NEW COMMITTEE MEMBER INFORMATION BOOKLET

KEIZER PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD

Property of City of Keizer
Please return at the end of your term
KEIZER CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE PROTOCOL

Committees appointed by the Keizer City Council will follow the following protocol:

1. Committee decisions are to be made during scheduled meetings.
2. All Committee meetings are open to the public and are required to receive public testimony.
3. Keizer City Council and the Keizer City Manager must be given a full copy of all Committee meeting minutes.
4. All Committee projects and/or recommendations must be approved by Keizer City Council manner, unless pre-approved limits have been set by the City Council:
   a. A plan, project, or recommendation will be formulated with information regarding any fiscal impact, neighborhood impact, etc. This information should include possible resources and solutions.
   b. This information will then be presented at a Keizer City Council meeting.
   c. Keizer City Council will determine if the plan, project, or recommendation is feasible and will direct the Keizer City Manager to implement.
   d. The Keizer City manager will in turn direct the appropriate staff to work on a recommendation to be returned to Keizer City Council in a timely manner.
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Ordinance No. 83-007

AN ORDINANCE CREATING A PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD; PROVIDING FOR ITS COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION; PROVIDING FOR ITS FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES.

The City of Keizer ordains as follows:

Section 1. KEIZER PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD

COMPOSITION, TERMS, AND VACANCIES. (a) The Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is hereby created. The Board will have the powers and duties hereinafter set forth and such additional powers and duties as may be conferred on such Board by the laws of the State of Oregon, by the Charter of the City of Keizer or by Ordinances, Resolutions or Orders of the City Council.

(b) The Board shall consist of seven voting members. The members shall be appointed by the Mayor and shall serve for a term of three years. The terms of office for appointed members shall be staggered so that the term of office of not more than three will expire in the same year. Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, the initial term for board members originally appointed upon the passage of this ordinance may be established by the Mayor in order to achieve the proper staggering of terms. Members may be chosen from among such persons concerned with and interested in the conservation and development of public parks and playgrounds and like public places in the city.
(c) In the event a vacancy occurs, the Mayor shall appoint a successor to serve the unexpired term of the predecessor in office.

(d) The members of the Board shall not receive any compensation for their services.

Section 2. ORGANIZATION. (a) The Board shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson annually.

(b) Four members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Board shall establish a time and place for their regular meetings which shall be open to the public.

(d) The Board may make, establish and alter rules and regulations for its government and procedure consistent with the laws of the State of Oregon and with the Charter and Ordinances of the City of Keizer. Before any rules, amendments or deletions become effective, the Board must submit them to the City Council for approval.

(e) At least once each year, the City Council and the Board shall meet in joint session to review existing and changing policies, review Board by-laws and tour facilities and programs.

Section 3. POLICY, FUNCTION AND DUTIES. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the City of Keizer that all matters relating to public parks, playgrounds and related activities and programs shall be submitted to the Board for public input, investigation and discussion.
(b) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the Council on issues pertaining to public parks, playgrounds and related activities and programs.

(c) The Board shall have the following duties:

1. To make recommendations and advise the Council, Planning Commission and other bodies, groups or officials on all matters referred to it.

2. To act in the role of community catalyst in the formation and achievement of a comprehensive community-wide parks and recreation system and program to serve the environmental, historical, cultural and leisure needs of all the city residents.

3. To make and issue reports respecting its studies, research, examination and other activities to the City Council as may be required by the Council.

Passed this ___ day of ____________, 1983.

Signed this ___ day of ____________, 1983.

Mayor

City Recorder
AN ORDINANCE CREATING A PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD; PROVIDING FOR ITS COMPOSITION AND ORGANIZATION; PROVIDING FOR ITS FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES; REPEALING ORDINANCE 83-007

The City of Keizer ordains as follows:

Section 1. City of Keizer Ordinance No. 83-007 is hereby repealed.

Section 2. KEIZER PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD COMPOSITION, TERMS, AND VACANCIES. (a) The Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is hereby created. The Board will have the powers and duties hereinafter set forth and such additional powers and duties as may be conferred on such Board by the laws of the State of Oregon, by the Charter of the City of Keizer or by ordinances, resolutions or orders of the City Council.

(b) The Board shall consist of seven voting members. The members shall be appointed by the Mayor and shall serve for a term of three years. The terms of office for appointed members shall be staggered so that the term of office of not more than three will expire in the same year. Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, the initial term for board members originally appointed upon the passage of this ordinance may be established by the Mayor in order to achieve the proper staggering of terms. Members may be chosen from among such persons concerned with and interested in the conservation and development of public parks and playgrounds and like public places in the city.
(c) In the event a vacancy occurs, the Mayor shall appoint a successor to serve the unexpired term of the predecessor in office.

(d) The members of the board shall not receive any compensation for their services.

Section 3. ORGANIZATION. (a) The Board shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson annually.

(b) Four members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Board shall establish a time and place for their regular meetings which shall be open to the public.

(d) The Board may make, establish and alter rules and regulations for its government and procedure consistent with the laws of the State of Oregon and with the Charter and ordinances of the City of Keizer. Before any rules, amendments or deletions become effective, the Board must submit them to the City Council for approval.

(e) At least once each year, the City Council and the Board shall meet in joint session to review existing and changing policies, review Board by-laws and tour facilities and programs.

Section 4. POLICY, FUNCTION AND DUTIES. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the City of Keizer City Council that all matters relating to public parks, playgrounds and related activities and programs shall be submitted to the Advisory Board for public input, investigation and discussion.
(b) It shall be the function of the Board to advise the Council on issues pertaining to public parks, playgrounds and related activities and programs, including parks usage, schedules, maintenance, budgets, operating policies and long range plans.

(c) The Board shall have the following duties:

(1) To make recommendations and advise the Council, Planning Commission and other bodies, groups or officials on all matters referred to it.

(2) To act in the role of community catalyst in the formation and achievement of a comprehensive community-wide parks and recreation system and program to serve the environmental, historical, cultural and leisure needs of all of the city residents.

(3) To make and issue reports respecting its studies, research, examination and other activities to the City Council as may be required by the Council.

PASSED this 1st day of May, 1989.

SIGNED this 2nd day of May, 1989.

MAYOR

CITY RECORDER
The City of Keizer ordains as follows:

Section 1. TITLE. This Ordinance shall be known as the Keizer Parks Ordinance.

Section 2. PURPOSE. The purpose of this Ordinance is to establish rules and regulations governing the use of Keizer parks, in order to insure the safe enjoyment of all Keizer parks by the public. In addition, this Ordinance establishes a process for reserving certain parks and park facilities.

Section 3. DEFINITIONS. For the purposes of this Ordinance, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(1) "Council" means the Keizer City Council.

(2) "Director" means the director of the Department of Public Works as designated by the Council, or designee.

(3) "Law enforcement officer" means any law enforcement officer with lawful jurisdiction, by operation of law or agreement, within a Keizer City park.
(4) "Park" means all grounds, buildings, improvements, and areas dedicated to use by the public for park, recreation or open space purposes and over which the City has acquired right of use for such purposes.

(5) "Shoreline area" means the area on the shore of a body of water between the edge of the water and a line around the body of water four feet from the edge of the water.

(6) "Vehicle" means any wheeled device or conveyance, whether propelled by motor, animal or human power. The term "vehicle" excludes City service vehicles, baby strollers and wheelchairs.

(7) "Vessel" means any watercraft or other artificial contrivance used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water.

Section 4. **RULES AND REGULATIONS.**

(1) No person may disobey or fail to observe any rule or regulation set forth in this Ordinance, of which the person has actual notice, however given, or of which reasonable notice has been given by appropriate sign or notice in a park.

///

///
No person may disobey a lawful direction made pursuant to this Ordinance by the Director, any park attendant, guard, special officer authorized by the Director, or law enforcement officer.

Section 5. SPECIAL USES AND AREAS.

(1) The Director may select and designate specific areas and facilities in any park which may be limited to special uses, at all times or at certain times. Special uses may require a permit in writing or a reservation. Fees shall be established by Council resolution.

(2) Special uses may include, but are not limited to: Sports, games or other recreational activities, picnics, assemblies, entertainments, exhibitions, and weddings.

(3) Carlson Skate Park Regulations.

(a) Permitted uses in the skate park surface include skateboards, rollerblades, and BMX bikes, scooters and "Big Wheels" type tricycles only – no foot traffic or motorized vehicles.

(b) The use of helmets is mandatory.

(c) Use or placement of additional obstacles or other materials including, but not limited to, ramps, jumps, etc. are prohibited.
(d) Alcohol, tobacco products, illegal drugs, and glass containers are prohibited.

(e) Food and/or drink is prohibited on or within five (5) feet of the skate park surface.

(f) Use of Carlson Skate Park is prohibited if hazardous conditions exist. Any damage/hazardous conditions must be reported to the City of Keizer Parks Department.

(g) Use of skate park surface is prohibited when the surface is wet.

(h) Littering is prohibited.

(4) Keizer Little League Park Usage.

(a) Any individuals not affiliated with groups or organized teams may use the Park or individual fields at any time the Park is open if such use does not interfere with the priority or reserved use, cause safety concerns, or cause undue wear and tear in Little League’s reasonable discretion.

Section 6. EXCLUSIVE USE OF PARKS OR FACILITIES.

(1) The Director shall maintain a list of reservable parks and park facilities. A park, portion of a park or park facility on the Director’s list of reservable
parks may be reserved for the exclusive use of persons or groups, for a limited period, upon issuance of a permit by the Director, subject to any reasonable conditions (as stated in Section 7) imposed by the Council or the Director and the payment of any fees that the Council may establish.

(2) No exclusive use of any park or park facility may be made unless the Director has issued a permit allowing the use and all conditions imposed by the permit have been complied with.

(3) Exclusive use of the Keizer Little League Park shall only be granted consistent with the current Park Management Agreement.

Section 7. PERMIT PROCEDURES AND CONDITIONS.

(1) No permit for the use of a park or park facility listed on the Director’s list of reservable parks may be refused or limited, nor may any conditions be attached to the grant or exercise thereof, for any reason not related to the safe, reasonable and orderly use of park facilities.

(2) Each application for a permit must be received at a designated office in the Department of Public Works no more than one hundred eighty days before the event. For events up to twenty (20) persons, the permit must be requested no less than sixty (60) days prior to the date of the event. For
events of twenty-one (21) to fifty (50) persons, the permit must be requested no less than ninety (90) days prior to the date of the event. For events in excess of fifty (50) persons, the permit must be requested no less than one hundred twenty (120) days prior to the date of the event. The Director may waive the minimum or maximum time requirements if it is determined that a waiver is in the best interests of the citizens of the City. Upon granting a permit, the Director may attach reasonable conditions thereto respecting the time, place, manner, frequency, duration and maximum number of persons who may attend the permitted event.

(3) The Director shall grant or deny each application for a permit within thirty (30) calendar days after the date of receipt of the application, unless the time for a decision on the application has been waived by the applicant. The decision granting or denying an application shall be mailed to the applicant at the address listed on the application. The applicant may not consider the permit to have been granted until the permit is received.

(4) The Director may grant, deny, condition or limit a permit after having considered the suitability of the area or facility for the number of persons expected at the event, whether or not the activity proposed is a legal use
thereof, the impact of the proposed use upon public property, the effect of
the proposed use upon the peaceful enjoyment of the park by members of
the public attending and those not attending the event, the effect of the
proposed use upon the peace and convenience of members of the public
using private or public property or the public streets in the vicinity of the
park or park facility, the public health and safety, any traffic or parking
problems which may be caused by attendance at the event and the
equitable sharing of the use of the park or park facility. The Director is
specifically authorized to attach reasonable restrictions and conditions to
activities to occur at the event, including but not limited to, restrictions on
fires, amplified sound, dancing, sports, the use or presence of animals, the
use of equipment or vehicles, the number of persons to be present, the
location of any bandstand or stage within a specific park area, or the
creation of any sounds, smoke, light, smell or any other thing which
appears likely to create any unreasonable risk of harm or substantial
annoyance to any person using the park or park facility or to the public, or
damage to any public or private property. Violation of any of the terms
and conditions of any permit by the permittee, or any agent, servant or
employee of permittee, is cause for immediate suspension or revocation of
the permit by the Director.

(5) The Director may require in connection with a permit that adequate
security be furnished by the permittee and that the permittee provide
additional sanitary facilities, refuse receptacles, or make any other
reasonable arrangements, based on the type of activity for which the
permit is requested.

(6) The Director shall refuse to grant a permit where conditions cannot be met
or are not accepted. The applicant must agree to provide a means of
informing all of the persons participating in the proposed event of the
terms and conditions of the permit.

(7) No permit for a park or park facility is transferable without the consent in
writing of the Director.

(8) Upon the granting of a permit, any fees or deposits established by the
Council or conditions related thereto shall be paid or complied with by the
applicant before the date of the event. If the fees or deposits are not paid
before the date of the event, then the permit is null and void.
Each person to whom a permit has been granted must agree in writing, upon request from the Director, to indemnify and hold the City, its officers, agents and employees, harmless from any and all liability for injury to persons or property occurring as a result of the permitted event. The permittee shall be liable to the City for any and all damage to the park and park facilities which results from any act or omission of the permittee or is caused by any participant in the event.

Each person to whom a permit is granted must agree in writing, upon request from the Director, to waive all claims or causes of action against the City, its officers, employees or agents which the permittee may have for injury to person or property of any type arising from the permittee’s use of the reserved park or park facilities, except for the active affirmative negligence or willful act of the City, its officers, employees or agents, and to which the person to whom a permit or reservation is granted in no way contributed, either directly or through any other person, agent, partner, contractor or associate.

If the proposed use of a park or park facilities involves risk of damage or injury to persons or to property of others, the Director will require the
permittee to obtain a policy of commercial general liability insurance with
terms and limits of liability as determined by the Director to be
appropriate for the activity for which the permit is requested. The policy
shall name the City, its officers, agents and employees, as insureds, and
shall insure the insureds against all claims, suits and demands of any and
all persons for injury, including death or damage sustained by any person
or persons arising out of any act or omission of the permittee related to the
use of the park or park facility. The Director must approve any policy
issued pursuant to this section.

(12) The permittee shall have a copy of the permit on site during the event, and
must present the permit upon the request of the Director, any park
attendant, guard, special officer authorized by the Director, or law
enforcement officer.

(13) It is unlawful for a person to place any booth, table, chair, stool, structure,
vehicle, or piece of equipment in any portion of a park for which a park
permit has been issued without the consent of the permittee. This
subsection shall not apply to persons acting under the direction or control
of City.
Section 8. NONPUBLIC AREAS – POSTING REQUIRED – ENTERING OR DAMAGING PROPERTY PROHIBITED.

(1) By posting appropriate notices, the Director may exclude the public from or limit use of, any road, area, building, lands, trail, natural feature, water area or facility in a park which is used for access, storage, parking, shop, office, residence or utility purposes, or other park or recreational use, or any combination thereof, whenever public access to the same will endanger the public health or safety, interfere with such use, or cause damage to public property or natural resources. The Director may also by appropriate means exclude the public from the place of any construction, repair or demolition activity. No person may enter or remain or permit any person in their control to enter or remain in any part of a park when the park is closed to the public, unless authorized to do so by the Director.

(2) No unauthorized person may unlock, open, remove, move or tamper with any gate, door, window, ventilator, skylight, screen, grate, fence, lock or barrier, or any other thing maintained by the City to exclude the public from a park or portion thereof, or tamper with, remove or deface any sign, legend or other notice designating the same as dangerous or prohibiting entry therein.
Section 9. **ENTERTAINMENT – PERMIT REQUIRED.**

(1) No person or group may give any exhibition, show, play, entertainment, performance, dance or concert, or project any still or moving pictures in any park without first having obtained a permit from the Director.

(2) The Director may issue a permit for an event described in section 9(1) above if it is found that the use is not likely to interfere with the enjoyment of the park by any other person or persons using the park or property in the vicinity of the location of the proposed event, and is not likely to cause unreasonable damage to park facilities. The Director may attach reasonable conditions as to time, place, manner, frequency and duration of permitted events so that the health, safety, convenience and enjoyment of any persons not attending the event may not be unreasonably affected, and to protect park facilities from unreasonable damage.

(3) The requirements of section 7 herein concerning permit procedures and conditions apply to permits issued under this section.
Section 10. EXCLUSION OR REMOVAL OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES, ANIMALS OR MATERIALS.

The Director or any law enforcement officer may exclude, remove or require to be removed from a park any animal, vehicle, equipment, activity, thing or material, the use or presence of which is likely to:

1. Cause an unreasonable risk of harm or danger to any person or damage to any real or personal property;
2. Cause any unreasonable burden of maintenance or cleanup.

Section 11. VEHICLES - OPERATION AND PARKING PROCEDURES AND RESTRICTIONS.

1. No person may stop, park, or leave standing or unattended any vehicle, trailer or boat in any park, except in an area or space designated for parking of such objects, or upon any portion of any street or highway upon which the parking of such objects is permitted, or in excess of the time prescribed therefore by any City ordinance or permit issued by the Director. No person may stop, park or leave standing or unattended any vehicle, trailer or boat in any area or space designated for parking of such objects by the Director so that any part of such object is within the right-of-way of any street or highway within the limits of any park. The
Director is hereby directed to post signs giving notice hereof in those portions of parks as may be affected hereby.

(2) No person may operate a vehicle, except as authorized by the Director, in any park except upon a publicly owned road or trail which is open for public vehicular traffic within the park. No person may operate any vehicle on any park road or trail at a speed greater than the speed limit established by the Director and posted on the road or trail, or if no speed is posted, at a speed greater than ten miles per hour.

(3) No person may wash, wax, dismantle or repair any vehicle, trailer, boat or other equipment, or remove any lubricant from any vehicle, trailer, boat or other equipment, or otherwise service any vehicle, trailer, boat or other equipment, in any park except for emergency repairs or as authorized by the Director.

(4) No person may take into or operate or park or leave standing within any park any mechanically defective vehicle, trailer or boat, or any type vehicle that is in violation of City Ordinance or any provision of the Oregon Vehicle Code relating to mechanical requirements or safety of vehicles.
(5) No person may leave standing any vehicle, trailer or boat in any park at any time when the park or portion thereof is closed to the public, unless authorized in writing by the Director to do so.

(6) Any law enforcement officer or security officer authorized by City may remove from a park, in the manner provided and subject to the requirements of the Oregon Vehicle Code, any vehicle, trailer or boat left therein, or on any portion thereof, in violation of this section.

Section 12. ANIMALS AND PETS.

(1) The Director may establish a list of parks and/or areas within parks where dogs are allowed. The list shall be a part of the City’s park rules and regulations. The Director’s list shall indicate areas in which dogs may be on-leash, off-leash or prohibited. The presence of other animals, unless otherwise authorized in writing, is prohibited. The foregoing prohibitions do not prevent any law enforcement officer in the performance of their duty from possessing a police dog, or any person from utilizing a bona fide assistance or guide dog, in any park, provided that the animal is at all times in the control of the person. In all areas, owners shall gather and properly dispose of all of their animals’ feces.
(2) No person may set out food in any park for any wild animal, bird, fish or reptile. No person may set out food in any park for a tame animal not in the person’s custody.

(3) No person may abandon any animal, bird, fish or reptile in any park.

(4) No person may capture, hunt, molest, or harm, or attempt to capture, hunt, molest or harm, or administer or set out any bait or harmful substance for any wild or domestic animal, reptile, fish or bird, nor remove nor have in his possession the young, the eggs, or the nest of any animal, reptile or bird found in the park. Persons who are authorized by the Director to do so may kill, poison, or control or trap any of the above-named creatures, subject to applicable state and federal law.

Section 13. FIRES.

(1) No person may kindle or maintain in any park any outdoor fire in any place other than in a fireplace or barbecue pit maintained by City or in a portable barbecue or camp stove used safely in a designated picnic or cooking area in a park, or in another location as may be authorized in writing by the Director.
(2) In kindling or maintaining an outdoor fire in any park, only charcoal briquettes, paper and wood may be used. Only manufacturer approved fuels shall be used in any camp stove.

(3) No person who kindles or maintains any outdoor fire in a park may leave the area where the fire is located without completely extinguishing the fire so that it is cold to the touch.

(4) If deemed necessary for public health and safety purposes in the sole discretion of the Director, any and all areas may be designated “No Fire” areas.

Section 14. SMOKING. No person may ignite or smoke any tobacco or tobacco product, or any other material, on any park trail, restroom or in any fire risk area, or in any area additionally designated by the Director.

Section 15. INTOXICATING BEVERAGES. No person may possess or consume any intoxicating beverage in any area of any park or park facility.
Section 16. **POWERED MODELS – OPERATION RESTRICTIONS.** No person may operate in any park, any model airplane, boat, car, rocket or other device that is powered by a rocket motor, an internal combustion engine, or other power source, except in an area and at times as are designated for such use by the Director.

Section 17. **GOLF.** No person may hit any golf ball in any park except in an area designated for such use by the Director.

Section 18. **DOING BUSINESS PROHIBITED.** No person may practice or solicit for any occupation, business or profession in any park, or sell or offer for sale therein any service or merchandise unless pursuant to a contract with City, or authorized by a reservation permit.

Section 19. **WATER POLLUTION.** No person may throw, discharge or otherwise deposit or cause or permit to be placed into the waters of any fountain, pond, lake, stream, pool or any body of water in or adjacent to any park, or any tributary stream, storm sewer, sanitary sewer or drain flowing into such waters, any substance, matter or thing, that materially impairs the usefulness of the water for persons or the habitability of the water for any animal, bird, fish or reptile that drinks, swims in or otherwise uses the water.
Section 20. **GUNS, FIREARMS, DANGEROUS MATERIALS AND FIREWORKS.**

(1) No person, except by permit issued pursuant to ORS 166.291 or as otherwise authorized by law, may bring into a park or possess, use or discharge therein any of the following items: Any firearm or ammunition, explosive, incendiary bomb or material, fireworks (except as otherwise provided in this section), or any weapons such as, but not limited to, air guns, slingshots, bows/crossbows and arrows, or paint ball guns.

(2) No person shall shoot any of the above-described items into the park limits from outside the limits of a park.

(3) No fireworks may be brought into or used in any park, except for commercial firework displays approved in writing by the City Council.

Section 21. **CONDUCT.** Persons who willfully harass or interfere with any government employee in the performance of his or her duties in a park, or who by their conduct or by threatening or profane language annoy, willfully molest, unreasonably interfere with the use of a park by any other person, who have committed a public offense in a park, who operate any vessel in an unsafe manner or conduct themselves in an unsafe manner, shall leave the park upon request. Requests can be made by the Director, any park attendant, guard, special officer authorized by the Director, or law enforcement.
enforcement officer. No person who has left the park premises after a request may
reenter the park until after eight a.m. of the next day.

