7,450, the total SDC per resident ranges from \$2,075 up to \$7,142. Because each method is equally defensible, \$7,142 is the maximum allowable SDC per resident.

Table 7: Calculated SDC

	Current by Category	Future by Category	Current by Unit	Future by Unit
Cost Basis:				
Improvement Fee	\$ 16,626,636	\$ 32,903,401	\$ 51,828,788	\$ 54,374,870
Estimated Improvement Fee Fund Balance	(1,223,401)	(1,223,401)	(1,223,401)	(1,223,401)
Compliance Costs	28,290	28,290	28,290	28,290
Total Cost Basis	\$ 15,431,525	\$ 31,708,290	\$ 50,633,677	\$ 53,179,759
Growth in Residents	7,450	7,450	7,450	7,450
Improvement Fee per Resident	\$ 2,071	\$ 4,256	\$ 6,796	\$ 7,138
Compliance Fee per Resident	4	4	4	4
Total SDC per Resident	\$ 2,075	\$ 4,260	\$ 6,800	\$ 7,142
Fee Schedule:	Residents per Dwelling Unit			
Single-family dwelling unit	2.73	\$ 5,665	\$ 11,629	\$ 18,563
Multi-family dwelling unit	2.02	4,200	8,622	13,763
Mobile home dwelling unit	2.20	4,563	9,366	14,952
				15,703

Source: Previous tables, City staff, 2015-2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Tables B25024 and B25033 (residents per dwelling unit).

The last panel in **Table 7** shows the SDC calculated for various residential development types. The SDC is scaled to these types based on the average number of residents per dwelling unit, which is taken from Census data. As shown, the maximum allowable SDC for a single-family dwelling unit is \$19,496.

FUNDING PLAN

If the City implements the full parks SDCs calculated above, SDC revenues will still not be sufficient to cover the cost of the project list and additional revenue will be needed. Further, if a lower SDC is implemented, the amount to be collected from other sources will grow. **Table 8** below provides a summary of the funding plan for the City's project list under the recommended method of calculating the parks SDC.

Table 8: Funding Plan

	Future by Unit
Resources	
Beginning fund balance	\$ 1,223,401
SDC revenue	53,179,759
Other needed revenue	6,219,930
Total resources	\$ 60,623,090
Uses	
Project list (total cost)	\$ 60,594,800
Compliance costs	28,290
Ending fund balance	-
Total requirements	\$ 60,623,090

Source: Environmental Science Associates, City staff, previous tables.

At a minimum, the City will require \$6,219,930 of non-SDC revenue to complete the capital improvement plan. One possible source is a general obligation bond with a voter-approved levy. As shown in the table below, the tax rate required to pay the debt service on such a bond issue would be 47.67 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value. For a house with an assessed value of \$300,000, the annual debt service levy would be \$143.

Table 9: General Obligation Bond with Low Proceeds

	Low Scenario
Bond proceeds	\$6,219,930
Interest rate	4.00%
Maturity (years)	20
Annual debt service	\$457,673
Assessed value in FY 2020-21	\$960,166,014
Bond levy tax rate	\$0.4767
Tax on \$300,000 house	\$143

In contrast, if the City wished to finance its entire capital improvement plan with a general obligation bond and make park SDCs unnecessary, the burden on a house with an assessed value of \$300,000 would be \$1,393 per year.

Table 10: General Obligation Bond with High Proceeds

	High Scenario
Bond proceeds	\$60,594,800
Interest rate	4.00%
Maturity (years)	20
Annual debt service	\$4,458,671
Assessed value in FY 2020-21	\$960,166,014
Bond levy tax rate	\$4.6436
Tax on \$300,000 house	\$1,393

INDEXING

ORS 223.304 allows for the periodic indexing of SDCs for inflation, as long as the index used is:

- (A) A relevant measurement of the average change in prices or costs over an identified time period for materials, labor, real property or a combination of the three;
- (B) Published by a recognized organization or agency that produces the index or data source for reasons that are independent of the system development charge methodology; and
- (C) Incorporated as part of the established methodology or identified and adopted in a separate ordinance, resolution or order.

We recommend that the City index its parks SDC to the *Engineering News Record* Construction Cost Index for the 20-City Average and adjust charges annually. There is no comparable Oregon-specific index.

OPPORTUNITIES TO REFINE THE ANALYSIS

This SDC analysis should be considered preliminary. Further data and analysis will improve the defensibility of the SDC. **Table 11** outlines some of the opportunities for improvement. Each item is listed with its estimated impact on the final calculated SDC.

Table 11: Analysis Improvement Opportunities

	Likely Impact on SDC
Year of Construction for Existing Parks	Higher
More Accurate Compliance Cost Estimates	Higher
Land Acquisition Costs	Higher
Planned Year of Construction for Future Parks	None
Reimbursement Fee Fund Balance	Unknown
Better Categorization of Expansion Projects	Unknown

Note that while outlining the planned year of construction for future parks will have no impact on the final SDC number, showing the timing of projects in the SDC methodology is required by ORS 223.309(1).

APPENDIX G

Public Outreach Summary

SANDY PARKS AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC OUTREACH SUMMARY

Prepared for:
City of Sandy



Prepared by:
JLA Public Involvement

Winter 2021

DRAFT

Project Overview

Over the course of 2020, the City of Sandy worked to update their Parks and Trails Master Plan to better serve the community's needs now and into the future. In addition to conducting research on the existing conditions, the Master Plan update has been guided by input from the community to help the City ensure future park and trail projects serve the needs and desires of Sandy residents. The goals of the update are to:

- Identify the necessary parks and trails that are needed as the city grows.
- Distribute and build parks and trails equitably, so they serve everyone in the city.

Two phases of targeted outreach were conducted:

- Phase 1: Outreach was conducted from January – March 2020 and focused on creating awareness of the project, sharing existing conditions information, and gathering feedback about the community's needs and desires for future parks and trails facilities.
- Phase 2: Outreach was conducted in September – October 2020 and was focused on reporting out what was heard from the community in the previous phase, as well as sharing and soliciting feedback on proposed improvements to the overall Parks and Trails system and concepts for Champion Way, Deer Point, and Ponder Lane neighborhood parks, and the Sandy Community Campus.

Following both phases of public outreach, the draft Master Plan will be revised to include community input before sharing it with the City Council for acceptance.