Section 22. DAMAGING PARK PROPERTY. Unless authorized in writing by the
Director to do so, no person may:

(1) Pick, saw, chop, carve, cut, remove or damage any flowers, seeds, bark,
branches, twigs, leaves or blossoms of any tree, plant, shrub, vine, bush or
other vegetation in any park;

(2) Drive any nail, screw, bolt or staple into, or attach any wire, rope or other
fastening device to any tree or plant in any park;

(3) Mark, deface, damage, displace or remove any building, bridge, table,
chair, bench, fireplace, barrier, fence, railing, paving or paving material,
water pipe or light, or any sign, notice or placard, whether temporary or
permanent, or any cultural, natural or historic artifact, or monument stake,
post or other boundary marker, or any other structure, equipment, facility
or property, or part or appurtenance thereof whatsoever, in or from any
park;

///

///
(4) Cut or remove any sand, wood, turf, grass, gravel, stone or timber in or from any park, or make any excavation by any tool, equipment, blasting or by any other means in any park;

(5) Paint, erect, mark, post or fasten on or to any tree, shrub, fence, wall, building, monument or other property in any park any poster, bill, advertisement, inscription, sign or display, except for temporary directional signs which do not otherwise interfere with City-authorized signage, directing participants to an event within the park. Temporary directional signs shall be removed by event participants immediately following the event.

(6) Take or operate a vehicle upon or over any lawn or landscaping in any park. City will determine repair or replacement costs in event of damage.

Section 23. **LITTERING.** No person may deposit, drop or scatter any garbage, trash or rubbish, including, but not limited to, any glass, cigars/cigarettes or remains, paper, cans, ashes, leaves and cuttings, furniture, appliances or concrete in any park except in a receptacle designed and placed to receive the same; nor may any person import into or deposit in any park from any other place any garbage, trash or rubbish.
Section 24. CLOSING TIME – EMERGENCY CLOSING.

(1) Unless modified by the Director, all parks shall be open from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. during official Pacific Standard Time, and from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. during official Pacific Daylight Time.

(2) Entering or remaining after closing time:

(a) No person may enter or remain in any park or portion thereof at any time when the same is closed to the public unless the person is authorized to do so by the Director in writing.

(b) The Director shall, by appropriate signs or other means, give notice of closing times, and may designate certain areas which will be closed to the public at a regular closing time, regardless of whether or not any outdoor or indoor event is being or is scheduled to be conducted elsewhere in the park.

(c) Persons may remain after closing time if camped in a specifically designated camping area.

(3) Events After Closing Time: Any portion of a park or any enclosed building in a park in which an event is being conducted or is scheduled to be conducted, based upon a permit issued by the Director, shall not be
considered closed after the regular closing time to members of the public who are authorized participants in the event, and who are within the permitted portion of the park, the building, any paths leading thereto from any street, or any other facility, outdoor area or off-street parking area intended for use in connection therewith, until thirty minutes after the conclusion of the permitted event. As to other members of the public who are not participants in the event, the park and all buildings therein shall be considered closed at the regular closing time.

(4) Keizer Little League Park may be open after normal closing times where fields are appropriately lighted within the dates and times as follows:

(a) Lighting may extend the park hours from March 1 to October 31.

(b) The park will close, and the lights will be off, at 11:00 p.m.

(c) Extended hours shall be limited to Monday through Saturday; the park shall close at normal closing times on Sundays.

(d) City Council may extend these hours for special events.

(5) Emergency closing:

(a) The Council, the Director, or the Chief of Police, or their authorized representatives, may direct any park or designated
portion thereof to be closed at certain times or from time to time if the closing is reasonably necessary for the proper conduct of any activity by City, to protect public property or natural resources within a park or any private or public property or natural resources in the vicinity of a park from damage, or to preserve the public peace or safety in a park or portion of a park or in the vicinity thereof.

(b) When a park or portion thereof is closed to the public, pursuant to the above authority or any other proper authority, no person may enter the park or closed portion thereof after notice of closing or fail or refuse to promptly leave the park when requested to do so by the Director, any park attendant, guard, special officer authorized by the Director, or law enforcement officer.

Section 25. VESSELS.

(1) For parks located adjacent to the Willamette River, any vessel must be operated in accordance with all applicable county, state and federal regulations.
(2) No person may operate any windsurfer, air mattress, inner tube or raft or pontoon boat in any park except as designated by the Director. Any manufactured or homemade device deemed unsafe by United States Coast Guard standards or any park staff, or any vessel that requires occupant(s) to be in the water at any time is prohibited.

Section 26. VIOLATIONS.

(1) Violation of this Ordinance is considered a Class A violation as provided in ORS Chapter 153. Enforcement shall be accomplished through the Keizer Civil Infraction Ordinance.

(2) All fines levied from violations and any permit fees collected shall be placed in the City Parks fund.

(3) In addition to enforcement noted above, violators may be excluded from the park.

Section 27. SEVERABILITY. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional, or is denied acknowledgment by any court or board of competent jurisdiction, then such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.
Section 28. REPEAL OF ORDINANCE NO. 2001-460. Ordinance No. 2001-460 (Establishing Keizer Parks Regulations) is hereby repealed in its entirety.

Section 29. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after its passage.

PASSED this 7th day of May, 2007.

SIGNED this 7th day of May, 2007.

[Signature]
Mayor

[Signature]
City Recorder
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

RESOLUTION NO. R96- 894

ESTABLISHING A PROCESS FOR NAMING OF CITY PARKS

WHEREAS, The City of Keizer desires a formal policy for naming park properties, and

WHEREAS, a policy was reviewed and recommended by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council adopt the following process for naming park properties:

1. Criteria: Park properties should be named for their location, or in memory of a deceased individual who has positively impacted the City of Keizer in his/her lifetime.

2. Public input: In the case of a Neighborhood park, include a question on a park survey that is distributed to the neighbors of the park, asking their ideas for a name. If the park is larger and would be considered a Community park, ideas for a park name could be asked in the local paper, City Newsletter or water bill.

3. Parks and Recreation Advisory Board review: All ideas will be reviewed by the Board and a recommendation forwarded to the City Council.

4. City Council Decision: The City Council will receive from the Parks Board a review of the possible park names along with the Board’s recommendation.

PASSED this 15 day of April, 1996.

SIGNED this 15 day of April, 1996

Mayor

City Recorder
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2006-1737

ADOPTING POLICIES FOR KEIZER PARKS AND
PUBLIC PLACES DONATION OPPORTUNITIES

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the adoption of policies with regard
to donations to parks and public spaces;

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to adopt such policies for future donations;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the attached
"City of Keizer Park and Public Space Donation Policies" is hereby adopted.

PASSED this 20th day of November, 2006.

SIGNED this 20th day of November, 2006.

Mayor

City Recorder
City of Keizer Park and Public Space Donation Policies

POLICY STATEMENT:

The Keizer Council, Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, and other boards and task forces appreciate individuals and organizations who wish to observe, acknowledge or remember a significant historical event, occasion, or individual through donations to improve public spaces, parks or buildings by planting trees, installing site furnishings or other amenities.

When carried out in a manner that helps accomplish a recognized need within Keizer and that adds to the quality of a public space, park or building, such donations are both a positive memorial and significant contribution to the community.

Donors are encouraged to consider methods that provide a meaningful contribution in the name of an individual or event without the need for a physical memorial. Assisting with the renovation of a feature or structure or the design and construction of a site, trail, structure, or the planting of a tree or grove of trees may be a lasting memory that also contributes to the quality of a site. The donation of land or the assistance with the acquisition of land can be a very significant and lasting memorial.

SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

The following guidelines are adopted to clarify City requirements relating to common donation requests.

1. Tree Donations

The City accepts trees or financial donations for trees when the following guidelines are met:

   a. Locating a tree in the proposed site is appropriate and would preserve the integrity and aesthetics of the site.
   b. Special location requests will be considered with the final location to be determined by the City.
   c. Tree species and size must be approved by the City.
   d. Donations may be made at any time of the year but actual planting will take place during the best time of year for survival; usually in the spring or fall.
   e. The City of Keizer will install or arrange for installation of all approved trees. When agreeable to both the City and the donor, installation can be carried out by the donor or another approved installer.
   f. Trees will be pruned and maintained to the same standard as other trees in the park.
   g. In instances where trees do not survive, tree replacements will be provided if the City was responsible for planting the tree. Replacement trees may or may not be of the same variety and in the exact location as that of the original donation.
Due to concerns over maintenance, vandalism, and the more natural setting associated with a living memorial, plaques may not be appropriate in every situation. Should donors wish to participate in the planting of a memorial tree, or wish to host a commemorative ceremony, they may make arrangements with the City to do so. Donors are responsible for all ceremonal arrangements and associated costs.

2. Shelters, Table, Bench and Art Donations

Shelters, benches, tables, art and other amenities of a similar scale enhance the beauty and utility of Keizer's parks and public spaces. In making donations for a specific amenity or site, the following guidelines apply:

a. Staff will work to identify existing benches and other site amenities which need to be replaced or installed. Donors are encouraged to provide amenities at these locations.

b. Although suggestions will be considered for particular locations, placement must be approved by the City. Final decisions as to location will be determined by the City in consultation with the donor.

c. All park amenities will be designed, constructed, and installed in a manner that meets the standards and requirements of the City.

d. The City of Keizer will install or arrange for installation of all approved site furnishings, and amenities. When agreeable to both the City and the donor, installation can be carried out by the donor or another approved installer.

e. The City of Keizer will maintain site furnishings and amenities according to the maintenance schedule for the selected park or public space.

f. If intended as a memorial, appropriate plaques may be attached to the amenity provided the following standards are met:
   - The size, placement, and wording of the plaque do not change or detract from the public use and enjoyment of the site.
   - The plaque materials, construction, and installation meet City standards for durability and maintenance.
   - Should donors wish to plan a memorial or commemorative ceremony associated with a donated amenity, they may make arrangements with the City to do so. Donors are responsible for all ceremonial arrangements and associated costs.

g. A financial donation covering the future maintenance of the amenity may be required.

h. Keizer will maintain donated park and public space amenities. The amenity may be removed or relocated upon consultation with the donor.

3. Cash Donations

Except as stated below, cash donations will be used to best meet current needs of the parks and public spaces as determined by the City.
From time to time, the City may accept cash donations that the donor requires to be used for a specific project. Restricted cash donations will be carefully reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Projects will be approved only if they:

a. maintain or improve the public space consistent with its existing or planned character and use. It is important that the character of natural areas, athletic fields, playgrounds, picnic areas, meeting spaces, and other public areas be maintained and enhanced. It is important that if the donation is intended as a memorial that it not transform the site into a location that is perceived as a site of memorials.

b. are consistent with specific plans (if any) approved by the City for the proposed site. Only proposals that are consistent with such plans and advance the quality of the area as a public space will be approved.

c. involve acceptable liabilities, expenses, and maintenance obligations for the City of Keizer over the expected life of the donation. Any proposal that has significant impact or financial implications for the City, and has not been explicitly approved as part of an existing plan, must be approved by the City Council.

PROCEDURES

1. Cash donations are made payable to the City of Keizer.

2. Proposed non-cash or restricted cash donations must be submitted in writing on a form provided by the City.

3. The City will review proposed donations and approve those that meet an immediate need of Keizer parks or public spaces, that are appropriate for the site, are consistent with city principles regarding memorials and that meet applicable standards relating to design, materials, construction, and installation.

4. When there are questions regarding a potential donation or memorial other entities will be involved with the review as appropriate. This can include City Departments, the Parks and Recreation Citizens Advisory Board, the City Manager, the City Council, and others. Questions can include the desirability or consistency of a proposal within the context of existing plans, aesthetic impact, cost and maintenance implications for the City, liability, and others.

5. Specific donations will be documented in an agreement. Once such an agreement has been signed by a donor and the City, and the associated funding or materials associated with the donation received by the City, the City will proceed with arranging for final design (if needed) and installation.

6. In no event shall any tree, shrub, other vegetation, shelter, bench, table, site furnishings or any other item of any type be placed on park or other public property
without the express written consent of the City. If any item is placed without such permission, it is subject to removal without notice.

7. As used herein, "the City" shall mean the City Manager or his/her designee.
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2006-1740

AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. R96-894 (ESTABLISHING A PROCESS FOR NAMING OF CITY PARKS)

WHEREAS, Resolution No. R96-894 was adopted by the Keizer City Council on April 15, 1996;

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to amend such Resolution to provide for the renaming of City Parks;

WHEREAS, the Keizer City Council has considered the matter and wishes to amend the Resolution as set forth below;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that Resolution No. R96-894 (Establishing a Process for Naming of City Parks) is amended as set forth below:

Section 1. Addition of Section 5. A new Section 5 is added to Resolution No. R96-894 as follows:

5. Renaming of Parks: For the renaming of existing, named parks, the City Council may adopt a new name for a park after such review, recommendation by
the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, and public
input as City Council may see fit without necessarily
following the above process.

PASSED this 20th day of November, 2006.

SIGNED this 20th day of November, 2006.

Mayor
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RATIFYING CITY MANAGER’S EXECUTION OF KEIZER RAPIDS PARK DOG PARK DONATION AGREEMENT (KEIZER VETERINARY CLINIC LLP)

WHEREAS, the City of Keizer has adopted Resolution R2006-1737 (Adopting Policies for Keizer Parks and Public Places Donation Opportunities) which sets forth policies for cash and non-cash donations for public parks;

WHEREAS, Keizer Veterinary Clinic LLP wishes to donate $11,000.00 to initiate construction of the dog park at Keizer Rapids Park and wishes to make the donation depending on terms and conditions set forth in the attached Agreement;

WHEREAS, City wishes to accept such donation and enter into the attached Agreement pursuant to Resolution R2006-1737;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the execution of the attached Keizer Rapids Park Dog Park Donation Agreement by the City Manager is hereby ratified.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager and city staff are authorized to move forward with any actions consistent with such Agreement and construct the dog park pursuant to the adopted Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan.

PASSED this 7th day of April, 2008.

SIGNED this 7th day of April, 2008.

[Signature]
Mayor

[Signature]
City Recorder
KEIZER RAPIDS PARK DOG PARK DONATION AGREEMENT

PARTIES:

CITY OF KEIZER

KEIZER VETERINARY CLINIC LLP

(City)

(Keizer Veterinary)

RECITALS:

A. City has adopted Resolution R2006-1737 (Adopting Policies for Keizer Parks and Public Places Donation Opportunities). Such Resolution sets forth the policies for cash and non-cash donations for public parks.

B. Keizer Veterinary wishes to donate $11,000.00 to initiate construction of a dog park at the Keizer Rapids Park. Keizer Veterinary wishes to make this donation depending on the terms and conditions set forth herein.

C. City wishes to accept such donation and together with other funds construct the dog park as approved in the Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan.

Now therefore, based on the mutual promises and considerations set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT:

1. Upon execution of this Agreement by both parties, Keizer Veterinary shall remit $11,000.00 to City.

2. City agrees to use such funds solely for construction of the dog park in substantial conformance with the adopted Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan.

3. Such dog park shall be substantially complete no later than June 1, 2011, subject to appropriate budget approval.

4. City agrees to construct and place two (2) signs in connection with the dog park. One sign will be placed at each entrance to the dog park. The dog park shall not be named for Keizer Veterinary, but Keizer Veterinary shall be the sole sponsor listed in prominent lettering on such sign. The size, design and text of such signs shall be subject to the reasonable approval of Keizer Veterinary.
5. City agrees that the dog park shall not be named for an individual either living or deceased prior to June 1, 2023.

6. The listing of Keizer Veterinary as the primary sponsor shall be used on the signs as set forth above and any and all promotional information and material distributed or produced by City. The naming of Keizer Veterinary as primary sponsor in such situations shall continue until June 1, 2023.

7. City agrees to keep the dog park in good condition and repair for the term of this Agreement.

8. Keizer Veterinary shall have no rights with regard to use or regulation of the dog park.

CITY OF KEIZER
By: __________________________
    Christopher C. Eppley,
    City Manager
DATED: 3-7-08

KEIZER VETERINARY CLINIC LLP
By: __________________________
    Chris S. Erion, Partner
DATED: 3-28-08
March 3, 2008

Mr. Chris Erion  
Keizer Veterinary Clinic  
4815 River Rd. N  
Keizer, Oregon 97303

Dear Mr. Erion:

I appreciate your quick response on the details for signage at the new off-leash Dog Park located at Keizer Rapids Park. The Community is extremely excited about this amenity at Keizer Rapids Park and with your firms donation it will become a reality.

This letter outlines my understanding of our conversation on Feb 29, 2008 regarding the signage required in order to fully execute the draft document Chris Eppley delivered to your offices. The City will provide two signs one at each entrance to the Dog Park on the top rail of the fence 20” high by 48” long using 6” size lettering for “Keizer Veterinary Clinic”, 3” lettering for the “Sponsored By” and 2” lettering identifying your firms web site address. The City will provide proofs of the proposed signage for your review prior to ordering. Once the agreement is signed and this letter of understanding is initialed the fence and signage will be ordered and installed. I estimate the project including sign installations will take 6-10 weeks to complete.

I believe I have captured all of our discussion points regarding expectations on the signs. If you concur, please forward a signed copy of the dog park agreement, an initialed copy of this letter to Chris Eppley, so we may begin the project. Let me know at 503-856-3554 if I didn’t cover all the items discussed last week. The City looks forward to a successful project with our partners providing the first formal amenity at Keizer Rapids Park.

Sincerely:

Rob Kissler  
Director of Public Works  
kissslerr@keizer.org

“Pride, Spirit and Volunteerism”
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2009-1917

ADOPTING POLICIES FOR KEIZER PARKS AND RECREATION DONATION OPPORTUNITIES;
REPEALING RESOLUTION R2006-1737 (ADOPTING POLICIES FOR KEIZER PARKS AND PUBLIC PLACES DONATION OPPORTUNITIES)

WHEREAS, Resolution R2006-1737 (Adopting Policies for Keizer Parks and Public Places Donation Opportunities) was adopted by the Keizer City Council on November 20, 2006;

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to repeal such Resolution and replace it with new policies for future donations;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the attached "Keizer Parks and Recreation Donation Opportunities" is hereby adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution R2006-1737 (Adopting Policies for Keizer Parks and Public Places Donation Opportunities) is hereby repealed in its entirety.

PASSED this 2nd day of February, 2009.

SIGNED this 2nd day of February, 2009.

[Signature]
Mayor

[Signature]
City Recorder

PAGE 1 - Resolution R2009-1917
Keizer Parks and Recreation
Donation Opportunities

The Keizer City Council and Keizer Parks and Recreation Board encourage individuals, groups and organizations to make donations to improve public parks, places and facilities.

I. Types of Donations: Gifts donated to parks can be designated for a specific park or program or undesignated leaving use of the donation to the discretion of city staff. Donation opportunities are limitless but include:

- Park Equipment (benches, picnic tables, kiosks, walkways)
- Playground Equipment
- Trees and shrub plantings
- Recreation Programs and Scholarships
- Sports Equipment
- Artwork
- Structures & facilities
- Property

Gifts to improve Keizer parks can be donated to the City of Keizer or the Keizer Parks Foundation. This foundation was established in 2007 to provide a volunteer citizen organization and fundraising effort focusing solely on improving Keizer’s parks and associated recreation programs. The foundation will work with the Keizer Parks Department to implement its projects in a manner that is coordinated with and beneficial to the city.

Gifts may be tax deductible. Donors are advised to consult their own tax professional to determine deductibility. Each individual, group, or organization will receive a letter of appreciation and appropriate tax verification information.

II. Criteria for Accepting Donations: The following general principles have been established by the Keizer Parks and Recreation Board to help determine the appropriateness of donations:

A. Preserve the integrity and artistry of the parks, trails, and open spaces. Donations should be placed in a park to enhance the master plan and be part of the overall landscape design of the site.

B. Provide a “Quiet Reverence” instead of a public display. Donations should allow the existing natural scenery and architecture to dominate. Donations should not detract from the quality of the visitor’s experience or overpower the setting.

C. Less is better than more. A conservative approach is warranted and great consideration must be given to site design if a donation is located in scenic or historic environs of parks, trails, and open spaces.
D. **Incorporate Broad Community Values.** All donations should have significance that is readily apparent to the general public and not that of a small special interest group.

III. Recognition for donations:

A. **Acknowledgement of general donations:** The city and parks and recreation advisory board will work to visibly acknowledge significant donations in a manner that is appropriate for the given donation, that does not detract from the quality of a park or program, and that serves to encourage further donations to improve public facilities and programs.

B. **Acknowledgement of sponsorships:** Sponsorships are temporary agreements with the city of Keizer for donations that fund events, recreational activities, or specific items (i.e. benches, trees, tables, fountains). The acknowledgement will be in the form of a plaque and/or recognition in event materials or other agreed upon recognition methods. For specific items, the recognition may extend to the life of the item at the City's option.

C. **Acknowledgement through Naming Rights:** One of the most visible and sensitive forms of acknowledgement is the naming of a park or a facility within a park after an individual, company, or organization. In an effort to treat all "naming" suggestions in a fair and open manner, and recognizing the potential for controversy surrounding such decisions, the Parks and Recreation Advisory group has developed the following guidelines.

1. **General Procedure for Naming Rights:**
   a. Naming suggestions from the public, advisory board members, organizations, and others should be made to the Parks Division in Keizer's Public Works Department in writing. The information provided should include justification for the name in order to aid in considering the suggestion.
   b. After review by the appropriate city staff the proposal will be placed on the agenda of the Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory board and will be brought forward with a recommendation from city staff. Public input will be solicited via normal publication methods and time will be provided for public input at a designated Parks Advisory meeting. Procedures for naming and renaming of parks will at a minimum include the provisions outlined in City Council Resolutions R96-894 and R2006-1740 pertaining to the naming of city parks.
   c. The Keizer Parks and Recreation Board recommendation will be forwarded to the Keizer City Council for final action and official designation.

2. **Criteria for Names:** The following are criteria the advisory board will use in considering suggestions for names:
a. Names will be considered if appropriate for the park, facility, or amenity within a facility. The name must not duplicate, or be closely relate to, or pronounced similarly, to any other name within the Keizer system to minimize confusion to the general public; or be a name associated with a company whose business is deemed illegal; or be discriminatory or derogatory of race, gender, creed, religious or political affiliations, or other similar factors.

b. To be recommended, names should be relevant to the item being named, be reviewed by other individuals, corporations, and organizations who have made significant contributions to the completion of the park or facility being named, and meet one or more of the following criteria:

(1) Recognize a person or organization that has made an exceptional contribution to and a positive impact in the community, either through many acts over time or one exceptional contribution. Relevant contributions can include: significant funding or donations of material, time, and/or talent to build, maintain or develop a park or facility; donations enabling the acquisition, development or conveyance of land or facility; or other tangible or intangible contributions or positive impacts.