PHASE 1 OUTREACH (JANUARY – MARCH 2020)

Participation and Format

The first phase of outreach included the following activities:

Stakeholder Interviews

On January 28, 2020, twelve community stakeholders were interviewed in small groups with two to three people and in some cases, one. These stakeholders were recruited based on their special knowledge, expertise, or experience with the Sandy Parks system. Each interview began with introductions and a brief project overview from the City and ESA. The main purpose of the interviews was to gather insight on needs, gaps and priorities within the Parks and Trails system that would help inform the Master Plan development process. A summary of the stakeholder interviews can be found at the end of this document in **Appendix B**.

Open House #1

The first in-person open house took place on February 27, 2020 at the Sandy Senior Center. Attendees were provided a project fact sheet at the door and invited to view a variety of display boards, as well as speak with project staff from the City of Sandy. Display boards included project information and feedback opportunities in the form of a dot exercise to identify preferred park amenities. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and provide comments on print versions of the survey. **Approximately 28 people attended the open house and 21 completed survey questionnaires at the event.** A summary of the feedback received can be found in at the end of this document in **Appendix C**.

EXHIBIT C

Bilingual Event

The project team held a bilingual event to gather feedback via hard copy questionnaires on March 11, 2020 at the Sandy Vista Apartments, a complex that houses predominately Spanish-speaking individuals and families. Participants were able to share their experience with Sandy parks, learn more about the park system, ask questions, and submit print surveys. Bilingual staff assisted with the presentation and communication with community members. The survey was available in both English and Spanish language versions at the event. **A total of 27 people submitted print survey responses.** A summary of the feedback received can be found in at the end of this document in **Appendix D.**

Online Survey

In addition to the in-person events, a corresponding online survey was available from February 28 to March 15, 2020. **A total of 81 surveys were submitted online.** A summary of the feedback received can be found in at the end of this document in **Appendix C.**

Outreach and Notification

For the first phase of outreach, the following methods were used to promote participation in the open house events and the online survey.

- Project website: The City posted information on the project website about the open house event and a link to the online survey.
- City e-mail list: The City distributed an announcement about the open house and online survey to their e-mail list.
- Social media posts: The City posted an event to their Facebook page advertising the in-person open house and shared the online survey on Facebook separately.
- Spanish Language outreach event at Sandy Vista: Flyers were distributed to every apartment unit and posted in the common areas with the date, time and location of the meeting.

PHASE 2 OUTREACH (SEPTEMBER – OCTOBER 2020)

Participation and Format

The second phase of outreach included the following activities:

Online Open House Event

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 public health crisis, the outreach was primarily online. The online open house event was posted for public viewing and participation from September 24 to October 25. During that time, the site garnered 1,573 unique visitors, with 72 people completing the online questionnaire. A summary of the feedback received can be found in at the end of this document in **Appendix E.** The bilingual mailer can be found in **Appendix F.**

Online open house located at: <https://openhouse.jla.us.com/sandy-ptsm#>

Spanish Language Community Survey

Since a second follow-up event at Sandy Vista Apartments was not possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a Spanish language survey was developed and distributed to residents of Sandy Vista in order to provide current information about the Master Plan effort and solicit input on proposed park designs concepts. A summary of the feedback received can be found in at the end of this document in **Appendix E.**

EXHIBIT C

Outreach and Notification

For the fall round of outreach, a flyer was developed and distributed to the community by the City to promote the online open house feedback opportunity. In addition, the City promoted the event on their Social Media platforms and distributed the link to the online open house via their e-mail list serve. The city website also directed visitors to the online open house.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX E.1: PROJECT FACT SHEET

Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan



In Sandy we are proud of our parks system, from the 1.75-mile Tickle Creek Trail, to neighborhood playgrounds, to the 127-acre Sandy River Park. All told, there are 17 facilities within Sandy city limits. Those parks, grounds, trails and open spaces are maintained by just two full-time employees and a summer worker.

But the city is growing. After more than 20 years, it is time for an updated Parks & Trails Master Plan to serve our growing community in the near future, and for years to come.

What's a "Master Plan"?

It's a reference document, a little like a map or an owner's manual. In this case, the City of Sandy will use it to help make sure future park and trail projects serve the goals, needs and hopes of residents like you.

The master plan will help us with two things:

- Identify the necessary parks and trails needed as the city grows.
- Distribute and build parks and trails equitably, so they serve everyone in the city.

This requires planning both in the short term (including what features the next new park should have) and the long term (including where to acquire land now that will become parks and trails in future decades.




EXHIBIT C



We need your input!

We need you to tell us how you use parks now and how you may use them in the future. This might include parks and trails connectivity and how you access them.

We also want to hear your preferences for potential park and trail projects and learn which ones you think should take priority (and why) as money becomes available.

What's next

The planning process is currently underway and will take approximately 10 months to complete. There will be multiple opportunities for community engagement and input to help guide the process. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), comprised of Sandy community members will meet at multiple times throughout the project to help guide the work of the project team, in addition to one-on-one interviews with key community groups, public open houses and online surveys.

**December–
January**

Project start,
establish priorities

**February–
April**


Existing Conditions
and Needs Assessment

**August–
October**

Plan Development
and Concepts

Mid-2021

Plan Adoption



For questions or more information, contact Nancy Ream Enabnit: 503.668.7535 | nancyenabnit@gmail.com.

EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX E.2: STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On January 28, 2020, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), JLA Public Involvement and the City of Sandy interviewed twelve community stakeholders based on their special knowledge, expertise or experience with the Sandy Parks system. Interviews were conducted in small groups with two to three people and in some cases, one. Each interview began with introductions and a brief project overview from the City and ESA. The main purpose of the interviews was to gather insight on needs, gaps and priorities within the Parks and Trails system that would help inform the Master Plan development process.

This report is a compilation of stakeholder responses that summarizes the key themes and most-often heard comments, and a few individual responses are included to give a fuller indication of the type of feedback received.

STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED:

- Melissa Thompson, Sandy Senior Center & area resident
- Juntu Oberg, NW Trails Alliance
- Olga Gerberg, Latinx Community
- Carol Cohen, OBRA & area resident
- Susan Drew, Community Gardens & area resident
- Martin Montgomery, Sandy Mt. Festival & Kiwanis
- Joseph Preston, Parks Maintenance
- Chris Hargrave, Youth Sports & area resident
- Sarah Richardson, Adult Softball, Dog Park & area resident
- Carissa Strobel, Mike Strobel and Lori Engdall, Eastwind Running

Several other groups were invited, but did not attend, including:

- Sandy Helping Hands
- Ant Farm
- Community Action Center
- Sandy Transit
- SHS Green Club
- Mt. Hood Athletic Club
- Swimming Pool
- Police
- Library
- Pickle Ball

KEY THEMES:

Several themes emerged. It is important to note that these themes are not universally accepted points of view, but simply those that were raised by multiple interviewees.