(2) Highlight a relevant, important historical event, natural phenomenon or geographic location.

(3) Names reflecting private business identities will be considered when it results from donations that made a park or facility available to the public that otherwise would not exist and reflects either the initial agreement concerning the donation and/or ongoing contributions helping to maintain or improve the park or facility. Commitments for names conferred through this provision are only for the period of time specified in the associated agreements. Names reflecting business donations will only be considered when the donation covers in excess of 50% of the costs associated with the facility.

3. In all cases, the Parks Advisory Board and City of Keizer are strongly committed to appropriately acknowledge all critical contributors through signage at the site of major donations. Signage shall be approved and placed by the City or its agents only.
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2009-1931

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A TRANSACTION FOR THE EXCHANGE OF PROPERTY ADJACENT TO WALLACE HOUSE PARK, MARION COUNTY, KEIZER, OREGON WITH DENNIS AND TOMI FAST

WHEREAS, Dennis and Tomi Fast own the residential property located at 3595 Rivercrest Drive N., Keizer, Marion County, Oregon;

WHEREAS, such property is adjacent to Wallace House Park;

WHEREAS, city staff and the Fasts have preliminarily agreed to an exchange of property in which the City would deed a fifteen foot strip adjacent to the Fast rear property line and the Fasts would dedicate fifteen feet of additional right-of-way on Rivercrest Drive;

WHEREAS, a notice of hearing as provided in ORS 221.725 was completed and a public hearing was held on March 16, 2009;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Keizer enters the findings set forth below;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED as follows:

Section 1. PUBLIC HEARING. A public hearing was held before the City Council on March 16, 2009. Notice of such hearing was published concerning the above
Section 2. FINDINGS. The notice requirements of ORS 221.725 have been complied with. The nature of the proposed transaction and the general terms thereof, including other evidence of the market value of the property have been fully disclosed by the City Council at the public hearing. Any resident of the city has been given an opportunity to present written or oral testimony at the hearing.

The fifteen foot strip of property adjacent to the Fast rear lot line is of limited use as park property and would be better used as rear yard area in exchange for the expansion of the right-of-way on Rivercrest Drive which provides better pedestrian and bicycle access to the park. The expansion of Rivercrest Drive and the frontage improvements discussed herein benefit the park with better access.

Section 3. DECISION TO TRANSFER PROPERTY. Following the public hearing, the City Council voted to authorize the City Manager to transfer the property as contemplated in the state report.

Section 4. AUTHORIZATION TO CITY MANAGER. The City Council hereby authorizes the City Manager to transfer the property as set forth herein.

PASSED this 16th day of March, 2009.

SIGNED this 16th day of March, 2009.

Mayor

City Recorder
PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY DEDICATION

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that Dennis J. Fast and Tomi R. Fast, as tenants by the entirety, hereinafter called the “Dedicators”, in consideration of payment of No Dollars, but for other valuable consideration to them paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, does hereby dedicate to the use of the public forever, for public right of way, sidewalk, and utility purposes, all the certain land described as follows:

SEE EXHIBIT “A”

The Dedicators covenant and warrant to the City of Keizer, its successors and assigns, that they are lawfully seized in fee simple of the above described premises, free from all encumbrances except liens, encumbrances, exceptions, conditions and restrictions of record. Except as limited herein, Dedicators will warrant and forever defend the said premises and every part and parcel thereof against the lawful claims and demands of all persons whomsoever.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Dedicators have executed this instrument this ____ day of ________________, 2009.

Dennis J. Fast

Tomi R. Fast

STATE OF OREGON )
) ss
County of Marion )

On this ____ day of ________________, 2009, before me personally appeared Dennis J. Fast, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who signed the within instrument in my presence.

NOTARY PUBLIC FOR OREGON
My Commission expires: ________
STATE OF OREGON  )  
) ss  
County of Marion )

On this ___ day of ____________, 2009, before me personally appeared Tomi R. Fast, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who signed the within instrument in my presence.

NOTARY PUBLIC FOR OREGON  
My Commission expires: ________

This dedication is accepted on behalf of the public by the City of Keizer, however, the City of Keizer does not accept responsibility to maintain the property described above and is not responsible for any damages resulting on the dedicated property prior to the date that improvements are completed and the property is opened for public use. By acceptance alone, the City of Keizer does not open the subject property for public use.

__________________________
Mayor
EXHIBIT “A”

Legal Description for
Right of Way Dedication
March 6, 2009

The Easterly 15.00 feet of that certain tract of land conveyed to Dennis J. Fast and Tomi R. Fast, recorded in Reel 2018, Page 108 Marion County Deed Records and located in Section 10, Township 7 South, Range 3 West of the Willamette Meridian in Marion County, Oregon and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at an iron pipe that is West 14.48 chains and South 1° 03' East 356.53 feet and North 89° 51' West 2014.95 feet from the Northeast corner of the South ½ of the T.D. Keizer Donation Land Claim No. 38, in Section 11, Township 7 South, Range 3 West of the Willamette Meridian, Marion County, Oregon, and which point of beginning is on the South line of that tract of land conveyed to Lloyd E. Weeks et ux, by deed recorded August 4, 1926 in Book 188, Page 144 Deed Records for Marion County, Oregon;

Thence North 89° 51' West a distance of 15.00 feet along said Weeks’ South line to a point;

Thence South 0° 09' West a distance of 125.00 feet to a point, said point being on the South line of said Fast tract;

Thence South 89° 51' East a distance of 15.00 feet to a point on the Westerly line of Rivercrest Drive NE, said point being the Southeast corner of said Fast tract;

Thence North 0° 09' East a distance of 125.00 feet along the Westerly line of Rivercrest Drive NE to the Northeast corner of said Fast tract and the point of beginning.

Containing 1,875 square feet of land, more or less.
BARGAIN AND SALE DEED - STATUTORY FORM

CITY OF KEIZER, an Oregon municipal corporation, Grantor, conveys to DENNIS J. FAST and TOMI R. FAST, as tenants by the entirety, Grantee, the Grantor’s interest in the following described real property situated in Marion County, Oregon, to-wit:

See Exhibit “A” attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

The true consideration for this conveyance is no money, but other good and valuable consideration.


DATED this __________ day of ______________________, 2009.

CITY OF KEIZER, an Oregon Municipal Corporation

By: __________________________

Christopher C. Eppley, City Manager

STATE OF OREGON
County of Marion

This instrument was acknowledged before me on _________________, 2009 by Christopher C. Eppley, City Manager of the City of Keizer, an Oregon municipal corporation.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission Expires: __________

AFTER RECORDING
RETURN TO:
Dennis and Tomi Fast
3595 Rivercrest Dr N
Keizer, OR 97303

UNTIL A CHANGE IS REQUESTED,
SEND ALL TAX STATEMENTS TO:
Dennis and Tomi Fast
3595 Rivercrest Dr N
Keizer, OR 97303
EXHIBIT “A”

Legal Description
January 23, 2009

A portion of Parcel 2, as recorded in Reel 1092, Page 223 Deed Records for Marion County, Oregon, located in Section 10, Township 7 South, Range 3 West of the Willamette Meridian in Marion County, Oregon and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the South line of Parcel 3 as recorded in Reel 1092, Page 223 Marion County Deed Records, said point being the Northwest corner of that certain tract of land conveyed to Dennis J. Fast and Tomi R. Fast and recorded in Reel 2018, Page 108 Marion County Deed Records;

Thence South 00° 09’ 00” West a distance of 125.00 feet along the West line of said tract to the Southwest corner of said tract;

Thence North 89° 45’ 00” West a distance of 15.00 feet along the Southerly extension of said Fast tract;

Thence North 00° 09’ 00” East a distance of 125.00 feet, more or less, parallel with the West line of said Fast tract to a point on the South line of said Parcel 3;

Thence South 89° 45’ 59” East a distance of 15.00 feet along the South line of said Parcel 3 to the Northwest corner of said Fast tract and the point of beginning.

Containing 1,875 square feet, more or less.
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2010-2006

ESTABLISHING KEIZER PARK USE FEES; REPEALING RESOLUTION R2009-1964

WHEREAS, Keizer Parks Regulations provide for use fees to be set by resolution;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2009-1950 set such fees;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2009-1964 revised such fees and repealed Resolution R2009-1950;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Keizer wishes to amend the Keizer Park Use Fees;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that park use fees for reserved exclusive use shall be as follows:

Section 1. $35.00 minimum for two (2) hours and then $12.00 per hour for each additional hour for park areas in which any shelters, temporary structures or facilities are constructed, except for the Keizer Rotary Amphitheater.

Section 2. $70.00 minimum for two (2) hours and then $35.00 per hour for each additional hour up to a maximum of $350.00 per day for any single sport field reserved for organized events or any events at the Keizer Rotary Amphitheatre organized by private parties, non-profit entities, or organizations benefiting the City of Keizer community.

III

III
Section 3. $105.00 minimum for three (3) hours and then $35.00 per hour for each additional hour or ten percent (10%) of ticket sales, whichever is greater, for any single sport field reserved for organized events or any events at the Keizer Rotary Amphitheatre for any for-profit organizations or any party or person not listed in Section 2.

Section 4. In addition to the use fees set forth above, there shall be a fee of $10.00 for a half day or $20.00 for a full day for any organized events at the Keizer Rotary Amphitheatre that require electrical power. The City Manager or designee is authorized to establish fees for any additional amenities, such as tables, additional labor charges, or equipment.

Section 5. In addition to the use fees set forth above, there shall be a permit application fee submitted in the amount of $50.00. If the event is cancelled within city regulations (see below) or the event permit denied, the use fees shall be refunded. The permit application fee shall only be refunded if the event permit is denied.

Section 6. Use fees shall be refunded in full if the event is cancelled thirty or more days prior to the date of the event. Such cancellation shall be in writing to the City and must be confirmed by the City in order to receive a refund. The City Manager or designee is authorized to establish appropriate procedures and process as set forth in the Use Agreement signed by all users.

Section 7. The process set forth herein shall be followed instead of the process set forth in the Parade/Special Event Ordinance (Ordinance No. 2000-419).
Section 8. **Waiver of Fees.** At the discretion of the City Manager or the City Manager's designee, fees may be waived for City of Keizer sponsored events, and for State of Oregon approved schools when requesting a park for educational use.

At the discretion of the City Manager or the City Manager's designee, park materials or services may be accepted in lieu of all or part of the applicable park reservation fee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that this Resolution shall take effect immediately.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution R2009-1964 is hereby repealed in its entirety.

PASSED this 4th day of January, 2010.

SIGNED this 4th day of January, 2010.

Mayor

City Recorder
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2013-2318

REESTABLISHING THE KEIZER PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD; REPEALING RESOLUTION R93-691 AND RESOLUTION R2007-1772

WHEREAS, the Keizer City Council reestablished the Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board by Resolution R93-691 on December 20, 1993;

WHEREAS, Resolution R93-691 was amended by Resolution R2007-1772 on May 7, 2007;

WHEREAS, the City Council wishes to update the requirements of the Board under the established format for Council boards;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board is hereby reestablished as outlined in Appendix “A”, which is attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the terms of the current Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board members shall continue without change.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution R93-691 and Resolution R2007-1772 are hereby repealed in its entirety.

PASSED this 22nd day of January, 2013.

SIGNED this 22nd day of January, 2013.

[Signature]
Mayor

[Signature]
City Recorder
Appendix "A"
City Council Advisory Board

Name: Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board

Purpose: The Board will serve in an advisory capacity to the City Council on issues pertaining to Keizer public parks, operating policies, and long range plans. In addition, the Board will act in the role of community catalyst in the formation and achievement of a comprehensive community-wide parks and recreation system.

Membership: The Board shall consist of nine (9) voting members to be appointed as outlined by the City Council Rules of Procedure. Members may be chosen from among such persons concerned with and interested in the conservation and development of public parks and playgrounds and like public places in the City. The Mayor will appoint a non-voting Council liaison to the Board and make such announcement at a regularly scheduled Council meeting. The Board will be staffed by a non-voting staff liaison to be appointed by the City Manager.

Term of Office: Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a three-year term. The terms of the members shall be staggered so that not more than one-third of the members will expire in the same year.

Chair and Vice-Chair: The Board will elect a Chair and Vice-Chair at the first meeting of each calendar year.

Meetings: Members of the Board shall establish a regular meeting date and shall meet as deemed necessary by the Chair. All meetings of the Board shall follow Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised and the Oregon Public Meeting Laws.

Attendance: It is the duty of each member to attend at least 75% of the meetings each calendar year. When a member is unable to attend a meeting, the member shall notify the Chair. Members of the Board may be removed by a two-thirds majority vote of the City Council.
AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE

The City of Keizer ordains as follows:

Section 1. TITLE AND PURPOSE. This Ordinance shall be known and may be cited as the "Parks Systems Development Charge Ordinance of the City of Keizer." The purpose of this charge or fee is to create a source of funds to assist in paying for capital improvement and acquisition of land for parks.

Section 2. FINDINGS. The City Council of the City of Keizer hereby finds:

(a) It is more cost efficient to use SDC revenue from new development in the entire community to finance the growth related portion of capital improvements based upon a city-wide priority rather than to hold the SDC revenue generated in one area of the community for improvements just in that area.

(b) The increase in administrative costs to account for receipt and expenditure of SDC revenues based upon geographic areas of the City of Keizer rather than on a city-wide basis would divert revenue from needed capital improvement projects. The benefit of minimizing administrative costs attributable to the systems development charge outweighs the benefit of allocating SDC revenues and expenditures based upon geographic areas.

(c) The systems development charge imposed by this Ordinance is not intended to be a tax on property or on a property owner as a direct consequence of ownership of the property within the meaning of Section 11b, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution.
or the legislation implementing such Section. If the systems
development charge imposed herein is viewed under the Section
as a tax against property or against a property owner, it is an
incurred charge within the meaning of that Section and the
legislation implementing it because it allows the owner to
control the quantity of service by determining the extent of
development, and it allows the owner to determine when the
service is to be initiated or increased by controlling when the
development occurs.

Section 3. SCOPE. The systems development charge imposed
by this Ordinance is separate from and in addition to any applicable
tax, assessment, charge, fee in lieu of assessment, or fee otherwise
provided by law or imposed as a condition of development. A systems
development charge is to be considered in the nature of a charge for
service rendered, or a charge for services to be rendered.

Section 4. DEFINITIONS. As used in this Ordinance, the
following words and phrases shall mean:

(a) Building Permit. Any permit issued by the building
department of the City of Keizer or Marion County.

(b) Capital Improvement. Facilities or assets used for parks
and recreation, including, but not limited to, neighborhood parks,
community parks, and other recreational facilities.

Capital improvement does not include costs of the operation or
routine maintenance of capital improvements.

(c) Development. (1) The first establishment of a use
involving the construction or the placing of a structure upon a
parcel of land that was prior to that event not occupied by any
structure, or (2) any construction, alteration or change of occupancy which increases the usage of any capital improvement or which creates the need for additional capital improvements.

(d) Owner. The legal owner of record of land or, where there is a recorded land contract which is in force, the purchaser thereunder.

(e) Improvement Fee. A fee for costs associated with capital improvements.

(f) Qualified Public Improvement. An improvement that is:

(1) Required as a condition of residential development approval; and

(2) Identified in the Comprehensive Park System Development Plan; and

(3) Not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of residential development approval.

(g) Reimbursement Fee. A fee for costs associated with capital improvements already constructed or under construction.

(h) System Development Charge or SDC. A reimbursement fee, an improvement fee, or a combination thereof, assessed or collected any of the times specified in Section 8 of this Ordinance. System development charge does not include any fees assessed or collected as part of a local improvement district or a charge in lieu of a local improvement district assessment, or the cost of complying with requirements or conditions imposed upon a land use decision.
Section 5. DEVELOPMENT CHARGE IMPOSED. Parks systems development charges as provided in this Ordinance are hereby imposed upon all development within the City of Keizer except where exempt under the provisions of Section 9. The person securing the building permit shall pay to the City of Keizer said parks systems development charge or charges established by resolution.

Section 6. DEDICATED FUNDS FROM SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE. The revenues received from the systems development charges shall be dedicated, budgeted and expended as provided by state law.

Section 7. USE OF CHARGE, SPECIAL FUND. All of the moneys dedicated under Section 6 shall be used only for the cost of projected capital improvements as provided for in the Comprehensive Park System Development Plan, including the costs of developing system development charge, methodology and providing an annual accounting of such SDC expenditures, provided further, said revenues may be pledged and used toward payment of principal and interest on bonds issued, if any, for the purpose of financing the extra capacity facilities.

Section 8. TIME OF PAYMENT. (a) The amount of the charge imposed under this Ordinance shall be due and payable to the City of Keizer at the time the building permit or mobile home set-up permit or mobile home park permit is issued.

(b) In lieu of payment being made as required under subsection (a) of this Section, the owner of the land on which the improvement will be located may request a lien be placed on the property for the amount of the charge and agree to pay the amount due in semiannual installments as authorized by ORS 223.208. The procedure for...
processing the request, the interest rate and other requirements for
establishing the lien and payment of the obligation in semiannual
installments shall be the same as are used for time payment of
special assessments at the time the lien request is submitted.

Section 9. EXEMPTIONS. The charge or fee imposed under this
Ordinance shall not apply to the following:

(a) Reconstruction or repair of a building or structure, or
portion thereof, which was damaged or destroyed by earthquake, fire,
flood, or other natural causes over which the owner had no control,
but only if such reconstruction or repair is done pursuant to a
building permit issued within one year after such damage or
destruction and there is no increase in the number of dwelling units.

(b) Moving a building or structure from a lot within City to
another lot within City provided there is no increase in the number
of dwelling units.

(c) Replacement structures for any forced acquisition wherein
a building or structure is acquired for city purposes through eminent
domain provided that the owner obtains a building permit for the
replacement structure within two years of the acquisition, and there
is no increase in the number of dwelling units.

(d) The City of Keizer, Oregon.

(e) Nothing in this Ordinance shall be construed as imposing
a charge upon any person when imposition of such charge upon that
person would be in violation of the Constitution of the United States
or the Constitution of the State of Oregon.

///

///
Section 10. SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE CREDIT. (a) A credit against the SDC shall be allowed for the construction of a qualified public improvement.

(b) If a qualified public improvement is partially located on and partially located off property that is the subject of the residential development approval, the credit shall be only for the cost of that portion of the improvement not located on or wholly contiguous to the property. The credit shall be only against the SDC for the type of improvement being constructed and the credit shall not exceed such SDC even if the cost of the capital improvement exceeds the applicable SDC.

(c) Other types of credits may be granted by the City Manager or his designee, upon recommendation by the Parks Advisory Board. Such credits may include, but are not limited to, a credit for a developer's donation of park land and/or park improvements within their development. In no event shall the credit exceed the amount of the SDC.

Section 11. METHODOLOGY. (a) The methodology used to establish the improvement fee shall consider the cost of projected capital improvements needed to increase the capacity of the systems to which the fee is related.

(b) The methodology authorized by this Section shall be established by resolution; and this methodology may be adopted and amended when making any revision to the system development charge.

Section 12. APPEALS. (a) A decision regarding exemptions or credits made by the City Manager or his designee under this Ordinance may be appealed to the Keizer City Council by filing a written appeal.
request with the City Recorder within ten (10) days from the 
decision, describing with particularity the decision from which the 
person appeals. The Council shall within thirty (30) days after 
filings of the request, hear and consider the appeal. The Council may 
affirm, modify, extend, or overrule said decision in a manner that 
is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance.

(b) In the manner provided in subsection (a), any citizen or 
other interested person may challenge an expenditure of system 
development charge revenues by filing such appeal with the Keizer 
City Council within two years of the expenditure. The decision of 
the Council shall be reviewed only as provided in ORS 34.010 to 
34.100, and not otherwise.

(c) Notwithstanding the above subsections, no legal action 
intended to contest the methodology used for calculating the parks 
system development charge shall be filed after sixty (60) days 
following adoption or modification of the Parks System Development 
Charge Ordinance or Resolution, pursuant to ORS 223.304(5).

Section 13. This act being necessary for the immediate 
preservation of the public peace, health, and safety, an emergency 
is hereby declared to exist and this Ordinance shall be in full force 
and effect upon its passage.

PASSED this 1st day of June ___________, 1992.

SIGNED this 3rd day of June ___________, 1992.

Mayor

City Recorder

LIEN, HOBSON & JOHNSON
Attorneys at Law
4855 River Rd. N.
Keizer, Oregon 97303
(503) 390-1635
PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES
UPDATE METHODOLOGY REPORT
July 17, 2000

Don Ganer & Associates

15418 NW White Fox Dr. • Beaverton, Oregon 97006 • (503) 690-8981
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CITY OF KEIZER

Parks and Recreation Facilities
System Development Charges Update
Methodology Report

1.0 INTRODUCTION

System Development Charges are fees charged to new development to help pay a portion of the costs associated with acquiring and/or building capital facilities to meet the needs of growth. The 1989 Oregon Systems Development Act (ORS 223.297 - 223.314) authorizes the collection of SDC’s for certain types of facilities including:

- transportation,
- water,
- wastewater (sewer),
- stormwater, and
- parks and recreation.

The purpose of the SDC Act was to "...provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges...". The Act requires local governments to:

- enact SDC's by ordinance or resolution,
- develop a methodology outlining how each SDC is developed,
- adopt a capital improvement program (CIP) designating the estimated cost and timing of each project that may be funded with SDC revenues,
- provide credits against SDC’s for "qualified public improvements",
- separately account for SDC revenues and expenditures, and
- adopt procedures for public challenges of expenditures.

The City of Keizer implemented a Parks SDC in 1992. Since that time, cost increases, changes in population estimates, and the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Dolan v. City of Tigard have caused the Parks SDC to become outdated. In January 2000, the City engaged Don Ganer & Associates to update the Parks SDC methodology and rates, and provide guidelines for the expenditure of SDC revenues.
2.0 SDC BACKGROUND AND DATA

This section presents background information and data used to develop the SDC. In particular, this section of the report:

A. Discusses guiding concepts used in developing SDC's,
B. Explains what is meant by the terms "reimbursement fee" and "improvement fee" SDC's,
C. Presents the methodology approach used to update the Parks and Recreation SDC,
D. Analyzes credits,
E. Presents growth projections and summarizes census data regarding persons per dwelling unit,
F. Identifies current Levels of Service (LOS), and
G. Presents growth required facility needs.

A Guiding Concepts

In addition to the requirements of the ORS 223.297 - 223.314, court cases from Oregon and other states provide additional guidance for the methodology used in developing SDC's.