Feedback about Needed facilities/amenities:

The following thoughts and ideas were offered by interview participants when asked what they felt was needed in regard to future Parks and Trails facilities and amenities. Most ideas were offered by more than one person, and a few were just mentioned by one.

EXHIBIT C

- Pump tracks/skills course
- Sports fields for pick up sports, such as soccer, baseball
- Trails and trail connections (Tickle Creek to Cazadero, connect with Timberline Trail, add trail at Sandy Vista, Sandy River rustic trails, incorporate Tickle Creek trail, connect with Springwater)
 - Safer road crossings (underpass/overpass at 212/Hwy 26)
 - Include wayfinding on trails/paths
 - Trail system loop around city
 - Utilize powerline corridors
 - Connect Tickle Creek Trail connections off road
- Pickle Ball
- More programming/amenities for disabled, such as:
 - sensory gardens
 - raised beds for community gardens
 - improved surface trails
 - accessible trails
 - universal designed playground, such as Harper's in Portland
- Sports complex with lights and synthetic turf
- Standing Wave/Whitewater Park
- Progressive skills complex for both bike and skate skills.
- Outdoor basketball hoops
- Dog park trail system with natural features
- Shelters
- Restrooms
- Covered shelters/multipurpose spaces
- Family oriented facilities, broad appeal with activities for a range of age groups: open field/ soccer, picnic area, BBQ's
- Improve geographic distribution of facilities:
 - Community garden for north side of town (Knollwood?)
 - Dog park for south side of town
 - Basketball Court north side of town
 - Large field on south side of town.

Feedback about favorite parks and trails:

During the course of the conversation with stakeholders, a few popular parks and trails were mentioned. Those include:

- Tupper
- Tickle Creek
- Bornstedt
- Meinig Park

EXHIBIT C

Parks that are in need of repair:

At least a few people mentioned parks that are in need of repair or rehabilitation. Those include:

- Tupper Park playground equipment
- Meinig Park (ADA access, power distribution, improved paths & bridges, undeveloped space could be improved, additional restrooms)
- Skatepark (demolish, redesign and relocate)

Nearby regional facilities:

A few people mentioned other, nearby regional facilities owned and managed by other providers, or other facilities as examples of what was desired in Sandy. Those are as follows:

- Timberline Trail – Mt. Hood (future connection)
- Sandy Ridge Trail system - Welches
- Cazadero/ Springwater Trail – Gresham to Portland (future connection)
- Hoodview Sports Complex – North Clackamas (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Harper’s Playground – Portland (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Oral Hull Sensory Garden (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Rock Ridge Bike Skills Course – Bend (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Pump Track, Family man bike skills course – Hood River (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Tree Course – Hagg Lake (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Estacada has 2 disc golf courses
- McKay Park Standing Wave – Bend (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)
- Standing wave – Boise (example facility of what is desired in Sandy)

Concerns and areas for improvement:

Overall, the comments provided by stakeholders were positive and supportive of the Master Planning effort. A few comments were shared with regard to how the system could be improved, such as:

- Cleanliness of parks. Some parks, particularly trails and natural areas are littered with garbage and needs. Homelessness is an issue in these areas.
- Parks appear private/not accessible to the Latinx community. More outreach and communication are needed to provide a more welcoming, accessible environment. Consider using universal symbols on signs in addition to terms as well as provide materials and signage in Spanish.
- It will be important to engage the Latinx community during the Master Planning process. Consider holding a separate, Spanish language meeting at Sandy Vista Community Room.
- Recreation programming at Senior/Community Center is great but could be marketed better.

EXHIBIT C

- Future landscaping should include native, drought resistant plants and shrubs to reduce maintenance. Limit planting flower beds in key locations. Turf and trees are easier to maintain.
- Consider integrated pest management (reduce need to spray chemicals). Provide trail maps in addition to park maps.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX E.3: SPRING 2020 OPEN HOUSE AND ONLINE SURVEY

DISPLAY BOARDS

Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan

What is a "Master Plan"?

It is a reference document, a little like a map or an owner's manual. In this case, the City of Sandy will use it to help make sure future park and trail projects serve the goals, needs and hopes of residents like you.

The master plan will help us with two things:

- Identify the necessary parks and trails needed as the city grows.
- Distribute and build parks and trails equitably, so they serve everyone in the city.

This requires planning both in the short term (including what features the next new park should have) and the long term (including where to acquire land now that will become parks and trails in future decades).







Why are we doing this?

In Sandy we are proud of our parks system, from the 1.75-mile Tickle Creek Trail, to neighborhood playgrounds, to the 127-acre Sandy River Park. All told, there are 19 parks within Sandy city limits. The parks, trails and open spaces are maintained by just two full-time employees and a summer worker.

After more than 20 years, it is time for an update to the Parks & Trails Master Plan. The City is growing and we need a plan to serve our community now and into the future.

Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan






WELCOME

Please sign in!
We invite you to:

Sign up and stay updated on the project.

Visit each station and learn more about the project.

Ask questions! Talk with staff.

Complete a comment form to share your thoughts.





EXHIBIT C



Proposed Amenities

What facilities or activities are most needed in the community? (check all that apply)




-  Restroom
-  Natural/Gravel Trails
-  Paved Multi-Use Trails
-  Picnic Areas/Shelters
-  Playgrounds
-  Soccer/Multipurpose Fields

EXHIBIT C

Proposed Amenities

What facilities or activities are most needed in the community? (check all that apply)



Baseball and Softball Fields



Indoor Community Centers



Indoor Swimming Pools



Community Gardens



Disc Golf



Skateboard Park



Bicycle Pump Track

Proposed Amenities

What facilities or activities are most needed in the community? (check all that apply)



Off-Leash Dog Parks



Basketball Courts



Tennis Courts



Pickle Ball Courts



Sensory Garden



Universal Playground



Parking

EXHIBIT C

FLYER

Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan



Share your vision for our community parks and trails!