(1) "Essential Nexus" Requirement

In a 1987 case, Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, the U.S. Supreme Court established that government agencies must show that an "essential nexus" (e.g. reasonable connection) exists between a project's impacts and any dedication requirements. For SDC's the "essential nexus" requirement means there must be a reasonable connection between the nature of the development and the facilities being funded with the SDC revenues. If, for example, parks and recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development, an SDC methodology designed to fund the new capacity needed to serve new development meets the "essential nexus" requirement.
(2) "Rough Proportionality" Requirement

In its landmark 1994 decision in Dolan v. City of Tigard, the U.S. Supreme Court cited the need for "rough proportionality" between requirements placed on a developer by government and the impacts of the development. This concept of rough proportionality is applied in SDC's by insuring that new growth is not required to pay to upgrade existing deficiencies or provide new facilities beyond a level "roughly proportionate" with the extent of new development's impact; SDC's can be charged only for the portion of capital facilities costs that are attributable to growth.

ORS 223.307(2) also requires that "the portion of improvements funded by improvement fees must be related [e.g., roughly proportionate] to current or projected development." The City's adopted Comprehensive Park System Development Plan and SDC methodology includes improvements that serve both growth and non-growth needs, and it does not identify which or what portion of the improvements is "related to current or projected development". This SDC methodology update includes SDC rates which are roughly proportionate to the impacts created by new development, and provides SDC revenue expenditure guidelines to promote compliance with ORS 223.307(2).

B "Reimbursement fee" and "Improvement fee" SDC's

The Oregon SDC Act provides for the imposition of two types of SDC's: (1) "improvement" fees, and (2) "reimbursement" fees. "Improvement fee" SDC's may be charged to fund acquisition and/or construction of new capital facilities that will be needed in the future, or to make improvements to existing capital facilities (i.e., additional tennis courts, expansion of playgrounds, etc.) which provide new "capacity" to accommodate growth. In order to maintain facilities at current levels of service (i.e., 1.2 acre per 1,000 persons for developed community parks, etc.), the City will need to add acres and develop parks to serve new development, and the City may charge improvement fee SDC's to fund all or a portion of the costs of these facilities.
If "excess capacity" is available to accommodate future growth, a "reimbursement fee" SDC may be charged to recoup the costs (including bonded indebtedness) associated with improvements which have already been acquired/constructed. The City does not currently have sufficient facilities to meet adopted standards; therefore, no excess capacity exists and a reimbursement fee SDC is not warranted.

C. SDC Methodology Approach

The three basic approaches used in developing SDC's are (1) Capital Projects-Driven, (2) Level of Service (LOS)-Driven, and (3) Combination.

(1) "Capital Projects-Driven" SDC's

Capital Projects-Driven SDC's are based on a specific list of planned capital improvements. The amount of the SDC is determined by allocating a portion of the cost of the planned improvements (the "fair share" that can be attributed to growth) among the projected developments that will be paying SDC's. This approach works best when individual public facilities can be allocated between current and future users on the basis of objective data, and when standards do not adequately allocate costs between these groups. Costs which are attributable to growth may be funded through SDC's, and remaining costs must be funded from non-SDC sources.

(2) "LOS-Driven" SDC's

LOS-Driven SDC's work best when individual facilities cannot be allocated between current and future users on the basis of objective data, and instead are provided on the basis of a levels of service. The SDC is determined by multiplying the LOS standard for each type of facility by the estimated cost per unit of facility. SDC's cannot be used to pay for eliminating deficiencies in the current LOS, or for providing a higher LOS than that which currently exists unless either (1) alternative revenue sources are identified to pay for eliminating existing deficiencies, or (2) the primary recipients of the higher LOS will be future residents.
(3) "Combination" SDC's

A "combination" approach uses elements of both the LOS-Driven approach and the Capital Projects-Driven approach. LOS standards are used to determine facility needs, identify deficiencies and excess capacity, and develop a list of capital improvement projects. The project costs then serve as the basis for calculating the SDC rates.

The Keizer Parks and Recreation SDC update was developed using the "LOS-Driven" approach. LOS standards were developed based on the current LOS, and the costs of maintaining this LOS were then used to determine SDC rates.

D. Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC which a development is required to pay, and must be calculated to account for (1) "qualified public improvements" and (2) other payments new development may make through property taxes or other means.

(1) "Qualified Public Improvement"

A credit must be given for the donation of a "qualified public improvement" which (1) is required as a condition of development approval, (2) is identified in the CIP, and (3) either is not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval, or is required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related. The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (i.e., parks and recreation, etc.), and must be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity (LOS standard) needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credit may be applied against SDC's that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.
In addition to these required credits, the City may, if it so chooses, provide a greater credit, establish a system providing for the transferability of credits, provide a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the capital improvement plan, or provide a share of the cost of an improvement by other means. Any provisions for such credits must be applied uniformly to all new development.

In order for the City to charge growth an improvement fee SDC for 100% of the costs of new facilities required to serve growth, a credit must also be given for any costs that will be paid by growth in the future for existing capital facilities (included in the LOS standards) or future facilities needed to repair deficiencies. The City has no outstanding debt for existing parks and recreation capital facilities and the SDC is designed only to maintain the current LOS; therefore, no credit against the SDC for repayment of debt is required.

E. Population Growth and Persons per Dwelling Unit

The Parks and Recreation SDC is based on projected growth-required capital facility costs per "capita" (person). Estimated population growth from 2000 through 2010 is shown in Table 2.1, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>30,276</td>
<td>6,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Parks and Recreation SDC is based on estimated capital facility costs per capita, with the SDC rates based on the number of persons per dwelling unit. Dwelling units typically house different numbers of persons depending on the type of unit (e.g., single family or multi-family). To determine the appropriate number of persons per dwelling unit, 1990 census data for the City of Keizer maintained by the Center for Population Research and Census at Portland State University was analyzed, and the resulting calculations are presented in Table 2.2, below.

**Table 2.2**

**Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>1990 Census Avg. Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Facilities Inventory and Levels of Service**

The City provides a total of 97.1 acres of parks and recreation facilities, resulting in a total Level of Service (LOS) of 3.2 acres per 1,000 persons. Included in this total are 36.20 acres of developed Community Parks (1.2 acres per 1,000 persons), 16.10 acres of developed Neighborhood Parks (0.5 acres per 1,000 persons), and 22.90 of undeveloped/partially developed parks (0.8 acres per 1,000 persons). Following are photographs showing examples of these facilities in the City.
In addition to these developed and undeveloped parks, the City also has 21.90 acres of Natural Area Parks (0.7 acres per 1,000 persons).
The City’s parks and recreation facilities inventory and levels of service are shown in Table 2.3, below.

**TABLE 2.3**

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

CURRENT INVENTORY AND LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Community Parks</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>LOS/1,000 persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Park</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League Park</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Complex/Chalmer-Jones Park</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>36.20</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Neighborhood Parks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilark Park</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Park</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadows Park</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undeveloped/Partially Developed Parks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whitman Park</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernwook Park</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantview Park</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Area Parks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palma Cia Park</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers Edge Park</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ridge Park</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Total**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97.10</td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City’s Comprehensive Park System Development Plan includes recommended standards\(^1\) for parks acreages of 2.2 acres of developed Community Parks, 1.3 acres of developed Neighborhood Parks, and 5.8 acres of Natural Area Parks per 1,000 persons. In order for the City to charge SDC’s at rates required to meet the adopted standards, the City must either already provide facilities at standard or have a viable plan for how it will remedy the deficiency using a funding source not associated with growth. To meet these standards, the City would need to acquire/develop an additional 34.61 acres of Community Parks, 23.26 acres of Neighborhood Parks, and 153.70 acres of Natural Area Parks just to correct current deficiencies in parks acreages.

As an alternative to using the standards included in the Plan, the current Levels of Service (LOS) identified in Table 2.1 (page 6) may serve as alternative LOS standards by which growth-related facility needs may be determined.

**G. Facilities Needed to Serve Growth**

To determine the City’s growth-required needs, the current LOS for each type of facility (i.e., Developed Community Park acres, Developed Neighborhood Park acres, etc.) was applied to the projected 2010 population of the City. The City’s population is expected to grow by 6,724 residents by the year 2010, when it is expected to reach 37,000\(^2\). Table 2.4, below, presents a summary of additional needed facilities resulting from application of these LOS standards.

**TABLE 2.4**

**ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NEEDED TO SERVE GROWTH**

**(2000 - 2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
<th>Growth-Required Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Community Parks (acres)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Neighborhood Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped/Partially Developed Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Parks System (acres)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>21.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Comprehensive Park System Development Plan, *otak*, May 7, 1992, Tab 1

\(^2\) City staff projection estimate.
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3.0 CALCULATION OF PARKS AND RECREATION SDC

The updated Keizer Parks and Recreation SDC was calculated using a series of sequential formulas which, when completed, yields the SDC rate for each new dwelling unit in the City. The formulas identify:

A. the total growth-required parks and recreation facilities costs (Formula 1, below),
B. the facilities cost per new resident (Formula 2, page 12),
C. the compliance and administrative cost per new resident (Formula 3, page 12),
D. the total facilities cost per new resident (Formula 4, page 13), and
E. the SDC rate per dwelling unit (Formula 5, page 13).

A. Formula 1: Total Growth-Required Facilities Costs

The total growth-required parks and recreation facilities costs are determined by adding the products resulting from multiplying the number of units required to meet growth needs (from Table 2.2, page 6) by the cost per unit of facility.

\[
\begin{align*}
1. \quad \text{Growth-Required Units} \times \text{Cost Per Unit} &= \text{Growth-Required Facilities Costs} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Table 3.1, below, presents the calculation of the growth-required facilities costs.

**TABLE 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Growth-Required Units</th>
<th>Cost Per Unit$^3$</th>
<th>Growth-Required Facilities Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Community Parks (acres)</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$763,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Neighborhood Parks (acres)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>447,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped/Natural Area Parks (acres)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>696,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Growth-Required Units (acres)</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,907,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^3$ Undeveloped/Natural Area land acquisition cost estimate is $70,000 per acre. Developed Community Parks cost estimate is based on undeveloped land cost plus $25,000 per acre for development. Developed Neighborhood Parks cost estimate is based on undeveloped land cost plus $35,000 per acre for development. Cost estimates provided by City staff.
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B. Formula 2: Facilities Cost Per New Resident

The facilities cost per new resident is calculated by dividing the growth-required facilities costs (from Table 3.1, page 11) by the expected increase in the City's population during the planning period (from Table 2.1, page 6).

\[
\frac{\text{Growth-Required Facilities Cost}}{\text{Population Increase}} = \text{Facilities Cost Per New Resident}
\]

Table 3.2, below, presents the calculation of the facilities cost per new resident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.2</th>
<th>FACILITIES COST PER NEW RESIDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth-Required Facilities Costs</td>
<td>Population Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,907,800</td>
<td>6,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Formula 3: Compliance/Administration Cost Per New Resident

ORS 223.307(5) allows the City to recoup the direct costs of complying with Oregon law regarding SDC's. Recoupable costs include consulting, engineering, and legal fees as well as the cost of collecting and accounting for revenues and expenditures. The compliance/administration cost is estimated to total 10% of collected SDC revenues. The compliance/administration cost per new resident is determined by multiplying the facilities cost per new resident by this cost factor (10%).

\[
\frac{\text{Facilities Cost Per New Resident}}{\text{Compliance/Admin. Cost Factor}} = \text{Compliance/Admin. Cost Per New Resident}
\]

Table 3.3, page 14, presents the calculation of the compliance cost per new resident.
TABLE 3.3
COMPLIANCE/ADMINISTRATION COST PER NEW RESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Cost Per New Resident</th>
<th>Compliance/Admin. Cost Factor</th>
<th>Compliance/Admin Cost Per New Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$284</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Formula 4: SDC Per New Resident

The SDC Per New Resident represents the amount of revenue required for each new resident in order to pay the growth-required costs. The calculation is completed by adding the facilities cost per new resident (from Table 3.2, page 12) and the compliance/administration cost per new resident (from Table 3.3, above).

4. Facilities Cost Per New Resident + Compliance/Admin. Cost Per New Resident = SDC Per New Resident

The result of this calculation is presented in Table 3.4, below.

TABLE 3.4
SDC PER NEW RESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Cost Per New Resident</th>
<th>Compliance/Admin Cost Per New Resident</th>
<th>SDC Per New Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Formula 5: SDC Per Dwelling Unit

The SDC Per Dwelling Unit is calculated by multiplying the average number of persons per dwelling unit (from Table 2.2, page 6) by the SDC Per New Resident (from Table 3.4, above).

5. Persons Per Dwelling Unit X SDC Per New Resident = SDC Per Dwelling Unit

The result of this calculation is presented in Table 3.5, page 15.
TABLE 3.5
SDC PER DWELLING UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>X New Resident</th>
<th>SDC Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family:</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family:</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SDC rates identified in Table 3.5, above, are the maximum dollar amounts (in year 2000 dollars) that may be collected from new development for costs related to growth-required parks capital improvements. These costs are based on the expected number of "growth-required units" needed for each type of facility (i.e., community parks, neighborhood parks, etc.) during the period 2000 through 2010. For comparison, the parks SDC rates currently charged by a selection of other area Oregon cities are presented in Table 3.6, below.

TABLE 3.6
PARKS SDC RATES FOR OTHER AREA CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Single-Family Rate</th>
<th>Multi-Family Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tualatin</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canby</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Current as of November 1999
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4.0 SDC EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

ORS 223.307(2) requires that improvement fee SDC's “be spent only on capacity increasing capital improvements, including expenditures relating to repayment of debt for such improvements. An increase in system capacity may be established if a capital improvement increases the level of performance or service provided by existing facilities or provides new facilities.”

ORS 223.307(2) also requires that “the portion of improvements funded by improvement fees must be related to current or projected development.” This means that revenues from improvement fee SDC's may be used only for the portion of capital improvements that are needed for growth.

The City's adopted Comprehensive Park System Development Plan includes improvements that serve both growth and non-growth needs, but it does not identify which of the improvements is “related to current or projected development”. Community Parks and Undeveloped/Natural Area Parks are considered to serve the entire City population, so SDC revenues collected for these facilities may be used to acquire and/or develop Community Parks and Undeveloped/Natural Area Parks anywhere within the City. Neighborhood Parks are generally considered to serve only the population living within approximately 1/2 mile of each park, and most of the City's neighborhood parks serve a combination of residences, including those which were in place when the City's parks SDC was adopted in 1992, and those which have been constructed since that time. To ensure that SDC expenditures are "related to current or projected development" in compliance with ORS 223.307(2), the portion of improvements that will primarily benefit growth must be determined.

A review of mapping data provided by City staff indicates that the percentages of growth (1992 - 2010) and non-growth (pre-1992) needs served by each neighborhood park are approximately as shown in Table 4.1 (page 17). Copies of the maps are included as an appendix to this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Growth-Required</th>
<th>Non-Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernwood Park</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadows Park</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whitman Park</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Park</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantview Park</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilark Park</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These percentages should be used as guidelines for the portion of total acquisition and development costs (adjusted for inflation) that may be paid with SDC revenues. These guidelines should be applied whenever the City updates the parks capital improvements project list. The Oregon SDC Act requires that this project list include the estimated cost and timing for each project on which SDC revenues are to be used.

The City may chose to use SDC revenues for any combination of acquisition and development costs, so long as the percentage of total costs paid with SDC’s and development-required donations does not exceed the estimated growth-required portion. For example, suppose that ten years ago the City received a donation of land (unrelated to development), made initial improvements for a park, and plans to make additional improvements during the next ten years. If the land and improvements are valued (today) at $100,000, and the City plans to spend an additional $100,000 on development, the total acquisition and development cost for the park is $200,000. If the growth-required percentage for this park was 50% or more, the entire $100,000 in planned additional development costs could be paid from SDC revenues ($200,000 X 50% = $100,000). If the growth percentage was less than 50%, the amount payable from SDC’s would be determined by multiplying the total costs ($200,000) by the growth percentage.
APPENDIX

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK SERVICE AREA MAPS

1. Bair Park
2. Clear Lake Park
3. The Meadows Park
4. Country Glen/Hidden Park
5. Wilark Park
6. Mike Whitman Park
7. North View Park
8. Pleasantview Park
9. Willamette Manor Park

Note: No map is provided for Fernwood Park because the service area was developed prior to 1992, and no further development is planned.
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
3. The Meadows Park

Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
     Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
     White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2010-2003

ESTABLISHING UPDATE METHODOLOGY FOR PARK SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES (DECEMBER 2009 UPDATE REPORT)

WHEREAS, the City of Keizer adopted the Parks and Recreation Master Plan on March 3, 2008 (Ordinance No. 2008-570);

WHEREAS, in April 2008, the City engaged Don Ganer and Associates, Inc. to review such Master Plan and prepare an updated Parks Systems Development Charge Methodology Report (Update Report);

WHEREAS, the City Council delayed implementing the methodology and new Parks Systems Development Charges due to the severe and historic downturn in the real estate industry;

WHEREAS, the City Council feels it is appropriate to move forward with the new methodology and to adopt such methodology to provide the foundation for updated Park System Development Charges to be adopted by separate Resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the Parks & Recreation SDC Methodology Update Report (December 15, 2009) attached and by this reference incorporated herein is hereby adopted as the update methodology used to determine maximum Parks Systems Development Charges.
PARKS AND RECREATION
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES
METHODOLOGY UPDATE REPORT

December 15, 2009
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

System Development Charges (SDCs) are one-time fees charged to new development to help pay a portion of the costs associated with building capital facilities to meet needs created by growth. The City of Keizer (City) first adopted Parks SDCs in 1992, and adopted an updated SDC methodology in 2000.

In April 2008, the City engaged Don Ganer & Associates, Inc. to review the City’s recently adopted Parks & Recreation Master Plan (Master Plan), and prepare an updated parks and recreation SDCs methodology report to reflect the growth portion of facility needs identified in the Master Plan.

Section 2.0 of this report presents authority and background information including (1) legislative authority for SDCs; (2) an explanation of “improvement fee” and “reimbursement fee” SDCs; and (3) requirements and options for credits, exemptions and discounts. Section 3.0 presents the methodology used to update the Parks and Recreation SDCs, and section 4.0 presents the calculation of Parks and Recreation SDC Rates.
2.0 AUTHORITY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Legislative Authority

The source of authority for the adoption of SDCs is found both in state statute and in the City's own plenary authority to adopt this type of fee. While SDCs have been in use in Oregon since the mid-1970's, State legislation regarding SDCs was not adopted until 1989, when the Oregon Systems Development Act (ORS 223.297 - 223.314) was passed. The purpose of this Act was to "...provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges...". Legislative additions and modifications to the Act were made in 1993, 1999, 2001, and 2003. The Oregon SDC Act requires local governments that enact SDCs to:

- adopt SDCs by ordinance or resolution;
- develop a methodology outlining how the SDCs were developed;
- adopt a plan and project list to designate capital improvements that can be funded with "improvement fee" SDC revenues;
- provide credit against the amount of the SDC for the construction of certain "qualified public improvements";
- separately account for and report receipt and expenditure of SDC revenues, and develop procedures for challenging expenditures; and
- use SDC revenues for capital improvements and compliance costs only - operations and maintenance uses are prohibited.

B. "Improvement fee" and "Reimbursement fee" SDCs

The Oregon Systems Development Act provides for the imposition of two types of SDCs: (1) "improvement fee" SDCs, and (2) "reimbursement fee" SDCs. "Improvement fee" SDCs may be charged for new capital improvements that will increase the capacity of the system in order to provide service to the new development. Revenues from "improvement fee" SDCs may be used for capacity-increasing capital improvements included in a required plan and list of projects that identifies the expected timing, cost, and growth-required percentage for each project. "Reimbursement fee" SDCs may be charged for the costs of existing capital facilities if "excess capacity" is available to accommodate growth. Revenues from "reimbursement fees" may be used for any capital improvement project, including major repairs, upgrades, or renovations. Capital improvements to be funded with "reimbursement fee" SDCs do not need to increase capacity, but they must be included in the list of projects to be funded with SDC revenues.
C. Requirements and Options for Credits, Exemptions, and Discounts

(1) Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC for a specific development. The Oregon SDC Act requires that credit be allowed for the construction of any "qualified public improvement" that (1) is required as a condition of development approval, (2) is identified in the plan and list of projects on which improvement fee SDC revenues may be used, and (3) either is not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval, or is located on or contiguous to such property and is required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary to meet the needs of the particular development project.

The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (e.g., a parks improvement can only be used for a credit for a parks SDC), and may be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credit may be applied against SDCs that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.

In addition to these required credits, the City may, if it so chooses, provide a greater credit, establish a system providing for the transferability of credits, provide a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the City's plan and list of projects, or provide a share of the cost of an improvement by other means (i.e., partnerships, other City revenues, etc.).

(2) Exemptions

The City may "exempt" certain types of development, such as "affordable housing" from the requirement to pay parks SDCs. Unless an alternative source of funding for SDCs is identified, exemptions reduce SDC revenues and, therefore, increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as property taxes.
(3) Discounts

The City may "discount" the amount of the SDC by reducing the portion of growth-required improvements to be funded with SDCs. For example, the City may decide to charge new development an SDC rate sufficient to pay only a percentage (i.e., 80%, 60%, etc.) of identified growth-required costs.

Because discounts reduce SDC revenues, they increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as property taxes, in order to achieve or maintain desired levels of service.
3.0 PARKS AND RECREATION SDC METHODOLOGY

The City's Master Plan includes projects designed to address both growth and non-growth needs within the City. The methodology used to develop the City's Parks and Recreation SDCs establishes the required connection between the demands of growth and the SDC by analyzing the proportionate need of facilities for use by current and future residents. The SDCs to be paid by a development meet statutory requirements because they are based on the nature of the development and the extent of the impact of the development on the need for parks and recreation facilities for which they are charged. The Parks and Recreation SDCs are based on population, and the SDC rates are calculated based on the specific impacts developments are expected to have on the City's population.

A. Population Growth

The Parks and Recreation SDCs are based on costs per "capita" (person) for each new person expected during the planning period. Table 3.1, below, shows projected population growth for the City through the year 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Projected Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,994</td>
<td>34,735</td>
<td>5,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Persons Per Dwelling Unit

The Parks and Recreation SDC rates are based on costs per capita and are calculated based on the number of persons per dwelling unit. To determine the appropriate number of persons per dwelling unit, official U.S. Census data for Keizer for the year 2000 was reviewed for single family and multi-family dwelling units, and an estimate was developed for senior housing. This information is displayed in Table 3.2, page 6.
TABLE 3.2

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling Unit (1 - 2 units)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling Unit (3 or more units)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing Dwelling Unit (10 or more units)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Facility Needs

The City's Parks & Recreation Master Plan is incorporated into this report by reference. The plan identifies facilities designed to address both growth and non-growth needs for the City. The Capital Improvements Plan (Appendix) identifies projects designed to meet these needs.

Table 3.3, below, presents a summary of facility needs through the year 2030. The "Current Need" is the share needed to provide facilities to current residents at the levels of service resulting from facilities planned for 2030. The "Growth Need" is the share needed to provide facilities to future residents at the levels of service resulting from facilities planned for 2030.