We are collecting ideas to better understand the community's needs and identify priorities that inform the development of our Parks and Trails Master Plan. Now is your opportunity to think about what services, activities, and amenities are important to you.



Learn more about your community parks and help us plan for the future!

March 11, 2020 from 4:30-6:00 p.m.
Sandy Vista 40747 SE Hwy 26
Sandy, OR 9705



Thank you for
your input and
helping to shape
the future of Sandy
parks and trails!




EXHIBIT C

SPRING 2020 OPEN HOUSE AND ONLINE SURVEY

Open House Dot Exercise

Each meeting participant was given five dots and asked to choose the amenities they would most like to see included in the parks and trails plan for Sandy. Below is a chart illustrating the most popular choices.



Other options included:

- Basketball courts (6)
- Indoor community centers (6)
- Community gardens (6)
- Bicycle pump tracks (6)
- Disc golf (4)
- Soccer/multipurpose fields (4)
- Pickle ball courts (3)
- Parking (3)
- Drinking fountains (3)
- Baseball/softball fields (2)
- Skateboard park (2)
- Tennis courts (1)

Online Survey Responses

A total of 129 surveys were received via the open house, community event, and online. Below is a summary of the responses.

1. How would you describe the current quality of parks and trails that serve Sandy residents?

A total of 127 people responded to this question.




Participants were asked to explain why they chose their answer. Common responses include:

EXHIBIT C

- Parks and greenspaces are not accessible due to lack of distribution and current proximity (7)
- Meinig Park needs better development and maintenance (5)
- Tickle Creek Trail is a great addition, but lacks adequate access (5)
- There is a lack of connections and crosswalks to support park access (4)
- Parks need to be bigger (3)


2. Do you feel there are enough parks and trails in Sandy?

A total of 116 people responded to this question.



3. Why do you visit the parks that you go to?

Participants were asked to choose from a list of reasons for why they visit parks and given the option to select all that apply. A total of 123 people responded to this question.




Of those that responded “other,” responses included:

- Water activities, i.e., splash pad, swimming, river access, fishing, etc. (10)
- Dog related activities and spaces (6)
- Wall ball (3)
- Time with family and friends (2)

4. What barriers prevent you from using park facilities more frequently?

Participants were given a list of barriers and asked to choose all that apply. A total of 121 people responded to this question.

EXHIBIT C



Of those that selected “other,” responses included:

- Lack of access based on proximity (5)
- Lack of restrooms (3)
- Lack of shade (2)
- Lack of natural areas, i.e., nature parks (2)

5. What facilities or activities do you see as the most needed in the parks?

Participants were given a list of facilities and activities and asked to select all those they felt are most needed. A total of 120 people responded to this question. Below is a chart illustrating the most common responses.



Participants could also choose the following:

- Parking (34)
- Soccer/multipurpose fields (34)
- Basketball courts (31)
- Sensory garden (28)
- Off-leash dog parks (27)
- Bicycle pump track (25)
- Skateboard park (24)
- Baseball/softball fields (23)
- Disc golf (22)
- Tennis courts (20)
- Pickleball courts (17)
- Other (20)


Other suggestions included:

EXHIBIT C

- Water features (8)
- Nature parks and natural areas (2)

6. Are there parks elsewhere that you particularly like? If so, which parks? Where?

Participants were asked to indicate whether there are parks they like other than those in Sandy and given the option to list them. A total of 97 people responded to this question.



The parks participants suggested included:

- Imagination Station Park (7)
- Happy Valley Park (7)
- Wildwood Park (5)
- Westmoreland Park (4)
- Meinig Park (3)
- Thousand Acres Park (3)

7. What type of park do you like to visit?

Participants were shown a list of different types of parks and given the option to select all that apply. A total of 120 people responded to this question.




EXHIBIT C

8. Do you have any other comments for us to consider as we develop the Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan?

Participants were asked to answer in their own words what they would like considered in the Sandy Parks and Trails Master Plan. A total of 53 people responded to this question. Responses included:


- Prioritize maintenance, security, and development of existing parks (10)
- Build more water features and facilities and provide better access to rivers and lakes (7)
- Develop parks and trails in the Champion Way area (3)
- Develop parks and trails in the Deer Pointe area (3)
- Provide more shade for park activities, especially for summer activities (2)
- Provide more and increase accessibility to information about parks so people understand how to use them (2)

9. Where do you live?

Participants were asked to indicate what zip code they live in. A total of 108 participants responded to this question with the majority (96) indicating that they live in 97055. Other zip codes participants provided include 97009, 97023, 97049, 97206, and 40793.

10. How often do you use parks or trails in Sandy?

A total of 106 people responded to this question.




Demographic Information

Age

A total of 103 people responded to this question.

EXHIBIT C



Gender

Participants were asked to choose what best describes their gender. A total of 101 participants answered this question. A majority (70) indicated that they are female, 26 said they are male, four said they preferred not to answer, and one chose non-binary.

Race/Ethnicity

A total of 101 people responded to this question. A majority (75) indicated that they are white, 17 said they are Hispanic/Latino, and one said they are Asian. Five participants said they preferred not to answer and three said they are another race other than what was listed.

Household Income

A total of 98 people responded to this question.




EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX E.4: SPRING 2020 SANDY VISTA SPANISH-LANGUAGE OPEN HOUSE

Plan Maestro de *Sandy parques y caminos*



¡Comparta su visión para nuestros parques y caminos comunitarios!

Estamos recopilando ideas para comprender mejor las necesidades de la comunidad e identificar las prioridades que informan el desarrollo de nuestro Plan de Parques y Caminos. Ahora es su oportunidad de pensar qué servicios, actividades y comodidades son importantes para usted.

¡ Aprenda más sobre sus parques comunitarios y cómo ayudarnos a planificar para el futuro!

El 11 de marzo, 2020
de las 4:30-6:00 p.m.

Sandy Vista 40747 SE Hwy 26
Sandy, OR 9705



¡Gracias por su aporte y por ayudarnos a dar forma al futuro de los parques y caminos de Sandy!



EXHIBIT C

APPENDIX E.5: FALL 2020 ONLINE OPEN HOUSE

FLYER

Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan



Help shape the future of Sandy Parks and Trails by participating in our online open house!

We need your input and ideas to help shape the development of our future parks and trails system in Sandy. Learn about proposed concepts for Deer Pointe, Ponder Lane, Champion Way and Sandy Community Campus and share your thoughts by visiting us online at:
www.ci.sandy.or.us/ParksandTrailsMasterPlanUpdate



Thanks for your interest in Sandy's Parks and Trails.

For questions or more information contact:
Nancy Ream Enabnit: 503.668.7535 | nancyenabnit@gmail.com
Para preguntas en español o para recibir una encuesta en español contacte:
Travis Rumohr: 971.303.9311 | travisrumohr@jla.us.com



.....

Thanks for your interest in Sandy's Parks and Trails.



EXHIBIT C

SPANISH LANGUAGE SURVEY FLYER

Plan Maestro de *Sandy parques y caminos*



¡Contribuya a dar forma al futuro de Sandy Parks and Trails participando en nuestra jornada de puertas abiertas en línea!

Necesitamos su opinión e ideas para ayudar a dar forma al desarrollo de nuestro futuro sistema de parques y senderos en Sandy. Conozca los conceptos propuestos para Deer Point, Ponder Lane, Champion Way y Sandy Community Complexy comparta sus pensamientos visitándonos en línea:

www.ci.sandy.or.us/ParksandTrailsMasterPlanUpdate.



Gracias por su interés en Sandy's Parks and Trails.

Para preguntas o más información contacte.

Nancy Ream Enabnit: 503.668.7535 | nancyenabnit@gmail.com

Para preguntas en español o para recibir una encuesta en español contacte.

Travis Rumohr: 703.785.54534, travisrumohr@jla.us.com



.....
¡Gracias por su interés en Sandy's Parks and Trails.!



EXHIBIT C

ONLINE OPEN HOUSE RESPONSES

Those that participated in the online open house generally felt like the proposed parks and trails served the needs of the community, with some disagreeing, and some feeling there just needed to be some changes to the plans. Responses to the proposed park developments were also positive. When asked how well they like the layout of features in the park concepts the breakdown skewed positive:

- Champion Way – 37 said “Like it” compared to 2 that said “Dislike it”
- Deer Point – 37 said “Like it” compared to 3 that said “Dislike it”
- Ponder Lane – 33 said “Like it” compared to 2 that said “Dislike it”
- Sandy Community Campus – 31 said “Like it” compared to 7 that said “Dislike it”


The results of the feedback portion of the online open house indicate that there is general approval of the proposed concepts, with some proposed changes to reflect community desires. Some of the common features that people liked or said they would like to see included were:

- Skate parks
- Pump tracks
- Interconnected trails
- Safety features
- Bathrooms
- Splash pads
- Parking

The following represents the summary of the feedback portion of the online open house:

1. Do you feel that the proposed park system map will serve the needs of the growing community? (Check one.)

There was overall approval from most respondents to the proposed park system map, with 37 saying they felt it will serve the needs of the growing community, 25 saying it would do so with some changes, and only five saying it would not. Respondents were given an opportunity to explain and expand their answer in the question that followed.



2. Do you have any changes to suggest?


- 6 respondents said they wanted a revamped or expanded skate park as a priority.
- 4 respondents said they wanted to see more connectivity and mobility involved in the park designs, with them being a way for the public to get around.

EXHIBIT C

- 3 respondents said they desired park development near existing neighborhoods for accessibility.
- 2 respondents said they wanted to see more dog parks.

3. Do you feel that the proposed trail system map will serve the needs of the growing community? (Check one.)

There was overall approval from most respondents to the proposed park system map, with 42 saying they felt it will serve the needs of the growing community, 17 saying it would do so with some changes, and only eight saying it would not. Respondents were given an opportunity to explain and expand their answer in the question that followed.



4. Do you have any changes to suggest?


- 4 respondents said they were concerned about connecting Tickle Creek Trail to the Springwater Trail or just generally concerned about replicating the unsafe conditions on the Springwater.
- 3 respondents said they believed the number of trails in the plan was too ambitious and that more focus should be put into maintaining and improving what Sandy already has.
- 3 respondents said they like the idea of interconnectivity and making trails that provide people the ability to get around town.
- 2 respondents said they like the idea of varied difficulty trails and more options for people with mobility issues.

Feedback related to Champion Way Neighborhood Park:

1. How well do you like the layout of features in the Champion Way Park concept? (Check one.)

The most common response to the proposed layout in the Champion Way Park concept was “Like it”, followed by “Love it” and “Neutral”. Only three respondents selected that they “Hate it” or “Dislike it”. The data signifies that there was a significant positive response to the concepts proposed.

EXHIBIT C




2. If you could change / add one thing in the Champion Way Park concept, what would it be?

- 4 respondents expressed a desire for more sports courts.
- 3 respondents said they wanted to see a splash pad.
- 3 respondents said they wanted accessible bathrooms.
- 3 respondents said space for parking should be ensured.
- 2 respondents said they wanted to see a skate park added.

Feedback related to Deer Point Neighborhood Park

1. How well do you like the layout of features in the Deer Point Park concept? (Check one.)

There was significant positive response to the concepts laid out for the Deer Point Neighborhood Park, as well. Of the respondents, 50 said they “Like it” or “Love it”, while only four said they “Dislike it” or “Hate it”.



2. If you could change / add one thing in the Deer Point Park concept, what would it be?


- 6 respondents expressed concern about the connection and accessibility of Highway 26, especially in the case of children’s safety.
- 5 respondents said they would like a pump track to be included.
- 4 respondents said they wanted more space for dogs to be considered.
- 4 respondents said they want a splash pad.
- 4 respondents said they really like the inclusion of a disc golf course.
- 3 respondents said that a skate park would be a good addition.

EXHIBIT C

Feedback related to Ponder Lane Neighborhood Park

1. How well do you like the layout of features in the Ponder Lane Park concept? (Check one.)

The Ponder Lane Neighborhood Park concept gained significant positive responses. Of the respondents, 48 said the “Like it” or “Love it”, in reference to the concepts, with only two that said they “Dislike it”.



2. If you could change / add one thing in the Ponder Lane Park concept, what would it be?

- 3 respondents said there is a shortage of parking.
- 3 respondents expressed concern about the proximity of the park to a busy road.
- 4 respondents said they really like the addition of a dog park.
- 2 respondents said they think there should be a barrier to separate the off-leash dog park from the rest of the park.
- 2 respondents said they want a skate park.