TABLE 3.3

FACILITIES REQUIRED FOR GROWTH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>2030 LOS (Units/1000)</th>
<th>Current Inventory</th>
<th>Current Need</th>
<th>Current Surplus Deficit</th>
<th>2030 Planned Units</th>
<th>Growth Need</th>
<th>Growth Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Waterfront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Regional Parks (acres)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>(36.97)</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Small Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td>(6.96)</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Large and Special Use Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>(6.65)</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas and Undeveloped Park Land (acres)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>157.20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails &amp; Pathways (miles)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on planned 2030 levels of service, there is a 36.97-acre deficiency in developed Waterfront and Regional Parks, a 6.96-acre deficiency in developed Small Parks, and a 6.65-acre deficiency in Large and Special Use Area Parks. Improvement fee SDC revenues may be used only for growth needs, and may not be used to remedy deficiencies. Alternative revenues must be used to repair these deficiencies.
D. Facility Costs

The Capital Improvements Plan, included as an appendix to this report, identifies new facilities needed to serve parks and recreation needs of the City’s planning area through the year 2030. The total funding needed for all projects included in the Plan is $14,646,000. The SDC-eligible growth costs included in the Plan total $4,783,205, including $1,959,000 for new parkland, $2,580,205 for new park development, and $244,000 for trails and pathways.

For each project, the Capital Improvements Plan includes the total project cost, the growth-required portion (percentage), the SDC-eligible cost, and the estimated timing priority.

E. Compliance/Administrative Costs

The City incurs costs in the development and administration of the SDCs and may recoup a portion of those costs in accordance with ORS 223.307(5). Compliance/administrative costs through the year 2030 have been estimated as shown in Table 3.4, below:

**TABLE 3.4**

COMPLIANCE/ADMINISTRATIVE COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance/Administrative Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual SDC-CIP Management, Accounting and Reporting Costs (approximately $10,000 per year for planning, financial reporting and staff services)</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan Update (1 X $100,000)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Compliance/Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Total SDC-Eligible Costs

The City’s total SDC-eligible costs include the total growth costs (from Appendix) and compliance/administrative costs (from Table 3.4, above). The Total SDC-eligible costs are shown in Table 3.5, below.

**TABLE 3.5**

TOTAL SDC-ELIGIBLE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total SDC Eligible Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Facility Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUS: Compliance/Admin Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SDC-Eligible Costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.0 PARKS AND RECREATION SDC RATES

The City’s SDC rates are calculated using a series of sequential formulas which, when completed, yield the total parks and recreation SDC for each new dwelling unit in the City. The formulas identify:

a) the improvements cost per capita (Formula 4a, below),
b) the improvements cost per dwelling unit (Formula 4b, page 9)
c) the property tax credit per dwelling unit (Formula 4c, page 9), and
d) the net SDC per dwelling unit (Formula 4d, page 10).

The SDC rate is an “improvement fee” only, and does not include a “reimbursement fee” component.

A. Formula 4a: Improvements Cost Per Capita

The improvements cost per capita is calculated by dividing the SDC-eligible costs (identified in Table 3.5, page 7) by the increase in population expected to be created by new development through 2030 (from Table 3.1, page 5).

\[
4a. \quad \frac{\text{SDC Eligible Costs}}{\text{Population Increase}} = \text{Improvements Cost Per Capita}
\]

Table 4.1 presents the calculations of the improvements costs per capita.

**TABLE 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC Eligible Costs</th>
<th>Population Increase</th>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,103,205</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>$970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Formula 4b: Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit

The improvements cost per dwelling unit is calculated by multiplying the average number of persons per dwelling unit (from Table 3.2, page 6) by the improvements cost per capita (from Table 4.1, page 9).

\[ 4b. \quad \text{Persons Per Dwelling Unit} \times \ \text{Implements Cost Per Capita} = \ \text{Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit} \]

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 4.2, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Capita</th>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (1 - 2 units)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (3 or more units)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$2,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing (10 or more units)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Formula 4c: Property Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit

Debt instruments may be used to fund facilities needed to repair deficiencies, and a portion of these debts will be repaid from property taxes paid by growth. A tax credit has been calculated to account for potential payments in order to avoid charging growth twice; once through the SDC, and a second time through property taxes. A credit has been calculated for each type of dwelling unit using the following assumptions:

- $8 million in general obligation bonds issued in the year 2013,
- 5.0% average annual increase in total City property valuation for taxes,
- 3.0% annual increase in assessed property valuations,
- 3.0% annual inflation (decrease in value of money),
- average 2008 property valuations for new construction at $300,000 for single family and $150,000 for multi-family, and $100,000 for senior housing dwelling units.
Present Value of Future Property = SDC Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit

The amount of this credit is shown in Table 4.3, below.

**TABLE 4.3**

**TAX CREDIT PER DWELLING UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling Unit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling Unit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing Dwelling Unit:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Formula 4d: Net SDC Per Dwelling Unit**

The net SDC rate per dwelling unit is calculated by subtracting the tax credit per dwelling unit (Table 4.3, above) from the improvements cost per dwelling unit (Table 4.2, page 9).

\[
\text{Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit} - \text{SDC Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit} = \text{Net SDC Per Dwelling Unit}
\]

The results of these calculations are shown in Table 4.4, below.

**TABLE 4.4**

**NET SDC PER DWELLING UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>SDC Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Net SDC Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family:</td>
<td>$2,716</td>
<td>($1,086)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family:</td>
<td>$2,134</td>
<td>($543)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing:</td>
<td>$1,067</td>
<td>($362)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX

### KEIZER PARKS

#### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

12/15/09

### A. WATERFRONT PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP - 1 Palma Cea Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new park facilities on existing undeveloped parkland to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$23,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP - 2 Wallace House Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new park facilities on existing undeveloped parkland to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 11.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waterfront Parks Subtotals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$118,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$280,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$118,320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. SMALL CITY PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP - 1 Bair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new park facilities on existing undeveloped parkland to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 2 Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 3 Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 5.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 4 Calmers-Jones Park/Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 5 Clear Lake Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC-CIP Project</td>
<td>Estimated Project Cost ($)</td>
<td>Growth Share ($)</td>
<td>SDC-Eligible Growth Portion (%)</td>
<td>Project Timing Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. SMALL CITY PARKS (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 6 Country Glen Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 7 Keizer Station Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 8 Meadows Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 9 Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 10 Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 11 Joint School Use Parks (Sites Unidentified)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 12 New Small Park (Site Unidentified)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$1,480,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Parks Subtotals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,147,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,070,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,947,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX

### KEIZER PARKS

#### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

12/15/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. LARGE CITY PARKS</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP - 1 Claggett Creek Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired and develop additional land for expansion of the park to serve growth and non-growth needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 11.59</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>$273,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,432,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. REGIONAL PARKS &amp; SPECIAL USE FACILITIES</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RP - 1 Keizer Rapids Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new facilities to serve growth and non-growth needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 30.00</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SU - 1 Indoor Recreation Facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform Feasibility study for facilities to serve growth and non-growth needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 0.00</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Parks & Special Use Facilities Subtotals**

- Acquisition: 0.00
  - Cost: $0
  - Growth Share: $0
- Development: 30.00
  - Cost: $7,550,000
  - Growth Share: $1,026,380

**SUB-TOTAL**

- 30.00
  - Cost: $7,550,000
  - Growth Share: $1,026,380
# KEIZER PARKS

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

### E. NATURAL AREA/OPEN SPACE & UNDEVELOPED PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS - 1</td>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>Develop facilities to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS - 2</td>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>Develop facilities to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$10,528</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP - 1</td>
<td>Mike Whittam Park</td>
<td>Develop facilities to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$3,948</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natural Area/Open Space Subtotals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. PATHWAYS AND CONNECTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC - 1</td>
<td>Multi-Use Pathway (Clagett Creek)</td>
<td>Develop new multi-use pathway facilities to serve growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bike/Pathways Subtotal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development (miles)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MILES</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE UPDATE METHODOLOGY (2000) FOR A PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE

WHEREAS, the City of Keizer accepted the Comprehensive Park System Development Plan dated May 7, 1992; and

WHEREAS, such Plan sets forth a methodology for determining an equitable systems development charge; and

WHEREAS, the Council has accepted the Parks and Recreation Facility Systems Development Charges Update Methodology Report (July 17, 2000) which sets forth needed facility improvements and an updated methodology for determining appropriate parks system development charges; and

WHEREAS, on November 20, 2000 the City Council held the public hearing to consider amending the parks system development charges; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ordinance 92-231, the methodology used to establish the parks system development charge may be established by resolution;

///

///

///

///

FMAGIC
NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the attached methodology marked Exhibit 1 attached hereto (including Appendix A - Adjustment Factor) and by this reference incorporated herein is hereby adopted as the methodology used to determine the parks system development charge.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the attached update methodology (2000) replaces the methodology adopted under Resolution R92-563.

PASSED this 18th day of December, 2000.

SIGNED this 18th day of December, 2000.

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
City Recorder

824H.032
Notwithstanding any other provision, the dollar amounts of the SDC set forth in the SDC Methodology Report shall on January 1st of each year be adjusted to account for changes in the costs of acquiring and constructing parks facilities. The adjustment factor shall be based on the change in average market value of undeveloped land in the City, according to the records of the County Tax Assessor, and the change in construction costs according to the Engineering News Record (ENR) Northwest (Seattle, Washington) Construction Cost Index; and shall be determined as follows:

\[
\text{Change in Average Market Value} \times 0.50 + \frac{\text{Change in Construction Cost Index} \times 0.50}{\text{Parks System Development Charge Adjustment Factor}}
\]

The Parks System Development Charge Adjustment Factor shall be used to adjust the Parks System Development Charge, unless it is otherwise adjusted by the City Council based on a review of revenues and rates or adoption of an updated methodology.
PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES
UPDATE METHODOLOGY REPORT
July 17, 2000

Don
Ganer &
Associates
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

System Development Charges are fees charged to new development to help pay a portion of the costs associated with acquiring and/or building capital facilities to meet the needs of growth. The 1989 Oregon Systems Development Act (ORS 223.297 - 223.314) authorizes the collection of SDC’s for certain types of facilities including:

- transportation,
- water,
- wastewater (sewer),
- stormwater, and
- parks and recreation.

The purpose of the SDC Act was to "...provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges...". The Act requires local governments to:

- enact SDC’s by ordinance or resolution,
- develop a methodology outlining how each SDC is developed,
- adopt a capital improvement program (CIP) designating the estimated cost and timing of each project that may be funded with SDC revenues,
- provide credits against SDC’s for "qualified public improvements",
- separately account for SDC revenues and expenditures, and
- adopt procedures for public challenges of expenditures.

The City of Keizer implemented a Parks SDC in 1992. Since that time, cost increases, changes in population estimates, and the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Dolan v. City of Tigard have caused the Parks SDC to become outdated. In January 2000, the City engaged Don Ganer & Associates to update the Parks SDC methodology and rates, and provide guidelines for the expenditure of SDC revenues.
2.0 SDC BACKGROUND AND DATA

This section presents background information and data used to develop the SDC. In particular, this section of the report:

A. Discusses guiding concepts used in developing SDC’s,
B. Explains what is meant by the terms “reimbursement fee” and “improvement fee” SDC’s,
C. Presents the methodology approach used to update the Parks and Recreation SDC,
D. Analyzes credits,
E. Presents growth projections and summarizes census data regarding persons per dwelling unit,
F. Identifies current Levels of Service (LOS), and
G. Presents growth required facility needs.

A Guiding Concepts

In addition to the requirements of the ORS 223.297 - 223.314, court cases from Oregon and other states provide additional guidance for the methodology used in developing SDC's.

(1) "Essential Nexus" Requirement

In a 1987 case, Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, the U.S. Supreme Court established that government agencies must show that an "essential nexus" (e.g. reasonable connection) exists between a project's impacts and any dedication requirements. For SDC's the "essential nexus" requirement means there must be a reasonable connection between the nature of the development and the facilities being funded with the SDC revenues. If, for example, parks and recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development, an SDC methodology designed to fund the new capacity needed to serve new development meets the "essential nexus" requirement.
(2) "Rough Proportionality" Requirement

In its landmark 1994 decision in Dolan v. City of Tigard, the U.S. Supreme Court cited the need for "rough proportionality" between requirements placed on a developer by government and the impacts of the development. This concept of rough proportionality is applied in SDC's by insuring that new growth is not required to pay to upgrade existing deficiencies or provide new facilities beyond a level "roughly proportionate" with the extent of new development's impact; SDC's can be charged only for the portion of capital facilities costs that are attributable to growth.

ORS 223.307(2) also requires that "the portion of improvements funded by improvement fees must be related [e.g., roughly proportionate] to current or projected development." The City's adopted Comprehensive Park System Development Plan and SDC methodology includes improvements that serve both growth and non-growth needs, and it does not identify which or what portion of the improvements is "related to current or projected development". This SDC methodology update includes SDC rates which are roughly proportionate to the impacts created by new development, and provides SDC revenue expenditure guidelines to promote compliance with ORS 223.307(2).

B "Reimbursement fee" and "Improvement fee" SDC's

The Oregon SDC Act provides for the imposition of two types of SDC's: (1) "improvement" fees, and (2) "reimbursement" fees. "Improvement fee" SDC's may be charged to fund acquisition and/or construction of new capital facilities that will be needed in the future, or to make improvements to existing capital facilities (i.e., additional tennis courts, expansion of playgrounds, etc.) which provide new "capacity" to accommodate growth. In order to maintain facilities at current levels of service (i.e., 1.2 acre per 1,000 persons for developed community parks, etc.), the City will need to add acres and develop parks to serve new development, and the City may charge improvement fee SDC's to fund all or a portion of the costs of these facilities.
If “excess capacity” is available to accommodate future growth, a "reimbursement fee" SDC may be charged to recoup the costs (including bonded indebtedness) associated with improvements which have already been acquired/constructed. The City does not currently have sufficient facilities to meet adopted standards; therefore, no excess capacity exists and a reimbursement fee SDC is not warranted.

C. SDC Methodology Approach

The three basic approaches used in developing SDC's are (1) Capital Projects-Driven, (2) Level of Service (LOS)-Driven, and (3) Combination.

(1) “Capital Projects-Driven” SDC’s

Capital Projects-Driven SDC’s are based on a specific list of planned capital improvements. The amount of the SDC is determined by allocating a portion of the cost of the planned improvements (the "fair share" that can be attributed to growth) among the projected developments that will be paying SDC’s. This approach works best when individual public facilities can be allocated between current and future users on the basis of objective data, and when standards do not adequately allocate costs between these groups. Costs which are attributable to growth may be funded through SDC’s, and remaining costs must be funded from non-SDC sources.

(2) “LOS-Driven” SDC’s

LOS-Driven SDC’s work best when individual facilities cannot be allocated between current and future users on the basis of objective data, and instead are provided on the basis of a levels of service. The SDC is determined by multiplying the LOS standard for each type of facility by the estimated cost per unit of facility. SDC's cannot be used to pay for eliminating deficiencies in the current LOS, or for providing a higher LOS than that which currently exists unless either (1) alternative revenue sources are identified to pay for eliminating existing deficiencies, or (2) the primary recipients of the higher LOS will be future residents.
(3) "Combination" SDC's

A "combination" approach uses elements of both the LOS-Driven approach and the Capital Projects-Driven approach. LOS standards are used to determine facility needs, identify deficiencies and excess capacity, and develop a list of capital improvement projects. The project costs then serve as the basis for calculating the SDC rates.

The Keizer Parks and Recreation SDC update was developed using the "LOS-Driven" approach. LOS standards were developed based on the current LOS, and the costs of maintaining this LOS were then used to determine SDC rates.

D. Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC which a development is required to pay, and must be calculated to account for (1) "qualified public improvements" and (2) other payments new development may make through property taxes or other means.

(1) "Qualified Public Improvement"

A credit must be given for the donation of a "qualified public improvement" which (1) is required as a condition of development approval, (2) is identified in the CIP, and (3) either is not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval, or is required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary for the particular development project to which the improvement fee is related. The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (i.e., parks and recreation, etc.), and must be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity (LOS standard) needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credit may be applied against SDC's that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.
In addition to these required credits, the City may, if it so chooses, provide a greater credit, establish a system providing for the transferability of credits, provide a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the capital improvement plan, or provide a share of the cost of an improvement by other means. Any provisions for such credits must be applied uniformly to all new development.

In order for the City to charge growth an improvement fee SDC for 100% of the costs of new facilities required to serve growth, a credit must also be given for any costs that will be paid by growth in the future for existing capital facilities (included in the LOS standards) or future facilities needed to repair deficiencies. The City has no outstanding debt for existing parks and recreation capital facilities and the SDC is designed only to maintain the current LOS; therefore, no credit against the SDC for repayment of debt is required.

E. Population Growth and Persons per Dwelling Unit

The Parks and Recreation SDC is based on projected growth-required capital facility costs per "capita" (person). Estimated population growth from 2000 through 2010 is shown in Table 2.1, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>30,276</td>
<td>6,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2.1
ESTIMATED POPULATION INCREASE
(2000 - 2010)
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The Parks and Recreation SDC is based on estimated capital facility costs per capita, with the SDC rates based on the number of persons per dwelling unit. Dwelling units typically house different numbers of persons depending on the type of unit (e.g., single family or multi-family). To determine the appropriate number of persons per dwelling unit, 1990 census data for the City of Keizer maintained by the Center for Population Research and Census at Portland State University was analyzed, and the resulting calculations are presented in Table 2.2, below.

**TABLE 2.2**

**AVERAGE PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Facilities Inventory and Levels of Service**

The City provides a total of 97.1 acres of parks and recreation facilities, resulting in a total Level of Service (LOS) of 3.2 acres per 1,000 persons. Included in this total are 36.20 acres of developed Community Parks (1.2 acres per 1,000 persons), 16.10 acres of developed Neighborhood Parks (0.5 acres per 1,000 persons), and 22.90 of undeveloped/partially developed parks (0.8 acres per 1,000 persons). Following are photographs showing examples of these facilities in the City.
In addition to these developed and undeveloped parks, the City also has 21.90 acres of Natural Area Parks (0.7 acres per 1,000 persons).
The City’s parks and recreation facilities inventory and levels of service are shown in Table 2.3, below.

**TABLE 2.3**  
PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES  
CURRENT INVENTORY AND LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Community Parks</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>LOS/1,000 persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Park</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League Park</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Complex/Chalmer-Jones Park</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-total</td>
<td><strong>36.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed Neighborhood Parks

| Wilark Park               | 8.40  |                        |
| Willamette Manor Park     | 2.10  |                        |
| Northview Park            | 2.10  |                        |
| The Meadows Park          | 3.50  |                        |
| sub-total                 | **16.10** | **0.5** |

Undeveloped/Partially Developed Parks

| Mike Whitman Park         | 5.00  |                        |
| Fernwook Park             | 0.90  |                        |
| Pleasantview Park         | 2.50  |                        |
| Clear Lake Park           | 5.00  |                        |
| Country Glen Park         | 5.00  |                        |
| Bair Park                 | 2.00  |                        |
| Hidden Creek Park         | 2.50  |                        |
| sub-total                 | **22.90** | **0.8** |

Natural Area Parks

| Palma Cia Park            | 0.80  |                        |
| Sunset Park               | 1.20  |                        |
| Rivers Edge Park          | 10.30 |                        |
| North Ridge Park          | 9.60  |                        |
| sub-total                 | **21.90** | **0.7** |

Combined Total

| Combined Total            | **97.10** | **3.2** |
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The City’s Comprehensive Park System Development Plan includes recommended standards\(^1\) for parks acreages of 2.2 acres of developed Community Parks, 1.3 acres of developed Neighborhood Parks, and 5.8 acres of Natural Area Parks per 1,000 persons. In order for the City to charge SDC’s at rates required to meet the adopted standards, the City must either already provide facilities at standard or have a viable plan for how it will remedy the deficiency using a funding source not associated with growth. To meet these standards, the City would need to acquire/develop an additional 34.61 acres of Community Parks, 23.26 acres of Neighborhood Parks, and 153.70 acres of Natural Area Parks \textit{just to correct current deficiencies in parks acreages.}

As an alternative to using the standards included in the Plan, the current Levels of Service (LOS) identified in Table 2.1 (page 6) may serve as alternative LOS standards by which growth-related facility needs may be determined.

\textbf{G. Facilities Needed to Serve Growth}

To determine the City’s growth-required needs, the current LOS for each type of facility (i.e., Developed Community Park acres, Developed Neighborhood Park acres, etc.) was applied to the projected 2010 population of the City. The City’s population is expected to grow by 6,724 residents by the year 2010, when it is expected to reach 37,000\(^2\). Table 2.4, below, presents a summary of \textit{additional} needed facilities resulting from application of these LOS standards.

\begin{center}
\textbf{TABLE 2.4}
\end{center}

\textbf{ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NEEDED TO SERVE GROWTH}

(2000 - 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
<th>Growth-Required Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Community Parks (acres)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Neighborhood Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped/Partially Developed Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Parks System (acres)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>21.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Comprehensive Park System Development Plan, \textit{otak}, May 7, 1992, Tab 1

\(^2\) City staff projection estimate.
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3.0 CALCULATION OF PARKS AND RECREATION SDC

The updated Keizer Parks and Recreation SDC was calculated using a series of sequential formulas which, when completed, yields the SDC rate for each new dwelling unit in the City. The formulas identify:

A. the total growth-required parks and recreation facilities costs (Formula 1, below),
B. the facilities cost per new resident (Formula 2, page 12),
C. the compliance and administrative cost per new resident (Formula 3, page 12),
D. the total facilities cost per new resident (Formula 4, page 13), and
E. the SDC rate per dwelling unit (Formula 5, page 13).

A. Formula 1: Total Growth-Required Facilities Costs

The total growth-required parks and recreation facilities costs are determined by adding the products resulting from multiplying the number of units required to meet growth needs (from Table 2.2, page 6) by the cost per unit of facility.

\[
\text{Growth-Required Units} \times \text{Cost Per Unit} = \text{Growth-Required Facilities Costs}
\]

Table 3.1, below, presents the calculation of the growth-required facilities costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Growth-Required Units</th>
<th>Cost Per Unit $</th>
<th>Growth-Required Facilities Costs $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Community Parks (acres)</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>763,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Neighborhood Parks (acres)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>447,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped/Natural Area Parks (acres)</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>696,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Growth-Required Units (acres)</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,907,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[3\] Undeveloped/Natural Area land acquisition cost estimate is $70,000 per acre. Developed Community Parks cost estimate is based on undeveloped land cost plus $25,000 per acre for development. Developed Neighborhood Parks cost estimate is based on undeveloped land cost plus $55,000 per acre for development. Cost estimates provided by City staff.
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B. Formula 2: Facilities Cost Per New Resident

The facilities cost per new resident is calculated by dividing the growth-required facilities costs (from Table 3.1, page 11) by the expected increase in the City's population during the planning period (from Table 2.1, page 6).