Sandy Community Campus

1. How well do you like the Sandy Community Campus Phase 1 concept? (Check one.)

Out of all the proposed park concepts, the Sandy Community Campus Phase one concept had the most diversity of opinion, but there was still an overall positive response. 56 respondents said they “Like it” or “Love it”, while eight said they “Dislike it” or “Hate it”. Only five respondents said they were “Neutral” or “Not sure”.




EXHIBIT C

2. If you could change / add one thing in the Sandy Community Campus Phase 1 concept, what would it be?

- 11 respondents said they thought that a quality skate park should be a priority.
- 4 respondents said they want a pump track.
- 7 respondents said they want a pool to be a priority.
- 3 respondents noted the need for public restrooms.

3. Please rank which elements you feel should be included in the first phase.

The most popular number one choices that people said they feel should be included in the first phase were “Skatepark”, “Parking”, and “Pump Track”. The popularity of these choices tracks with their prevalence in open-ended comments about park elements. “Skatepark” and “Pump track” were also among the most popular selections for respondents’ 2nd choice, along with “Playground” and “Challenge course”. The element that the most respondents ranked last or chose not to rank at all, was that of “Picnic Area”, which also tracks with a lack of significant support in open-ended comments.



Tell us about yourself

1. Which parks do you live within walking distance of: (Check all that apply.)





EXHIBIT C

2. Are you interested in participating in a follow-up meeting regarding park design?
(Check one.)



3. Which park(s) are you interested in learning more about: (Check all that apply.)



Demographic Questions

1. What is your age? (Check one.)






EXHIBIT C

2. What best describes your gender? (Check one.)



3. What is your race or ethnicity (Check one.)




4. What is your preferred language?

A total of 56 people responded to this question. All respondents indicated that they spoke English as a preferred language.

EXHIBIT C

5. What is the combined income of all the people in your household? (Check one.)



PHYSICAL SURVEY IN SPANISH

Those that opted to participate in the Spanish language survey were informed that they would be entered into a raffle to win a \$25 Fred Meyer gift card upon receipt of their completed survey by October 25. One survey was completed and returned to JLA by mail.

The completed survey indicated general satisfaction with the concepts presented for the future of Sandy parks and trails. Below are the comments from the completed survey:

1. Do you feel that the proposed park system map will serve the needs of the growing community?
 - Yes
2. Do you feel that the proposed trail system map will serve the needs of the growing community?
 - Yes
3. How well do you like the layout of features in the Deer Point Park concept?
 - Like it
4. If you could change / add one thing in the Deer Point Park concept, what would it be?
 - (No answer)
5. How well do you like the layout of features in the Champion Way Park concept?
 - Like it
6. If you could change / add one thing in the Champion Way Park concept, what would it be?
 - (No answer)
7. How well do you like the layout of features in the Ponder Lane Park concept?
 - Like it
8. If you could change / add one thing in the Ponder Lane Park concept, what would it be?
 - (No answer)
9. Do you like the Sandy Community Campus Phase 1 concept?
 - Yes
10. Which elements do you feel should be included in the first phase of Sandy Community Campus? (please rank in order of preference with 1 being the highest priority)
 - Skate Park
 - Parking

EXHIBIT C

- Basketball
- Playground
- Picnic Area
- Community Garden

11. Which parks do you live within walking distance of?


- Sandy Community Campus

12. Would you be interested in participating in a follow-up meeting regarding your neighborhood park?

- Sandy Community

DRAFT

APPENDIX E.6: FALL 2020 BILINGUAL MAILER



Sandy Parks & Trails Master Plan

The City of Sandy has been working on updating the Parks & Trails Master Plan for the past year. Thanks to those of you who have participated in previous public meetings and completed the survey, we have considered your ideas and developed a draft plan based on your input and other analysis. Now is your chance to look over the proposed Master Plan as well as four new parks design concepts.

Once you look over the material, please take time to share your thoughts and ideas in the attached survey.

What's a Master Plan?
A master plan is like a map the City of Sandy will use to guide the development of future park and trail projects in order to serve the goals, needs and hopes of residents like you.

The Master plan will help us with two things:

- Identify the necessary parks and trails needed as the city grows.
- Distribute and build parks and trails equitably, to serve everyone in the city. This requires planning both in the short term (including what features the next new park should have) and the long term (including where to acquire land now that will become parks and trails later).

What have we heard so far?


- The most popular park features are unpaved trails, playgrounds, paved multi-use trails and off-leash dog areas.
- 63% of households felt the condition of existing parks is good or very good.
- 74% feel that the city could use more parks and trails.
- The top three reasons people visit parks are access to nature, exercise, and to use the playground.
- Lack of walking/biking connections to parks is a big reason people don't visit more often. Other factors are safety concerns, lack of lighting, and feeling crowded.

Natural areas with trails are the most popular, followed by neighborhood parks.
Amenities people want more of are:

- Restrooms
- Indoor swimming pools
- Playgrounds
- Natural surface trails
- Picnic area and shelters

Other feedback included:

- Improve trail network connections between parks by:
 - Creating a loop trail around the city.
 - Improving walking/biking safety at U.S. 26 and OR 211 crossings.
- Acquire and develop community parks, with recreation for everyone: sports fields, skate parks, bike pump tracks, and other features.
- New neighborhood parks to fill service-area gaps.
- Improve access to certain amenities, such as splash pad north of U.S. 26 and a dog park south of U.S. 26.



PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
The trail system map shows potential local and regional trails. Some are also shown in the Transportation System Master Plan and other regional planning documents.

Take our community survey available through

October 25 2020


Mail this survey or complete online, and you will be entered in a raffle for a \$25 Fred Meyer gift card. More information: ci.sandy.or.us/parksandtrailsmasterplanupdate

Natural areas with trails are the most popular, followed by neighborhood parks.
Amenities people want more of are:

- Restrooms
- Indoor swimming pools
- Playgrounds
- Natural surface trails
- Picnic area and shelters

Other feedback included:

- Improve trail network connections between parks by:
 - Creating a loop trail around the city.
 - Improving walking/biking safety at U.S. 26 and OR 211 crossings.
- Acquire and develop community parks, with recreation for everyone: sports fields, skate parks, bike pump tracks, and other features.
- New neighborhood parks to fill service-area gaps.
- Improve access to certain amenities, such as splash pad north of U.S. 26 and a dog park south of U.S. 26.




PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
The park system map shows where we might acquire land for new parks. Many proposed parks are in the Urban Growth Boundary or the Urban Reserve Boundary and would serve new areas of the city.

NO POSTAGE NECESSARY IF MAILED IN THE UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 85000 PORTLAND, OR

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

JLA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
921 SW WASHINGTON ST, STE 570
PORTLAND OR 97205-9809



Tell us what you think! Fill out and mail this survey or complete online: ci.sandy.or.us/parksandtrailsmasterplanupdate

1. Do you feel that the proposed park system map will serve the needs of the growing community?
 Yes Yes, with some changes (please explain below) No (please explain below)

2. Do you feel that the proposed trail system map will serve the needs of the growing community?
 Yes Yes, with some changes (please explain below) No (please explain below)

3. How well do you like the layout of features in the Deer Point Park concept?
 Love it Like it Neutral Dislike it Hate it Not sure

4. If you could change / add one thing in the Deer Point Park concept, what would it be?

5. How well do you like the layout of features in the Champion Way Park concept?
 Love it Like it Neutral Dislike it Hate it Not sure

6. If you could change / add one thing in the Champion Way Park concept, what would it be?

7. How well do you like the layout of features in the Ponder Lane Park concept?
 Love it Like it Neutral Dislike it Hate it Not sure

8. If you could change / add one thing in the Ponder Lane Park concept, what would it be?

9. Do you like the Sandy Community Campus Phase 1 concept?
 Yes Yes, with some changes (please explain below) No (please explain below)

10. Which elements do you feel should be included in the first phase of Sandy Community Campus? (please rank in order of preference with 1 being the highest priority)

<input type="checkbox"/> Skate Park	<input type="checkbox"/> Parking	<input type="checkbox"/> Basketball	<input type="checkbox"/> Playground	<input type="checkbox"/> Picnic Area
<input type="checkbox"/> Community Garden	<input type="checkbox"/> Challenge Course	<input type="checkbox"/> Flexible Field	<input type="checkbox"/> Pump Track	

11. Which parks do you live within walking distance of?
 Champion Way Deer Point Ponder Lane Sandy Community Campus Other





12. Would you be interested in participating in a follow-up meeting regarding your neighborhood park?
 Yes No If yes, which park are you interested in learning more about?
 Champion Way Deer Point Ponder Lane Sandy Community Campus Other

Please provide contact information if you would like to receive future updates or come to a meeting:
 Name _____ E-mail _____

Park design concepts
Design concepts for four parks were developed and are presented for your review and comment. Three neighborhood parks (Deer Point, Champion Way and Ponder Lane) and one community park (Sandy Community Campus).

Neighborhood parks often include playgrounds, picnic areas and open lawn areas. They sometimes include splash pads, sport courts, community gardens, dog off-leash areas and other amenities.

A community park serves the entire community. Along with the amenities of a neighborhood park, it might include a skate park, sports fields, restrooms and parking.

For more information contact: Travis Rumohr 971-303-9311 | travis.rumohr@jla.us.com

Cut along dotted line, fold, tape, and return completed card by October 25, 2020. Postage paid.

EXHIBIT C

PLAN MAESTRO DEL SISTEMA DE PARQUES Y SENDEROS DE LA CIUDAD DE SANDY

La Ciudad de Sandy ya está trabajando para actualizar el Plan Maestro de Parques y Senderos de la Ciudad de Sandy. Agudecemos a aquellos visitantes que han participado en reuniones públicas anteriores y han completado la encuesta.

Hemos considerado sus ideas y hemos desarrollado un borrador de plan que se acerca con sus aportaciones y comentarios. Esta es su oportunidad de revisar el Plan Maestro propuesto, así como los otros números conceptuales de diseño para parques.

¿Qué es un plan maestro?
Un plan maestro es como un mapa que la Ciudad de Sandy usará para guiar el desarrollo de futuros proyectos de parques y senderos, para atender las metas, necesidades y esperanzas de los residentes como usted.

El plan maestro nos ayudará con dos cosas:

- Discutir, construir parques y senderos equitativamente, para que sirvan a todos en la ciudad.
- Esto requiere una planificación tanto a corto plazo (sincronizando qué características debe tener el próximo parque), como a largo plazo (sincronizando dónde adquirir tierras ahora, que más tarde se convertirán en parques y senderos).

¿Qué hemos escuchado hasta ahora?

- Los usuarios más populares de los parques son senderos sin pavimento, las áreas de juego, los senderos pavimentados de uso múltiple y las zonas para pasar a perros sin correa.
- 50% de hogares sienten que la condición de los parques existentes es buena o muy buena.
- 20% sienten que a la ciudad le vendría bien tener más parques y senderos.
- Las principales razones por las que la gente visita los parques son: el acceso a la naturaleza, ejercicio y el uso del área de juegos.
- La falta de conexiones peatonales o para bicicleta hacia los parques es una gran razón por la que la gente no los visita más a menudo. Otros factores son: pocos caminos con respecto a la seguridad, falta de iluminación y la sensación de que hay mucha gente.

Áreas naturales con senderos son más populares en Sandy. Parques comunitarios y vecinales también son populares. Las principales cinco instalaciones que a la gente le gustaría ver más son:


- Sanitarios
- Pícnics en espacios cerrados
- Senderos con superficie natural
- Áreas de picnic y descanso
- Áreas de juego

Otras opiniones de la comunidad incluyen:

- Desarrollar una red de senderos más sólida, para mejorar conexiones entre parques.
- Crear un circuito alrededor de la ciudad.
- Mejoramiento de seguridad en intersecciones peatonales y para bicicletas en las autopistas 20 y 211.

- Acoger y desarrollar parques comunitarios, como el campus de la Comunidad de Sandy, con conexiones que a la comunidad: campos deportivos, parques de patinaje, y otras características físicas.

- Desarrollar nuevos parques vecinales para llenar los vacíos de áreas de servicio.
- Mejorar espacios e instalaciones, como un área para refrescarse al norte de la autopista 20 y un parque para perros al sur de la Autopista 26.



MEJORAS PROPUESTAS
El mapa del sistema de parques muestra áreas de mejoras propuestas para mejorar los parques. Las mejoras propuestas están en el Plan de Documento. Más tarde en el tiempo, la reserva Urbana y serán a nuevas áreas de la ciudad.

MEJORAS PROPUESTAS
El mapa del sistema de parques muestra posibles mejoras locales y regionales. Algunos también se muestran en el Plan Maestro del Sistema de Parques y Senderos y en otros documentos de planificación regional.