2. Growth-Required Facilities Cost \div Population Increase = Facilities Cost Per New Resident

Table 3.2, below, presents the calculation of the facilities cost per new resident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.2</th>
<th>FACILITIES COST PER NEW RESIDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth-Required Facilities Costs</td>
<td>Population Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,907,800</td>
<td>6,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Formula 3: Compliance/Administration Cost Per New Resident

ORS 223.307(5) allows the City to recoup the direct costs of complying with Oregon law regarding SDC's. Recoupable costs include consulting, engineering, and legal fees as well as the cost of collecting and accounting for revenues and expenditures. The compliance/administration cost is estimated to total 10% of collected SDC revenues. The compliance/administration cost per new resident is determined by multiplying the facilities cost per new resident by this cost factor (10%):

3. Facilities Cost Per New Resident \times Compliance/Admin. Cost Factor = Compliance/Admin. Cost Per New Resident

Table 3.3, page 14, presents the calculation of the compliance cost per new resident.
TABLE 3.3
COMPLIANCE/ADMINISTRATION COST PER NEW RESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Cost Per New Resident</th>
<th>Compliance/Admin. Cost Factor</th>
<th>Compliance/Admin Cost Per New Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$284</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Formula 4: SDC Per New Resident**

The SDC Per New Resident represents the amount of revenue required for each new resident in order to pay the growth-required costs. The calculation is completed by adding the facilities cost per new resident (from Table 3.2, page 12) and the compliance/administration cost per new resident (from Table 3.3, above).

4. Facilities Cost Per New Resident + Compliance/Admin. Cost Per New Resident = SDC Per New Resident

The result of this calculation is presented in Table 3.4, below.

TABLE 3.4
SDC PER NEW RESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Cost Per New Resident</th>
<th>Compliance/Admin Cost Per New Resident</th>
<th>SDC Per New Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Formula 5: SDC Per Dwelling Unit**

The SDC Per Dwelling Unit is calculated by multiplying the average number of persons per dwelling unit (from Table 2.2, page 6) by the SDC Per New Resident (from Table 3.4, above).

5. Persons Per Dwelling Unit × SDC Per New Resident = SDC Per Dwelling Unit

The result of this calculation is presented in Table 3.5, page 15.
The SDC rates identified in Table 3.5, above, are the maximum dollar amounts (in year 2000 dollars) that may be collected from new development for costs related to growth-required parks capital improvements. These costs are based on the expected number of "growth-required units" needed for each type of facility (i.e., community parks, neighborhood parks, etc.) during the period 2000 through 2010. For comparison, the parks SDC rates currently charged by a selection of other area Oregon cities are presented in Table 3.6, below.

### Table 3.5
**SDC PER DWELLING UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SDC Per New Resident</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>SDC Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family:</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family:</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.6
**PARKS SDC RATES FOR OTHER AREA CITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Single-Family Rate</th>
<th>Multi-Family Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tualatin</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canby</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Current as of November 1999
Don Ganer & Associates
4.0 SDC EXPENDITURE GUIDELINES

ORS 223.307(2) requires that improvement fee SDC's “be spent only on capacity increasing capital improvements, including expenditures relating to repayment of debt for such improvements. An increase in system capacity may be established if a capital improvement increases the level of performance or service provided by existing facilities or provides new facilities.”

ORS 223.307(2) also requires that “the portion of improvements funded by improvement fees must be related to current or projected development.” This means that revenues from improvement fee SDC's may be used only for the portion of capital improvements that are needed for growth.

The City's adopted Comprehensive Park System Development Plan includes improvements that serve both growth and non-growth needs, but it does not identify which of the improvements is "related to current or projected development". Community Parks and Undeveloped/Natural Area Parks are considered to serve the entire City population, so SDC revenues collected for these facilities may be used to acquire and/or develop Community Parks and Undeveloped/Natural Area Parks anywhere within the City. Neighborhood Parks are generally considered to serve only the population living within approximately 1/2 mile of each park, and most of the City's neighborhood parks serve a combination of residences, including those which were in place when the City's parks SDC was adopted in 1992, and those which have been constructed since that time. To ensure that SDC expenditures are "related to current or projected development" in compliance with ORS 223.307(2), the portion of improvements that will primarily benefit growth must be determined.

A review of mapping data provided by City staff indicates that the percentages of growth (1992 - 2010) and non-growth (pre-1992) needs served by each neighborhood park are approximately as shown in Table 4.1 (page 17). Copies of the maps are included as an appendix to this report.
TABLE 4.1  
NEIGHBORHOOD PARK PERCENTAGES  
OF GROWTH-REQUIRED AND NON-GROWTH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Park</th>
<th>Growth-Required</th>
<th>Non-Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernwood Park</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadows Park</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whitman Park</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Park</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantview Park</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilark Park</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These percentages should be used as guidelines for the portion of total acquisition and development costs (adjusted for inflation) that may be paid with SDC revenues. These guidelines should be applied whenever the City updates the parks capital improvements project list. The Oregon SDC Act requires that this project list include the estimated cost and timing for each project on which SDC revenues are to be used.

The City may chose to use SDC revenues for any combination of acquisition and development costs, so long as the percentage of total costs paid with SDC’s and development-required donations does not exceed the estimated growth-required portion. For example, suppose that ten years ago the City received a donation of land (unrelated to development), made initial improvements for a park, and plans to make additional improvements during the next ten years. If the land and improvements are valued (today) at $100,000, and the City plans to spend an additional $100,000 on development, the total acquisition and development cost for the park is $200,000. If the growth-required percentage for this park was 50% or more, the entire $100,000 in planned additional development costs could be paid from SDC revenues ($200,000 X 50% = $100,000). If the growth percentage was less than 50%, the amount payable from SDC’s would be determined by multiplying the total costs ($200,000) by the growth percentage.
APPENDIX

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK SERVICE AREA MAPS

1. Bair Park
2. Clear Lake Park
3. The Meadows Park
4. Country Glen/Hidden Park
5. Wilark Park
6. Mike Whitman Park
7. North View Park
8. Pleasantview Park
9. Willamette Manor Park

Note: No map is provided for Fernwood Park because the service area was developed prior to 1992, and no further development is planned.
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
2. Clear Lake Park

Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
3. The Meadows Park

Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
4. Country Glen/Hidden Park

Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
Guide: Pink = developed between 1992 and 2000
Yellow = undeveloped with potential for development between 2000 and 2010
White = developed before 1992 or not planned for further development
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2000-1231

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE AMOUNT OF THE PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (2000)

WHEREAS, the City of Keizer has adopted an update methodology for determining the parks system development charge pursuant to Resolution R2000-1230; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ordinance 92-231, the amount of the parks system development charge may be established by resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the parks system development charges authorized by Ordinance 92-231 shall be as follows:

$650.00 per dwelling unit for the following types of structures: single-family dwellings, duplexes, condominiums, developed manufactured home park spaces, and manufactured homes placed on lots not within a manufactured home park.

$435.00 per dwelling unit for the following types of structures: multi-family dwellings consisting of three or more dwelling units in a single building.

The above fees shall be adjusted on July 1 each year by calculating a percentage increase based on the average of the two following indices: (1) increase in undeveloped land average market value according to the records of the Marion County Tax Assessor, and (2) the increase in construction costs according to the Engineering News Record (ENR) Northwest.
Construction Cost Index. If the ENR Construction Cost Index is not available, a similar
index shall be used in conjunction with the Marion County Tax Assessor Index.

These fees are improvement fees only.

All system development charges collected hereunder shall be used as set forth in the
methodology report (Section 4.0 SDC Expenditure Guidelines), along with administrative
costs as allowed under Oregon law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the
charges established herein shall become effective January 1, 2001. The previous systems
development charge established by Resolution R92-564 as clarified by Resolution R93-683
shall be in effect for all building permit applications submitted prior to this effective date.

PASSED this 18th day of December, 2000.

SIGNED this 18th day of December, 2000.

Mayor

City Recorder

824H.033
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2005-1606

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE UPDATE METHODOLOGY
(2000) FOR A PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE;
AMENDING RESOLUTION R2000-1230

WHEREAS, Ordinance 92-231 sets forth that the methodology used to establish parks system development charges may be established by resolution;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2000-1230 adopts the methodology for determining the maximum parks system development charge;

WHEREAS, amendment of Resolution R2000-1230 is needed to amend the methodology set forth therein;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that Resolution R2000-1230 is hereby amended by replacing Exhibit 1 with Appendix A - Adjustment Factor (2005) attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the attached Appendix A - Adjustment Factor (2005) is hereby adopted as the methodology used to determine the parks system development charge and therefore replaces the methodology adopted under R2000-1230.

PASSED this 20th day of June, 2005.

SIGNED this 20th day of June, 2005.

[Signature]
Mayor

[Signature]
City Recorder
APPENDIX A - ADJUSTMENT FACTOR (2005)

Notwithstanding any other provision, the dollar amounts of the SDC set forth in the SDC Methodology Report shall on July 1 of each year be adjusted to account for changes in the costs of acquiring and constructing parks facilities. The adjustment factor shall be based on the change in average market value of undeveloped land in the City, according to the records of the County Tax Assessor, and the change in construction costs according to the Engineering News Record (ENR) Northwest (Seattle, Washington) Construction Cost Index; and shall be determined as follows:

\[
\text{Change in Average Market Value} \times 0.50 \quad + \quad \text{Change in Construction Cost Index} \times 0.50 \\
= \quad \text{Parks System Development Charge Adjustment Factor}
\]

Indexing Methodology:

Increase fee in $5.00 increments.
When index brings fee half way between the preceding fee and the next increment, increase fee to the next increment.
For example: When the index brings a $735.00 fee up to $781.43, increase fee to $780.00.
This methodology will keep the revenue within 1% of the annual indexing.

The Parks System Development Charge Adjustment Factor shall be used to adjust the Parks System Development Charge, unless it is otherwise adjusted by the City Council based on a review of revenues and rates or adoption of an updated methodology.
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2005-_1619

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE PARKS SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (2000); AMENDING RESOLUTION R2000-1231; REPEALING R2001-123; REPEALING R2005-1607

WHEREAS, Ordinance 92-231 sets forth that the amount of the parks system development charge may be established by resolution;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2000-1230 as amended by Resolution R2005-1606 adopts the methodology for determining the maximum parks system development charge;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2000-1231 sets forth the amount of the parks system development charge;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2001-1239 amended the parks system development charge outlined in Resolution R2000-1231;

WHEREAS, Resolution R2005-1607 amended the parks system development charge outlined in Resolution R2000-1231 and repealed R2001-1239;

WHEREAS, further amendment of Resolution R2000-1231 is needed to amend the parks system development charges set forth therein;

PAGE 1 - Resolution R2005-_1619
WHEREAS, Resolutions R2001-1239 and R2005-1607 should be repealed;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that Resolution R2000-1231 is hereby amended at Lines 12 through 16 inclusive to read as follows:

"$1,045.00 per dwelling unit for the following types of structures: single-family dwellings, duplexes, condominiums, developed manufactured home park spaces, and manufactured homes placed on lots not within a manufactured home park."

"$740.00 per dwelling unit for the following types of structures: multi-family dwellings consisting of three or more dwelling units in a single building."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that Resolution R2000-1231 is hereby amended on Page 2 by inserting the following sentence at the end of Line 2:

"Any adjustment that increases the system development charge shall be increased in $5.00 increments pursuant to Appendix A - Adjustment Factor (2005) attached to Resolution R2005-1606 as amended."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that Resolutions R2001-1239 and R2005-1607 are hereby repealed in their entirety.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the new system development charge set forth herein shall be applied to all building permit applications applied for after the date of September 1, 2005 and shall be adjusted annually on July 1 of each year.

PASSED this 1st day of August, 2005.

SIGNED this 1st day of August, 2005.

[Signature]
Mayor

[Signature]
City Recorder
CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

Resolution R2010-2003

ESTABLISHING UPDATE METHODOLOGY FOR PARK SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES (DECEMBER 2009 UPDATE REPORT)

WHEREAS, the City of Keizer adopted the Parks and Recreation Master Plan on March 3, 2008 (Ordinance No. 2008-570);

WHEREAS, in April 2008, the City engaged Don Garier and Associates, Inc. to review such Master Plan and prepare an updated Parks Systems Development Charge Methodology Report (Update Report);

WHEREAS, the City Council delayed implementing the methodology and new Parks Systems Development Charges due to the severe and historic downturn in the real estate industry;

WHEREAS, the City Council feels it is appropriate to move forward with the new methodology and to adopt such methodology to provide the foundation for updated Park System Development Charges to be adopted by separate Resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the Parks & Recreation SDC Methodology Update Report (December 15, 2009) attached and by this reference incorporated herein is hereby adopted as the update methodology used to determine maximum Parks Systems Development Charges.
PARKS AND RECREATION
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CHARGES
METHODOLOGY UPDATE REPORT

December 15, 2009
1.0 INTRODUCTION

System Development Charges (SDCs) are one-time fees charged to new development to help pay a portion of the costs associated with building capital facilities to meet needs created by growth. The City of Keizer (City) first adopted Parks SDCs in 1992, and adopted an updated SDC methodology in 2000.

In April 2008, the City engaged Don Ganer & Associates, Inc. to review the City’s recently adopted Parks & Recreation Master Plan (Master Plan), and prepare an updated parks and recreation SDCs methodology report to reflect the growth portion of facility needs identified in the Master Plan.

Section 2.0 of this report presents authority and background information including (1) legislative authority for SDCs; (2) an explanation of “improvement fee” and “reimbursement fee” SDCs; and (3) requirements and options for credits, exemptions and discounts. Section 3.0 presents the methodology used to update the Parks and Recreation SDCs, and section 4.0 presents the calculation of Parks and Recreation SDC Rates.
2.0 AUTHORITY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Legislative Authority

The source of authority for the adoption of SDCs is found both in state statute and in the City's own plenary authority to adopt this type of fee. While SDCs have been in use in Oregon since the mid-1970's, State legislation regarding SDCs was not adopted until 1989, when the Oregon Systems Development Act (ORS 223.297 - 223.314) was passed. The purpose of this Act was to "...provide a uniform framework for the imposition of system development charges...". Legislative additions and modifications to the Act were made in 1993, 1999, 2001, and 2003. The Oregon SDC Act requires local governments that enact SDCs to:

- adopt SDCs by ordinance or resolution;
- develop a methodology outlining how the SDCs were developed;
- adopt a plan and project list to designate capital improvements that can be funded with "improvement fee" SDC revenues;
- provide credit against the amount of the SDC for the construction of certain "qualified public improvements";
- separately account for and report receipt and expenditure of SDC revenues, and develop procedures for challenging expenditures; and
- use SDC revenues for capital improvements and compliance costs only - operations and maintenance uses are prohibited.

B. "Improvement fee" and "Reimbursement fee" SDCs

The Oregon Systems Development Act provides for the imposition of two types of SDCs: (1) "improvement fee" SDCs, and (2) "reimbursement fee" SDCs. "Improvement fee" SDCs may be charged for new capital improvements that will increase the capacity of the system in order to provide service to the new development. Revenues from "improvement fee" SDCs may be used for capacity-increasing capital improvements included in a required plan and list of projects that identifies the expected timing, cost, and growth-required percentage for each project. "Reimbursement fee" SDCs may be charged for the costs of existing capital facilities if "excess capacity" is available to accommodate growth. Revenues from "reimbursement fees" may be used for any capital improvement project, including major repairs, upgrades, or renovations. Capital improvements to be funded with "reimbursement fee" SDCs do not need to increase capacity, but they must be included in the list of projects to be funded with SDC revenues.
C. Requirements and Options for Credits, Exemptions, and Discounts

(1) Credits

A credit is a reduction in the amount of the SDC for a specific development. The Oregon SDC Act requires that credit be allowed for the construction of any "qualified public improvement" that (1) is required as a condition of development approval, (2) is identified in the plan and list of projects on which improvement fee SDC revenues may be used, and (3) either is not located on or contiguous to property that is the subject of development approval, or is located on or contiguous to such property and is required to be built larger or with greater capacity than is necessary to meet the needs of the particular development project.

The credit for a qualified public improvement may only be applied against an SDC for the same type of improvement (e.g., a parks improvement can only be used for a credit for a parks SDC), and may be granted only for the cost of that portion of an improvement which exceeds the minimum standard facility size or capacity needed to serve the particular project. For multi-phase projects, any excess credit may be applied against SDCs that accrue in subsequent phases of the original development project.

In addition to these required credits, the City may, if it so chooses, provide a greater credit, establish a system providing for the transferability of credits, provide a credit for a capital improvement not identified in the City’s plan and list of projects, or provide a share of the cost of an improvement by other means (i.e., partnerships, other City revenues, etc.).

(2) Exemptions

The City may "exempt" certain types of development, such as “affordable housing” from the requirement to pay parks SDCs. Unless an alternative source of funding for SDCs is identified, exemptions reduce SDC revenues and, therefore, increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as property taxes.
(3) Discounts

The City may "discount" the amount of the SDC by reducing the portion of growth-required improvements to be funded with SDCs. For example, the City may decide to charge new development an SDC rate sufficient to pay only a percentage (i.e., 80%, 60%, etc.) of identified growth-required costs.

Because discounts reduce SDC revenues, they increase the amounts that must come from other sources, such as property taxes, in order to achieve or maintain desired levels of service.
3.0 PARKS AND RECREATION SDC METHODOLOGY

The City’s Master Plan includes projects designed to address both growth and non-growth needs within the City. The methodology used to develop the City's Parks and Recreation SDCs establishes the required connection between the demands of growth and the SDC by analyzing the proportionate need of facilities for use by current and future residents. The SDCs to be paid by a development meet statutory requirements because they are based on the nature of the development and the extent of the impact of the development on the need for parks and recreation facilities for which they are charged. The Parks and Recreation SDCs are based on population, and the SDC rates are calculated based on the specific impacts developments are expected to have on the City's population.

A. Population Growth

The Parks and Recreation SDCs are based on costs per "capita" (person) for each new person expected during the planning period. Table 3.1, below, shows projected population growth for the City through the year 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected 2030</th>
<th>Estimated 2007</th>
<th>Projected Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39,994</td>
<td>34,735</td>
<td>5,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Persons Per Dwelling Unit

The Parks and Recreation SDC rates are based on costs per capita and are calculated based on the number of persons per dwelling unit. To determine the appropriate number of persons per dwelling unit, official U.S. Census data for Keizer for the year 2000 was reviewed for single family and multi-family dwelling units, and an estimate was developed for senior housing. This information is displayed in Table 3.2, page 6.
TABLE 3.2

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg. Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling Unit (1 - 2 units)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling Unit (3 or more units)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing Dwelling Unit (10 or more units)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Facility Needs

The City’s Parks & Recreation Master Plan is incorporated into this report by reference. The plan identifies facilities designed to address both growth and non-growth needs for the City. The Capital Improvements Plan (Appendix) identifies projects designed to meet these needs.

Table 3.3, below, presents a summary of facility needs through the year 2030. The “Current Need” is the share needed to provide facilities to current residents at the levels of service resulting from facilities planned for 2030. The “Growth Need” is the share needed to provide facilities to future residents at the levels of service resulting from facilities planned for 2030.

TABLE 3.3

FACILITIES REQUIRED FOR GROWTH NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>2030 LOS (Units/1000)</th>
<th>Current Inventory</th>
<th>Current Need</th>
<th>Surplus (Defic.)</th>
<th>2030 Planned Units</th>
<th>Growth Need</th>
<th>Growth Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Waterfront and Regional Parks (acres)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>(36.97)</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Small Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>33.96</td>
<td>(6.96)</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Large and Special Use Parks (acres)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>(6.65)</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Areas and Undeveloped Park Land (acres)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>157.20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails &amp; Pathways (miles)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on planned 2030 levels of service, there is a 36.97-acre deficiency in developed Waterfront and Regional Parks, a 6.96-acre deficiency in developed Small Parks, and a 6.65-acre deficiency in Large and Special Use Area Parks. Improvement fee SDC revenues may be used only for growth needs, and may not be used to remedy deficiencies. Alternative revenues must be used to repair these deficiencies.
D. Facility Costs

The Capital Improvements Plan, included as an appendix to this report, identifies new facilities needed to serve parks and recreation needs of the City’s planning area through the year 2030. The total funding needed for all projects included in the Plan is $14,646,000. The SDC-eligible growth costs included in the Plan total $4,783,205, including $1,959,000 for new parkland, $2,580,205 for new park development, and $244,000 for trails and pathways.

For each project, the Capital Improvements Plan includes the total project cost, the growth-required portion (percentage), the SDC-eligible cost, and the estimated timing priority.

E. Compliance/Administrative Costs

The City incurs costs in the development and administration of the SDCs and may recoup a portion of those costs in accordance with ORS 223.307(5). Compliance/administrative costs through the year 2030 have been estimated as shown in Table 3.5, below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance/Administrative Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual SDC-CIP Management, Accounting and Reporting Costs</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(approximately $10,000 per year for planning, financial reporting and staff services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan Update (1 X $100,000)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Compliance/Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Total SDC-Eligible Costs

The City’s total SDC-eligible costs include the total growth costs (from Appendix) and compliance/administrative costs (from Table 3.4, above). The Total SDC-eligible costs are shown in Table 3.5, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total SDC Eligible Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Facility Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUS: Compliance/Admin Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SDC-Eligible Costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 PARKS AND RECREATION SDC RATES

The City’s SDC rates are calculated using a series of sequential formulas which, when completed, yield the total parks and recreation SDC for each new dwelling unit in the City. The formulas identify:

a) the improvements cost per capita (Formula 4a, below),
b) the improvements cost per dwelling unit (Formula 4b, page 9)
c) the property tax credit per dwelling unit (Formula 4c, page 9), and
d) the net SDC per dwelling unit (Formula 4d, page 10).

The SDC rate is an “improvement fee” only, and does not include a “reimbursement fee” component.

A. Formula 4a: Improvements Cost Per Capita

The improvements cost per capita is calculated by dividing the SDC-eligible costs (identified in Table 3.5, page 7) by the increase in population expected to be created by new development through 2030 (from Table 3.1, page 5).

\[
\text{SDC Eligible Costs} + \frac{\text{Population Increase}}{\text{Improvements Cost Per Capita}}
\]

Table 4.1 presents the calculations of the improvements costs per capita.

**TABLE 4.1**

**IMPROVEMENTS COST PER CAPITA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC Eligible Costs</th>
<th>Population Increase</th>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,103,205</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>$970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Formula 4b: Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit

The improvements cost per dwelling unit is calculated by multiplying the average number of persons per dwelling unit (from Table 3.2, page 6) by the improvements cost per capita (from Table 4.1, page 9).

\[
4b. \quad \text{Persons Per Dwelling Unit} \times \frac{\text{Improvements Cost Per Capita}}{\text{Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit}}
\]

The results of these calculations are displayed in Table 4.2, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Average Persons Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Capita</th>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (1 - 2 units)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (3 or more units)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$2,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing (10 or more units)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Formula 4c: Property Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit

Debt instruments may be used to fund facilities needed to repair deficiencies, and a portion of these debts will be repaid from property taxes paid by growth. A tax credit has been calculated to account for potential payments in order to avoid charging growth twice; once through the SDC, and a second time through property taxes. A credit has been calculated for each type of dwelling unit using the following assumptions:

- $8 million in general obligation bonds issued in the year 2013,
- 5.0% average annual increase in total City property valuation for taxes,
- 3.0% annual increase in assessed property valuations,
- 3.0% annual inflation (decrease in value of money),
- average 2008 property valuations for new construction at $300,000 for single family and $150,000 for multi-family, and $100,000 for senior housing dwelling units.
Present Value of Future Property = Credit Per Tax Payments Dwelling Unit

The amount of this credit is shown in Table 4.3, below.

**TABLE 4.3**

**TAX CREDIT PER DWELLING UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling Unit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling Unit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing Dwelling Unit:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Formula 4d: Net SDC Per Dwelling Unit**

The net SDC rate per dwelling unit is calculated by subtracting the tax credit per dwelling unit (Table 4.3, above) from the improvements cost per dwelling unit (Table 4.2, page 9).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit} - \text{SDC Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit} &= \text{Net SDC Per Dwelling Unit} \\
\text{Single-Family:} & \quad $2,716 - ($1,086) = $1,630 \\
\text{Multi-Family:} & \quad $2,134 - ($543) = $1,591 \\
\text{Senior Housing:} & \quad $1,067 - ($362) = $705
\end{align*}
\]

The results of these calculations are shown in Table 4.4, below.

**TABLE 4.4**

**NET SDC PER DWELLING UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements Cost Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>SDC Tax Credit Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Net SDC Per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family: $2,716</td>
<td>($1,086)</td>
<td>$1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family: $2,134</td>
<td>($543)</td>
<td>$1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing: $1,067</td>
<td>($362)</td>
<td>$705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A. WATERFRONT PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP - 1 Palma Ciea Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$23,120</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP - 2 Wallace House Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waterfront Parks Subtotals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$118,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$118,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. SMALL CITY PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing Priority (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP - 1 Bair Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 2 Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 3 Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 4 Calmers-Jones Park/Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 5 Clear Lake Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. SMALL CITY PARKS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP - 6 Country Glen Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 5.90</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 7 Keizer Station Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop new park facilities on existing undeveloped parkland to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 1.30</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 8 Meadows Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 3.00</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 9 Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 2.10</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 10 Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate and upgrade existing park facilities non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 2.40</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate &amp; Upgrade</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 11 Joint School Use Parks (Sites Unidentified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 6.00</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP - 12 New Small Park (Site Unidentified)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquire land and develop small park to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres = 4.00</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Parks Subtotals**

- Acquisition: 4.00
  - $800,000
- Development: 12.10
  - $3,270,000
- TOTAL: 12.10
  - $4,070,000

*Note: Project Timing and Priority are approximate.*
## C. LARGE CITY PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-OP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Rated Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP - 1 Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>11.59 acres</td>
<td>Acquired</td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>$273,066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,159,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. REGIONAL PARKS & SPECIAL USE FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-OP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Rated Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RP - 1 Keizer Rapids Park</td>
<td>30.00 acres</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU - 1 Indoor Recreation Facility</td>
<td>0.00 acres</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$6,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Parks & Special Use Facilities Subtotals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Rated Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Growth Share ($)</th>
<th>Project Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$7,550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,026,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>$7,550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,026,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# KEIZER PARKS
## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

### E. NATURAL AREA/OPEN SPACE & UNDEVELOPED PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS - 1 Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>Develop facilities to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>3.70 Acquiring</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS - 2 Northridge Park</td>
<td>Develop facilities to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>9.50 Acquiring</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP - 1 Mike Whittam Park</td>
<td>Develop facilities to meet growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>6.10 Acquiring</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Area/Open Space Subtotals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth Share ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. PATHWAYS AND CONNECTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDC-CIP Project Number</th>
<th>Facility Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth-Required Portion (%)</th>
<th>SDC-Eligible Project Cost ($)</th>
<th>Project Timing</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC - 1 Multi-Use Pathway (Clagett Creek)</td>
<td>Develop new multi-use pathway facilities to serve growth and non-growth needs.</td>
<td>0.80 Development</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bike/Pathways Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>Growth Share ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development (miles)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MILES</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF KEIZER, OREGON

PARKS & RECREATION MASTER PLAN

MOORE IACOFANO GOLTSMAN, INC.
815 SW 2ND AVE, SUITE 200
PORTLAND, OR 97204
503.297.1005
WWW.MIGCOM.COM

January 2008
October 16, 2007

Dear Keizer Resident,

In the fifteen years since Keizer’s last parks master plan, the city’s population has almost doubled, from 19,600 to over 34,000, with growing numbers of families with children. During this time, city park acreage has more than doubled, development has filled most the available open space within the city’s urban growth boundary, and many areas that were undeveloped at the time of the previous park plan now have significant housing. To utilize existing resources most effectively and to identify how to best serve Keizer’s current parks and recreation needs, a comprehensive parks review was needed. We are very pleased with the support of the Keizer City Council and the work of MIG that has made the following report possible. Our experience working with MIG and city staff was very positive and we want to thank them for the hard work and professionalism shown.

Keizer has grown into an active, vibrant community with increasingly complex and often competing needs. Keizer’s city government is very lean supporting a citizenry that through volunteerism is very active in promoting and implementing projects. Within tight budgets, a lot is happening. Keizer’s parks do not have an employee who is an advocate solely responsible and accountable for representing parks and recreation needs. Given the competition for time and resources within the city, Keizer will be unsuccessful in implementing the recommendations of this plan and in developing in a manner that realizes the potential public benefit inherent in its investment in public lands and recreation facilities. For these reasons, Keizer’s Parks and Recreation Board supports the recommendation to create a Park and Recreation Department within the city, staffed by a director, to be our highest priority.

In addition to our highest priority, the current board set other priorities that include:

- Improve existing parks as recommended in the plan with emphasis on undeveloped and river parks.
- Create a new small city park in one of the under served areas.
- Develop a new, stronger joint use agreement with the school district, 24J that increases the community recreation benefits from joint use of available school and city resources. We selected Cummings Elementary School as a priority for exploring what can be done in using this model to help serve an under served area
- Begin a trail system starting with the Claggett Creek trail segment.
- Complete smaller park improvements.
- Begin studying the feasibility and needs for a recreational program and facility.
- While investing available SDC funds to develop currently undeveloped, needed parks, save a portion for future park acquisition.
It is our hope that successive boards and councils will set priorities that support and expand upon the ideas presented in this master plan. The Keizer citizen’s Parks and Recreation Board wholeheartedly supports the concepts and suggestions included in this master plan. As we heard in our community input sessions, we think it is time for Keizer to have parks and recreation programs that truly enhance our area, community and our lives.

Sincerely,

Keizer’s 2007 Citizen Advisory Committee for Parks and Recreation
**PREFACE**

During this Plan’s development the Keizer Parks Advisory Board selected the highest priority recommendations for City Council’s consideration.

**Priority One:** Establish a separate Parks Department that reports directly to the City Manager and has responsibility for meeting the objectives identified in this Parks & Recreation Master Plan. Establishment of a Parks Department is the highest priority for the Parks Advisory Board. Without the focus of such a Department, Keizer will not accomplish the goals in the Plan or develop a quality park system that meets the needs of its residents.

**Priority Two:** Improve the existing parks as recommended in the Plan as funding becomes available. The Parks Advisory Board selected the following project sites as first priority for funding:

- Bair Park;
- Chalmers Jones Park;
- Keizer Rapids Park;
- Mike Whittam Park;
- Northridge Park;
- Palma Ciea Park; and
- Wallace House Park.

The Parks Advisory Board has emphasized a need for a balance of funding for Keizer Rapids Park that does not unduly detract from the development and upkeep of the total park system. Chalmers Jones Park is identified in order to set aside up to $50,000 in funding for water features desired by many of Keizer’s citizens. And the Parks Advisory Board is encouraging the development of Mike Whittam Park as a community garden.

**Priority Three:** Create small city parks on school sites through joint use agreements with the 24J School District.

**Priority Four:** Save a portion of the system development charge funds for land acquisition. Starting June 30, 2007 save 15 percent of existing system development charges and starting on July 1, 2007 annually save 25 percent of all new system development charges.

**Priority Five:** Begin developing a trail system starting with the Claggett Creek Trail segment that will connect to the existing regional trail system.

**Priority Six:** Determine the needs, costs, and resources to cover the financing for an indoor facility and its programming.

**Priority Seven:** Complete minor parks improvements identified in the plan such as ADA accessibility, picnic tables and drinking fountains.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Winter 2006, the City of Keizer began updating its Park & Recreation Master Plan to address the recreational needs of its residents. The plan describes a strategy for meeting current and future needs, based on a vision set forth by the community, the Parks Advisory Board, and City Staff.

Planning Process
The Parks & Recreation Master Plan identifies a vision for Keizer’s park system, and presents recommendations for achieving that vision. The Plan identifies and evaluates existing park and recreation areas; assesses the need for additional park land, open space, and recreation facilities; and establishes goals and objectives for recreation programming. The intent of the Master Plan is to provide a logical, comprehensive blueprint for further development of the City’s park system and services.

The City of Keizer recognizes that community insight and input into the master planning process is essential if future park development is to meld with the existing urban fabric and be embraced by the public. Community input for this Parks & Recreation Master Plan was gathered in four primary ways: consultation with the Parks Advisory Board; three community meetings; contacting organized sports groups; and a community forum. Details regarding the planning process and public involvement are contained in Chapter 1.

Existing Parks and Facilities
Keizer has developed a park system that offers a variety of park sites and recreation opportunities. Within this system, different types of parks serve different needs in the community. As the City grows, both in population and geographically, the existing park system will need to expand and change to serve the needs of the community. The City’s current inventory currently includes:

- ten small city parks;
- one large city park;
- one regional park (under development);
- three waterfront parks (partially developed);
- one special use area park;
- two natural area/open space parks; and
- one undeveloped park.

In addition to the City’s available park lands, the majority of available sports fields are available at school site locations. These locations are managed by the City of Salem with assistance from Salem–Keizer Public Schools. The inventory of the parks system is summarized in Chapter 2.
Vision & Goals
The public outreach efforts during the park planning process provided feedback from a variety of City residents regarding their vision, needs, and preferences for parks and recreation services. Through these efforts, a vision for the future emerged. Keizer envisions a livable and interconnected community with a park system that:

- Preserves and maintains a comprehensive system of parks that provide for our community’s growth;  
- Provides a system of unique destinations reflecting Keizer’s pride in its parks and natural areas;  
- Enhances waterfront access to take advantage of the opportunities offered by our water resources;  
- Provides a system of trails to connect parks, open space, schools, neighborhoods and regional destinations; and  
- Includes facilities and programs that are responsive to the community’s needs.

This vision provided the foundation for all goals, objectives, recommendations, and guidelines within this Plan. Eight goals were identified for the City of Keizer’s park and recreation system, and their associated objectives are specified in Chapter 3.

- **Goal 1:** Provide well-designed, accessible and safe parks, recreation facilities, and natural open space areas.
- **Goal 2:** Maximize opportunities for public enjoyment of waterfront access.
- **Goal 3:** Connect neighborhoods with parks, schools, natural open space areas, and the waterfront, as well as downtown and the region.
- **Goal 4:** Meet the park and recreation needs of Keizer’s growing community.
- **Goal 5:** Ensure that a program of recreation services is available for community members of all ages and abilities.
- **Goal 6:** Provide efficient and high quality maintenance of parks, facilities, and natural open space areas.
- **Goal 7:** Be an efficient and effective provider of the parks and recreation services desired by the community.
- **Goal 8:** Encourage public involvement in park and recreation issues.
Needs Assessment
As part of the planning process, a detailed facility needs assessment was completed. The purpose of the needs assessment was to establish in quantifiable terms the need for park land and recreation facilities in Keizer. The community needs identified in the analysis were used to determine recommendations for system-wide improvements, including potentially acquiring or developing new park sites, improving existing parks, and partnering with other service providers. The results of the needs assessment are summarized in Chapter 3.

- The distribution of park facilities is uneven throughout the city creating gaps in park access. West Keizer is parks deficient and two additional small city parks are needed to serve these residents.

- The available undeveloped parks will need development to adequately serve Keizer’s projected 2030 population and any future growth estimates.

- Keizer will eventually provide 5 acres of developed parks per 1,000 residents upon the completion of Keizer Rapids, Keizer Station, Palma Ciea, Wallace House and Bair Parks.

- If Keizer expands its urban growth boundary, an additional large city park will be needed to serve the north Keizer population.

- Additional park land may be required to address facility or amenity deficiencies, such as playground space.

- Connections between the parks through pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and existing waterways will need consideration as Keizer’s park develops and funds become available.

Design Guidelines
The strength of a successful park system is that it provides a variety of park types and recreation opportunities throughout the community to serve residents. Site selection, park design, and development should support the function and purpose of each park type to ensure that diverse recreation opportunities are provided and community recreation needs are met. The design guidelines outline specific design and development guidelines for the following types of parks:

- Large city parks;
- Small city parks;
- Waterfront parks;
- Special use areas; and
- Natural / open space areas.

Design and development guidelines are intended to provide planning and site programming guidance, addressing such things as park size, layout, recommended amenities, and other development concerns for each type of park. However, each site is unique, and these guidelines are not intended to override site-specific concerns or judgments. Chapter 4 presents general design policies that will guide all park planning along with design and development guidelines specific to various park types in Keizer.
Administration, Maintenance, and Programs
As Keizer grows and adds more developed park inventory to its system, the City should transition to a more traditional approach of managing park and recreation services. In general the City’s role should include:

- Assessing and meeting park and recreation needs in the community;
- Maintaining and developing a quality park system;
- Coordinating service delivery efforts with organizations in the community; and
- Providing a level of recreation programs and services that meets needs not filled by other recreation service providers.

The recommendations in this Plan are designed to build capacity within a new Parks and Recreation Department to effectively carry out park services. These are organized into five service areas and are explained in detail in Chapter 5:

- Administration and management;
- Finance and budgeting;
- Park planning and development;
- Maintenance and operations; and
- Recreation programs.

Recommended Park System
The concept for Keizer’s park facility plan is a system of parks that is varied, accessible, and linked to the regional parks system. Parks have been classified into categories reflecting the functions provided by the park. Access to small and large city parks, and waterfront parks, are increased through the distribution of park facility locations that are within a half-mile walking distance of most residents. The proposed system expands on the existing bicycle and multi-use path system. It creates connections between park facilities through additions to the existing bicycle network, the regional multi-use trail, and the Willamette waterway. A select set of recommendations are included below with a complete listing of park and facility specific recommendations are contained in Chapter 6:

- Two additional small city parks are needed to serve these residents.
- The available undeveloped parks will need development to adequately serve Keizer’s projected 2030 population and any future growth estimates.
- If Keizer expands its urban growth boundary, an additional large city park will be needed to serve the north Keizer population.
- Keizer will need to provide additional children’s play areas to adequately serve the existing population.
- Connections between the parks through pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and existing waterways will need consideration as Keizer’s park develops and funds become available.
Financing and Plan Implementation
Chapter 7 lays out the probable cost for the City of Keizer to implement the recommendations contained in this Parks & Recreation Master Plan. Keizer’s existing park system is underfunded and as a consequence inadequately supports its residents. Keizer is at a pivotal point in deciding whether it is willing to take the next step in providing a parks system that is responsive to community need, provides varied and unique experiences, incorporates waterfront access, promotes environmental stewardship, and connects Keizer to the region. The financing strategy in this plan is intended to provide an understanding of the financial realities facing the future of the Keizer's park and recreation system. The information has been organized into five sections:

- **Estimating Costs.** This section outlines the parameters utilized for estimating the probable cost of all the park’s projects.

- **Capital Projects.** The costs for the projects have been summarized into a ten year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which prioritizes projects into three categories: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, and as funds become available.

- **Improvement Actions.** Costs are then summarized into improvement action categories: land acquisition, new park development, major park improvements, minor park improvements, and trail development.

- **Establishing Priorities.** To be able to direct funding toward the most significant projects in terms of meeting community needs a framework for prioritizing projects was developed.

- **Financing Strategy.** Two short-term (five year) capital project packages are presented along with additional funding options the City will want to explore.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION
1.1 Master Plan Overview
The Parks & Recreation Master Plan identifies a vision for Keizer’s park system, and presents recommendations for achieving that vision. The Plan identifies and evaluates existing park and recreation areas; assesses the need for additional park land, open space, and recreation facilities; and establishes goals and objectives for recreation programming. The intent of the Master Plan is to provide a logical, comprehensive blueprint for further development of the City’s park system and services.

1.2 Planning Process
The planning process for this Master Plan update was divided into four phases, as detailed below in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Planning Process**

- **Phase I – Inventory & Analysis:** In the initial stage of the project, a complete inventory of park and recreation resources in the Keizer planning area was compiled. This information – along with more general data about the community such as demographics, population projections, natural resources, climate, and land use – was analyzed and compared with neighboring communities and Marion County.

- **Phase II – Needs Assessment:** Public input was gathered through the Parks Advisory Board, three community meetings, a community forum, and contacts with organized sports groups. Input from these sources assisted in establishing community demand for park and recreation facilities and services. Combining community input with a geographic level of service analysis resulted in a statement of need. Comparing this need to the existing resources presented a clear picture of the current and future needs of the community.

- **Phase III – Plan Development:** During Phase III, the planning team used policy directions determined in Phases I and II and worked with the Parks Advisory Board and City staff to identify major directions for the Plan. The consulting team synthesized this information to formulate goals, objectives and specific recommendations into a plan framework, and then developed a Draft Park and Recreation Master Plan for the Parks Advisory Board and City staff review.
1.2 Phase IV – Plan Refinement & Approval: After the planning team refined the Draft Plan based on Parks Advisory Board and City staff comments, the Draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan was reviewed by the Parks Advisory Board, which made recommendation for adoption to City Council. City Council held a Council work session in October 2007, and the Plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission in January 2008. The Plan will be up for adoption by Council in February 2008.

1.3 Public Involvement

The City of Keizer recognizes that community insight and input into the master planning process is essential if future park development is to meld with the existing urban fabric and be embraced by the public. Community input for this Parks & Recreation Master Plan was gathered in four primary ways: consultation with the Parks Advisory Board; three community meetings; contacting organized sports groups; and a community forum. These public involvement methods are summarized below.

- **Parks Advisory Board:** The Parks Advisory Board, comprised of eight appointed Keizer residents, was tasked with representing the opinions of the community. They were asked to review discussion papers and needs assessment findings. The Park Advisory Board will also refine the goals and objectives, and recommend the capital project priorities to the City Council.

- **Community Meetings:** The Parks Advisory Board held three community meetings in January at City Hall, Cummings and Clear Lake Elementary Schools to obtain feedback regarding Keizer’s existing park system and input on preferences for undeveloped park sites.

- **Community Forum:** A community forum, held to allow citizens to express their ideas about the future of Keizer’s park system, was hosted in February of 2007. A facilitated discussion regarding a vision for Keizer’s parks, opportunities, strengths, challenges and issues facing the parks system took place along with smaller group discussions regarding site designs for Bair, Palma Ciea, and Wallace House Parks.

- **Organized Sports Group Questionnaire:** A questionnaire was distributed to local organized sports groups to obtain information about team sport participation patterns, field use, and sport group needs in Keizer.
1.4 Plan Organization

This Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan is divided into six chapters, described below.

- **Chapter 1: Introduction**: Chapter 1 provides an overview of the document organization, planning process, and public involvement effort.

- **Chapter 2: Existing Conditions**: Chapter 2 describes Keizer’s community profile, and existing classifications and inventory of park facilities. Characteristics described include Keizer’s regional context, climate, natural resources, demographics, and planning issues.

- **Chapter 3: Needs Assessment**: Chapter 3 presents key findings from the Parks Advisory Board, community meetings, community forum and the organized sports group questionnaire, which have been collated into a series of goals and objectives reflecting community priorities. Then a demand and needs analysis is provided. This analysis includes an inventory of existing parks, natural areas, and recreational programs in the Keizer area. It also explains the methodology used to assess and quantify park and facility needs in Keizer, along with a summary of the City’s future park and facility needs.

- **Chapter 4: Park Design and Development Standards**: Chapter 4 presents design and development guidelines intended to provide planning and site programming guidance, addressing such things as park size, layout, recommended amenities, and other development concerns for each type of park.

- **Chapter 5: Recommendations for Administration, Maintenance and Programs**: Chapter 5 gives recommendations for providing recreation services in Keizer, addressing topic areas such as administration and management, finance, maintenance, and recreation programs.

- **Chapter 6: Park and Facility Recommendations**: Chapter 6 presents the recommended park system, the park concept and facility plan and makes site specific recommendations for the development or redevelopment of parks, natural areas and open space, multi-use pathways and recreation facilities.

- **Chapter 7: Financing and Plan Implementation**: Chapter 7 identifies the cost of all capital projects listed in the Plan, suggests a financing strategy, and recommends a six-year capital improvement plan.

- **Appendix A: Park Inventory**
  Appendix A provides additional detailed information about Keizer’s individual parks and site master plans developed during the planning process.
Appendix B through E: Analysis Papers

During the planning process, discussion papers were prepared to present and evaluate the critical demographic, physical, and social factors that impact the decision-making process. These discussion papers included:

Appendix B: Discussion Paper 1: Community Profile;
Appendix C: Discussion Paper 2: Existing Resources;
Appendix D: Discussion Paper 3A: Needs Assessment: Park Land; and
CHAPTER 2:
EXISTING CONDITIONS
2.1 Overview

This chapter summarizes the background information that is the backbone of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan. It describes Keizer’s regional context, natural resources, and demographic composition. It then summarizes park classifications, the existing inventory of park sites and resources available through school facilities.

2.2 Community Profile

Regional Context

The City of Keizer is situated in Marion County, Oregon to the west of the I-5 corridor and directly north of the State’s capital, Salem. Its location in the center of the Willamette Valley provides its residents access to a wide variety of destinations; the Pacific Coast, the Cascade Mountains and the greater Portland-Vancouver metro area are all within an hour to an hour and a half drive of Keizer’s central valley location. The primary planning area includes the lands within the city limits of Keizer designated in the long-range comprehensive plan adopted in January of 1987. The secondary planning area includes the shared urban growth boundary (UGB) with the City of Salem (Fig. 2).