Responda nuestra encuesta comunitaria disponible el 25 de octubre de 2020

Envíe esta encuesta por correo o línea en línea y participará en un sorteo de una tarjeta de regalo Fred Meyer de \$75. Más información: ci.sandy.or.us/parksandtrailsmasterplanupdate

NO POSTAGE NECESSARY IF MAILED IN THE UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 85600 PORTLAND, OR

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

JLA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
921 SW WASHINGTON ST, STE 570
PORTLAND OR 97205-9809

¡Díganos lo qué piensa! Envíenos esta encuesta o complete en línea: ci.sandy.or.us/parksandtrailsmasterplanupdate

1. ¿Siente que el mapa del sistema de parques propuesto atenderá las necesidades de la creciente comunidad?
 Sí Sí, con algunos cambios (por favor, explique abajo) No (por favor, explique abajo)

2. ¿Siente que el mapa del sistema de senderos propuesto atenderá las necesidades de la creciente comunidad?
 Sí Sí, con algunos cambios (por favor, explique abajo) No (por favor, explique abajo)

3. ¿Qué tanto le gusta la organización de elementos en el concepto del parque Deer Point?
 Le encanta Le gusta Neutral No le gusta Lo odia No está seguro

4. Si pudiera cambiar o agregar una cosa al concepto del parque Deer Point, ¿qué sería?

5. ¿Qué tanto le gusta la organización de elementos en el concepto del parque Champion Way?
 Le encanta Le gusta Neutral No le gusta Lo odia No está seguro

6. Si pudiera cambiar o agregar una cosa al concepto del parque Champion Way, ¿qué sería?

7. ¿Qué tanto le gusta la organización de elementos en el concepto del parque Ponder Lane?
 Le encanta Le gusta Neutral No le gusta Lo odia No está seguro

8. Si pudiera cambiar o agregar una cosa al concepto del parque Ponder Lane, ¿qué sería?

9. ¿Le gusta el concepto para la Fase 1 del Campus de la Comunidad de Sandy?
 Sí Sí, con algunos cambios (por favor, explique abajo) No (por favor, explique abajo)

10. ¿Qué elementos considera que deberían incluirse en la primera fase del Campus de la Comunidad de Sandy? (por favor, clasifíquelos por prioridad, siendo 1 la máxima prioridad)

Pista de patinaje Estacionamiento Béisquet Área de Juegos Área de picnic
 Jardín comunitario Pista de obstáculos Campo de uso flexible Pista tipo Pump Track

11. ¿Qué parques están a poca distancia de donde usted vive?
 Champion Way Deer Point Ponder Lane Campus de la Comunidad de Sandy Otro

12. Would you be interested in participating in a follow-up meeting regarding your neighborhood park?
 Sí No Sí, sobre qué parque le interesaría conocer más?
 Champion Way Deer Point Ponder Lane Campus de la Comunidad de Sandy Otro

Por favor, proporciónenos información de contacto si quiere recibir actualizaciones futuras o venir a una reunión:
 Nombre _____ Correo electrónico _____

Contra la línea de puntos, dibuje, pegue con cinta adhesiva y devuelva la tarjeta completa antes del 18 de octubre de 2020. Fraseo por pagar

Conceptos de diseño de parques
Se han desarrollado Conceptos de Diseño para cuatro parques y se están presentando para que usted los revise y comente sobre ellos. Tres parques vecinales (Deer Point, Champion Way y Ponder Lane) y un parque comunitario (Campus de la Comunidad de Sandy).

Los parques vecinales a menudo incluyen áreas de juegos, áreas de picnic y áreas abiertas con césped. A veces incluyen áreas acústicas para relajación, cancha de béisbol, jardines comunitarios, áreas para pasar a perros sin correa y otras instalaciones.

Un Parque Comunitario sirve a toda la comunidad, junto con las instalaciones de un Parque Vecinal. También puede incluir un polo de patinaje, cancha deportiva, sanitarios, jardines comunitarios y estacionamientos.



¿Preguntas? ¿Información? Contacte a: Travis Rumohr 971-303-9311 | travis.rumohr@jla.us.com

Exhibit C
Ordinance No. 2022-11

1. Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement. Both the Planning Commission and the City Council held a public hearing prior to adopting the ordinance. City staff completed a presentation explaining the proposed revisions to the Parks and Trails Master Plan. The Commission held a public hearing on April 25, 2022. The Council held a public hearing on June 6, 2022. The City provided notice of the public hearings in accordance with state law and the City’s development code. Goal 1 is satisfied.
2. Goal 2 – Land Use Planning. Goal 2 requires the ordinance to be coordinated with other governmental entities and to be supported by an adequate factual base. The City provided 35-day notice to the State of Oregon on July 19, 2021, and modifications on March 11, 2022. Goal 2 is satisfied.
3. Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands. Goal 3 does not apply to the decision.
4. Goal 4 – Forest Lands. Goal 4 does not apply to the decision.
5. Goal 5 – Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces. The proposed code amendments help assure protection of natural resources and open space. The amendments also help achieve the goals and policies of the 2022 Parks and Trails Master Plan. Goal 5 is satisfied.
6. Goal 6 – Air, Water and Land Resources Quality. Goal 6 does not apply to the decision.
7. Goal 7 – Areas Subject to Natural Hazards. Goal 7 does not apply to the decision.
8. Goal 8 – Recreational Needs. The proposed code amendments help the City fulfill recreational needs for current and future Sandy residents over the next 15 years in coordination with the 2022 Parks and Trails Master Plan. Goal 8 is satisfied.
9. Goal 9 – Economic Development. Goal 9 does not apply to the decision.
10. Goal 10 – Housing. The proposed modifications to Chapters 17.32 and 17.86 provide clarification and updated language to reflect the needed housing policies in Oregon. Goal 10 is satisfied.
11. Goal 11 – Public Facilities and Services. The proposed code amendments help the City fulfill recreational needs for current and future Sandy residents over the next 15 years in coordination with the 2022 Parks and Trails Master Plan. This text amendment will not undermine or contradict any aspect of the existing public facilities plan. Goal 11 is satisfied.
12. Goal 12 – Transportation. Goal 12 does not apply to the decision.
13. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. The City’s comprehensive plan with respect to Goal 13 and its standards governing energy conservation are not affected by the decision. Goal 13 is satisfied.
14. Goal 14 – Urbanization. The decision does not analyze or expand the City’s urban growth boundary. Goal 14 is not applicable.