Figure 2: Regional Context

Portland - 45 miles north, Lincoln City - 60 miles west, and Mt. Hood – 80 miles east
Natural Resources
The City of Keizer has two significant water features within its boundaries: the Willamette River and Claggett Creek. The City currently maintains developed and undeveloped park properties along these waterways, presenting both opportunities and challenges to park development. Keizer’s most varied topography is along the Claggett Creek corridor, which currently provides natural open spaces and wetland habitat along the length of its corridor, but access to these areas is limited. The Willamette River connects four of Keizer’s park properties; however, only one of the properties is partially developed with few waterfront park amenities. Keizer’s mild climate allows for year-round use of these areas and of the other more formally developed park facilities.

Demographics
With a population of 34,735, Keizer has been experiencing a steady period of growth since its incorporation in 1982 and is at 87% of its projected population for 2030 of 39,994 residents. The most current population projection, conducted in 2000 by the Mid Willamette Valley Council of Governments, is based on the amount of developable land within the City’s planning area. Keizer is nearly out of developable lands and discussions regarding the expansion of the urban growth boundary (UGB) have not taken place. If there is no expansion of the UGB, little population growth can be expected in the coming years. Expansion of the UGB or increases in population density through redevelopment efforts will quickly bring Keizer to its 2030 projection.

Keizer has a demographic distribution similar to communities its size, Marion County and the State of the Oregon. The City varies from other communities in that it has a slightly larger youth population. The largest percentage of children in 2000 were under age five, with the next largest percentage between the ages of five and nine. Keizer appears to attract young families, particularly those with children under the age of 15.
2.3 Existing Park Resources

Park Classification

Keizer has developed a park system that offers a variety of park sites and recreation opportunities. Within this system, different types of parks serve different needs in the community. As the City grows, both in population and geographically, the existing park system will need to expand and change to serve the needs of the community.

For the purpose of this Plan, Keizer’s parks have been classified according to their function. The classifications are described below.

- **Regional Parks**: Regional parks are sites planned to provide recreational activities for the city and surrounding region. These parks often have a mix of passive and active recreational activities. Regional parks are typically larger sites with a defining feature such as a butte, water feature, wildlife area, or other natural element. Regional parks often have facilities able to accommodate large numbers of visitors throughout the course of the seasons, and their own trail network connecting facilities on the site.

- **Large City Parks**: Large city parks are planned to provide active and structured recreation opportunities, as well as passive and non-organized opportunities for individual and family activities. Large city parks often have sport fields or similar facilities as the central focus of the park with play equipment, picnic areas, pathways and open spaces available. The recommended distribution of large city parks is a park location within one to two miles of all residents. Park size can range from five acres to 20+ acres, with an optimal size of at least 10 to 15 acres.

- **Small City Parks**: Small city parks are designed primarily for non-supervised, non-organized recreation activities. They are generally small in size and attract local residents within a walking distance of one-quarter mile to one-half mile. Facilities typically found in a small city park include children’s play equipment, picnic areas, pathways, open grassy areas for passive use, outdoor basketball or tennis courts, and open lawn areas for informal sports. The size of these parks ranges between one to five acres.

- **Waterfront Parks**: Waterfront parks are distinguished by providing access to large bodies of water such as rivers and lakes. These parks are generally designed to support enjoyment of active and passive water related activities, such as swimming, fishing, boating, and bird or wildlife viewing. Facilities often include boat launches, docks, beaches, viewpoints, picnic areas, trails, and pathways. While other types of parks may contain rivers, lakes, or waterfront as part of a range of amenities, the primary purpose of waterfront parks is to provide water access.
• **Special Use Area Park:** Special use areas are stand-alone recreation sites or miscellaneous park lands designed to support a specific use. Facilities that are typically included in this classification are sports field complexes, community centers, community gardens, skate parks, and aquatic centers. Specialized facilities may also be provided within a park of another classification.

• **Natural Area/Open Space Park:** Natural areas are undeveloped or partially developed lands primarily left in their natural state with recreation use as a secondary objective. They are usually owned or managed by a governmental agency and may have limited public access. This type of land often includes informal open spaces, wetlands, steep hillsides, and heavily wooded areas. Environmentally sensitive areas that include wildlife habitats, stream and creek corridors, or unique and/or endangered plant species can also be considered natural open space. Natural open spaces may serve as trail corridors, wildlife viewing areas, or open areas for quiet contemplation. Natural open space parks generally support unstructured recreational activities and can vary in size.

Figure 3 at the end of this chapter depicts Keizer’s existing parks system. Park inventory information is summarized on the following pages. For additional details by site see *Appendix A: Park Inventory*. For more detailed information regarding Keizer’s demographic profile and existing resources see *Discussion Paper 1: Community Profile and Discussion Paper 2: Existing Resources*, dated March 2007, available under separate cover from the City of Keizer.
## Existing Parks

Table 1: Summary of Existing Park Land — Keizer Planning Area shows Keizer’s existing park inventory by classification. In addition to developed park sites, this inventory includes undeveloped and planned sites.

### Table 1: Summary of Existing Park Land — Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Park</strong></td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Rapids Park</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large City Park</strong></td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small City Park</strong></td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park (planned)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park (formerly Wilark)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers-Jones Park / Carlson Skate Park²</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Station Park (planned)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Park</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma Ciea Park (planned)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace House Park (formerly River’s Edge - planned)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Use Area Park</strong></td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League Park</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Area/Open Space Park</strong></td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undeveloped Park</strong></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whittam Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.
² Carlson Skate Park is a special use area within Chalmers-Jones Park
School Sites

Schools are an important resource for recreation facilities such as sports fields, playgrounds, and gymnasiums. The Salem-Keizer School District is the public school organization serving Keizer. Table 2 details the facilities available on public school sites in the planning area. Table 3 on the following page summarizes sports fields and courts available through the school district and the City’s parks.

Table 2: Summary of Existing Public School Facilities — Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 multi-use sports field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 youth backstop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 covered basketball courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 covered blacktop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 basketball hoops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 open area blacktop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bark chip running trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 back stops on large field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge</td>
<td>1 soccer field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 youth baseball field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 covered backboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Running track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser</td>
<td>1 soccer field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 youth baseball field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 soccer field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 youth baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 youth baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 covered play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 covered backboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1 soccer field (no goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 “Big Toy” play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 gravel play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 backboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track surrounds field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covered general play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle</td>
<td>1 soccer field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 youth backstops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 covered backboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 adjustable backboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 open field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 multi-use blacktop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>1 multipurpose field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 football field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 paved half mile track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 sprinting track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 baseball backstops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 small basketball court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auxiliary gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteaker</td>
<td>1 football field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 soccer fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 youth soccer field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 baseball field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 half mile bark trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 paved 100m sprint track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auxiliary gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNary</td>
<td>1 football field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 quarter mile track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 grandstand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 auxiliary gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 baseball fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 multi-use fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Track &amp; field sports area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sports Fields & Courts
The majority of available sports fields and courts are managed by the City of Salem with assistance from Salem–Keizer Public Schools. The sports fields are scheduled by the Recreation Coordinator for Salem or by the Facility Rental Coordinator of the school district.

Table 3: Summary of Sport Fields & Courts — Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Baseball Field</th>
<th>Softball Field</th>
<th>Youth Baseball</th>
<th>Soccer Field</th>
<th>Youth Soccer Field</th>
<th>Multi-Use Field</th>
<th>Football Field</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Basketball court (full)</th>
<th>Basketball court (half)</th>
<th>Basketball hoop</th>
<th>Gymnasium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Nary¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Mc Nary High School facilities are not scheduled through the City of Salem or the Keizer-Salem Facility Rental Coordinator.
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CHAPTER 3:
NEEDS ASSESSMENT
3.1 Needs Assessment

This chapter summarizes the background information and technical analysis that form the basis of the recommendations for Parks & Recreation Master Plan. It presents key findings from the public involvement process, and discusses findings on park and recreation needs. Input from the public involvement process has been collected into a series of goals and objectives that has been utilized as the framework for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The chapter then summarizes the results of the parks and recreation facility needs assessment. Key findings of the park facility needs assessment are listed in this section. For more detailed information refer to Discussion Paper 3A: Needs Assessment—Parks and Discussion Paper 3B: Needs Assessment—Recreation Facilities, dated April 2007, which are available under separate cover from the City of Keizer.

3.2 Public Involvement Overview

As summarized in Chapter 1, there were a variety of opportunities for public input during the planning process. The vision, goals, and objectives described in this chapter define the park and recreation services that Keizer will provide. These elements were derived from input received throughout the planning process, including City staff and officials, the Parks Advisory Board, community members, and other service providers. Taken together, the vision, goals, and objectives provide a framework for the Parks & Recreation Master Plan.

Parks Advisory Board

The Parks Advisory Board consisted of eight appointed Keizer residents. This group met at key decision points in the planning process to provide guidance for the plan. The Parks Advisory Board indicated and clarified issues in many areas, including:

- The vision and concept for Keizer’s park system;
- Approach to providing parks in residential developments;
- Access to the Willamette River waterfront;
- Standards for design and maintenance;
- Cultural and historical context of existing parks;
- Potential trail alignments and connections to other systems;
- Keizer’s role as a regional recreation resource provider;
- Joint use agreements with the school district; and
- Final site master plans for Bair, Palma Ciea, and Wallace House Parks.

Community Meetings

The Parks Advisory Board held three community meetings in January 2007 to elicit public feedback regarding Keizer’s park system. The meetings were held at City Hall, and Cummings and Clear Lake Elementary Schools, and residents discussed overarching visions for the park system and park specific issues. This public input was then utilized in developing park design programs.
Community Forum

A community forum was held at Keizer City Hall in February of 2007, where a facilitated discussion took place regarding the community’s vision for parks; the park system’s strengths, opportunities, and challenges; and funding for a comprehensive parks system. Forum participants provided additional feedback about the future of the parks system through a survey and discussion groups regarding undeveloped park sites. Input from the meeting was used to develop the three site master plans for Bair, Palma Ciea, and Wallace House Parks.

Organized Sports Group Questionnaire

In order to assess the demand and supply of sports fields in the Keizer area, each major sports organization was contacted and asked to complete a short questionnaire regarding their use of recreation resources in Keizer. The results provided information about the use of Keizer’s athletic fields and school gymnasiums throughout the year and contributed to the needs assessment for athletic fields and indoor court spaces. Key findings are summarized in this chapter in section 3.4, Park and Recreation Facility Needs.

3.2 Community Vision for Parks

The public outreach efforts during the park planning process provided feedback from a variety of City residents regarding their vision, needs, and preferences for parks and recreation services. Through these efforts, a vision for the future emerged.

Keizer envisions a livable and interconnected community with a park system that:

- Preserves and maintains a comprehensive system of parks that provide for our community’s growth;
- Provides a system of unique destinations reflecting Keizer’s pride in its parks and natural areas;
- Enhances waterfront access to take advantage of the opportunities offered by our water resources;
- Provides a system of trails to connect parks, open space, schools, neighborhoods and regional destinations; and
- Includes facilities and programs that are responsive to the community’s needs.

This vision provided the foundation for all goals, objectives, recommendations, and guidelines in the following chapters within this Plan.
3.3 Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives form the framework for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. A goal is a general statement describing an outcome the City wishes to provide. Goals typically do not change over time unless community values or economic conditions make it necessary. Objectives are more specific statements that describe a means to achieving goals, and are measurable. Objectives may change over time. Recommendations are specific implementing actions to achieve the goals and objectives, and are contained in subsequent chapters of the plan.

Goals

Through the planning process, eight goals were identified for the City of Keizer’s park and recreation system:

- **Goal 1**: Provide well-designed, accessible and safe parks, recreation facilities, and natural open space areas.
- **Goal 2**: Maximize opportunities for public enjoyment of waterfront access.
- **Goal 3**: Connect neighborhoods with parks, schools, natural open space areas, and the waterfront, as well as downtown and the region.
- **Goal 4**: Meet the park and recreation needs of Keizer’s growing community.
- **Goal 5**: Ensure that a program of recreation services is available for community members of all ages and abilities.
- **Goal 6**: Provide efficient and high quality maintenance of parks, facilities, and natural open space areas.
- **Goal 7**: Be an efficient and effective provider of the parks and recreation services desired by the community.
- **Goal 8**: Encourage public involvement in park and recreation issues.
Objectives

Objectives are listed below, organized by goal. Objectives are numbered for reference to correspond to the goals.

Goal 1: Provide well-designed, accessible and safe parks, recreation facilities, and natural open space areas.

1a. Provide a variety of recreational opportunities within the Keizer park system.

1b. Develop a park system with locations convenient to most residents in Keizer. Where feasible, provide a park within ½ mile walking distance of each resident.

1c. Provide opportunities for indoor and covered recreational activities, such as a gymnasium, indoor recreation center, or covered playground and ball court areas.

1d. Meet the needs for athletic fields based on the demand created by the population of Keizer.

1e. Adopt and follow park design and development guidelines.

1f. Accept only those parks and facilities that are consistent with the City’s Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

1g. Incorporate interpretation of local history, culture, and the environment into the park system.

Goal 2: Maximize opportunities for public enjoyment of waterfront access.

2a. Recognize the Willamette River and Claggett Creek as unique local recreation resources.

2b. Provide opportunities for public access to the waterfront where conditions permit it.

2c. Maintain habitat and environmental benefits of waterfront park locations.

2d. Improve access to waterfront parks as practical to increase waterfront park opportunities.

2e. Provide a range of waterfront recreation experiences.

Goal 3: Connect neighborhoods with parks, schools, natural open space areas, and the waterfront, as well as with downtown and the region.

3a. Develop an interconnected pedestrian and bicycle system that connects neighborhoods with parks, schools, and waterways.

3b. Connect the City’s pedestrian and bicycle system with the Polk and Marion County regional systems.

3c. Develop a network of off-street trails using natural open space areas, parks, utility corridors, and other features. This network can be supplemented with on-street connections where needed.

3d. Provide a multi-use trail network along Claggett Creek.

3e. Provide waterway trails along the Willamette River.
Goal 4: Meet the park and recreation needs of Keizer’s growing community.

4a. Secure adequate park land in developing areas to serve future residents.
4b. Preserve areas with critical or unique natural features, such as stream corridors, wildlife habitat, and wetlands.
4c. Partner with the Salem-Keizer School District to maximize public use of recreation facilities on school sites, especially for athletic fields.
4d. Establish mechanisms so that new development is responsible for providing or paying for the park and recreation facilities needed to serve increased population.

Goal 5: Ensure that a program of recreation services is available for community members of all ages and abilities.

5a. Monitor the availability of additional recreation services as the community grows.
5b. Coordinate with private and non-profit providers, such as organized sports leagues, to ensure they have adequate facilities and space to provide recreation services.
5c. When it benefits the community, provide space and opportunity for private groups and commercial interests to conduct recreational programs. However, the City should not subsidize the operating costs of private providers.
5d. Provide recreational programs when staffing levels, facilities, and resources permit (e.g., sports camps, day camps, fitness classes).

Goal 6: Provide efficient and high quality maintenance of parks, facilities, and natural open space areas.

6a. Maintain park and recreation facilities in a manner to make them safe, attractive, and a positive part of the neighborhood and the City.
6b. Develop maintenance frequency protocols that maximize the life of the City’s park and recreation assets.
6c. Maximize efficient use of the maintenance budget.
6d. Consider the maintenance costs and staffing levels associated with acquisition, development, or renovation of parks or natural open space areas, and adjust the annual operating budget accordingly for adequate maintenance funding of the system expansion.
Goal 7: Be an efficient and effective provider of the parks and recreation services desired by the community.

7a. Maintain an operating budget that reflects what the community needs and can afford with regard to park and recreation services.
7b. Maximize operational efficiency to provide the greatest public benefit for the resources expended.
7c. Provide better tracking of the costs of maintaining City-owned facilities by their function, including public buildings, infrastructure (e.g., well-heads), parks and natural areas, and the cemetery.
7d. Tailor services and operating hours to community needs, so that policies, work schedules, and administrative direction support public use of parks and services.
7e. Develop staff growth by encouraging participation in professional organizations, educational classes and training seminars.

Goal 8: Encourage public involvement in park and recreation issues.

8a. Support the Park Advisory Board as the forum for public discussion of parks and recreation issues.
8b. Provide public review opportunities in park planning and design decisions.
8c. Establish publicity efforts to inform citizens of the recreational opportunities available in local neighborhoods and City-wide.
8d. Periodically review local park and recreation preferences, needs, and trends.
8e. Encourage citizen involvement and participation in maintaining and restoring the quality of parks, such as adopt-a-park programs, and sports group partnerships.
3.4 Park & Recreation Facility Needs

As part of the planning process, a detailed facility needs assessment was completed. The purpose of the needs assessment was to establish in quantifiable terms the need for park land and recreation facilities in Keizer. The process for completing the needs assessment in Keizer included the following:

- Inventorying and assessing the existing park and recreation amenities in the community;
- Evaluating public input on park and recreation needs;
- Conducting a survey of organized sports groups;
- Analyzing park land and amenities using a combination of methods to determine a recommended level of service (LOS); and
- Applying the LOS standards to determine current and future park land and amenity needs.

The community needs identified in the analysis were used to determine recommendations for system-wide improvements, including potentially acquiring or developing new park sites, improving existing parks, and partnering with other service providers.

Park Service Indicators

Keizer is an almost fully built-out community with an established system of developed parks providing various amenities. The developed parks are a source of pride for the community but do not satisfy the full range of residents' recreation needs. Based on input received through the Parks Advisory Board, three community meetings, and a community forum, three indicators for basic park service provision were identified for Keizer:

- **Public Park Access**: Every resident should have convenient access to some type of developed public park.

- **Children’s Play Areas**: Every resident should have convenient walking access to children’s play areas, and the walking distance should be manageable even by young children.

- **Pathways & Connections**: Connections between the parks via pedestrian walkways, bicycle trails, and existing waterways were identified as a major need by Keizer residents. Residents feel that viewing Keizer parks as complete system with local and regional connections is vital to increasing community ownership of the parks system.
Public Park Access

At this time Keizer has nine developed large and small city parks with six additional undeveloped or planned park sites, one special use area, a partially developed waterfront park, and two natural area/open space parks for a total of 19 park locations (see Figure 3: Existing Park Facilities in Chapter 2). These parks vary greatly in size, design, and amenities, but all supply some type of recreational opportunity either in their current state or planned development in the future. The table below summarizes the existing partially developed and developed park properties.

Table 4: Developed & Partially Developed Park Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers Jones/Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Large City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Level of Service (LOS)
The existing level of service (LOS) for public parks is calculated by dividing the existing developed and partially developed public parks in Keizer’s inventory by the current population of 34,735. This calculation results in an existing LOS for public parks of approximately one acre per 1,000 residents. This is a lower than typical amount of developed and partially developed park land than in other Oregon communities, most of which average between four to six acres per 1,000 residents.

Underserved Areas

Figure 4: Underserved Park Access Areas illustrates the concentration of existing developed and partially developed parks in Keizer with ¼ to ½ mile pedestrian access located east of River Road in southern and in northeastern Keizer. When the gaps in the service area reach are compared with the existing zoning information, four distinct underserved areas are revealed. Zone 1 is located along the southwestern portion of the Clear Lake Neighborhood and is primarily zoned single family residential. A private open space and a swimming pool are located in this area, but are restricted to the residents of the development. Zone 2 is located in west Keizer south of Staats Lake and just north of the future service reach areas of Keizer Rapids and Palma Ciea Parks. Zoning is primarily single family residential, with medium density residential areas east of McNary High School. Zone 3 is located in central Keizer north of Chemawa Road and up to the southeastern portion of the Gubser Neighborhood. The area closest to River Road is medium density residential, with the remaining area designated single
family. Zone 4 is located in the southern tip of Keizer’s city limits, in a medium
density residential area adjacent to the commercial corridor along River Road.

**Service Analysis**
If one takes the current population and calculate the existing parks with the
future development of Keizer Rapids, Bair Park, Keizer Station, Palma Ciea and
Wallace House Parks, a recommended LOS standard can be derived. The five
planned parks bring an additional 136.2 acres into the developed park inventory
bringing the level of service up to approximately five acres per 1,000 people. This
results in a recommended LOS standard for developed parks of 5 acres per 1,000
residents.

**Summary of Need:**
- The distribution of park facilities is uneven throughout the city creating gaps
  in park access.
- West Keizer is parks deficient and two additional small city parks are needed
to serve these residents.
- The available undeveloped parks will need development to adequately serve
  Keizer’s projected 2030 population and any future growth estimates.
- Keizer will eventually provide 5 acres of developed parks per 1,000 residents
  upon the completion of Keizer Rapids, Keizer Station, Palma Ciea, Wallace
  House and Bair Parks. Without the development of these parks, Keizer
  provides one acre of developed parks per 1,000, which is below the Pacific
  Northwest’s average of three to five acres per 1,000 residents.
- If Keizer expands its urban growth boundary, an additional large city park
  will be needed to serve the north Keizer population.
Figure 4: Underserved Park Access Areas
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Children’s Play Areas

Keizer is a family-oriented city, and places for children to play are important for family socialization and children’s physical development. As available developable land decreases and housing densities increase, outdoor areas for play will become increasingly scarce. The importance of having family recreation areas within walking distance for small children was a recurring theme of the public involvement process. One-quarter mile is the maximum distance a small child can be expected to walk with a parent to access a playground. Keizer currently has seven play equipment areas at existing parks, with eight play areas available at each elementary school site. The play areas at these locations vary in condition and quality. The complete inventory of playgrounds in Keizer is listed in the table below.

### Table 5: Existing Playgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Playgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Level of Service (LOS)**

Playgrounds are not typically reviewed in terms of residents served. However, playgrounds and play equipment are standard features in developed parks in most communities. Based on community input, there is need for more locations where families and children can play. Additionally, there is a strong desire for water features, or spraygrounds, at these locations. If the City plans to accommodate Keizer’s family-oriented residents, new playgrounds are needed to meet the demand.

**Underserved Areas**

Based on a geographic analysis and planned zoning, the highest need for playgrounds are in west and south Keizer. To provide a desired level of service for the projected population, additional playgrounds should be added to the system in the underserved areas, increasing the total number of publicly
accessible playgrounds in Keizer. The Parks Department currently has no land holdings in the underserved areas. If the city expands its urban growth boundary, additional play areas will need to be sited.

**Service Analysis**

Playgrounds are currently needed in locations where there are no existing developed parks, schools, or undeveloped park properties. There is a need for additional children's play areas. In the very long-term future, additional playgrounds will be needed to serve any residential development if the City expands its urban growth boundary.

**Summary of Need:**

- Playgrounds should be provided within ¼ to ½ mile of all residential areas in Keizer.
- Keizer will need to provide **additional playgrounds** to adequately serve the existing population.
- **Additional park land may be required** to address facility or amenity deficiencies, such as playground space.
Pathways and Connections
Keizer has no formal trail or pathway system connecting residents to its parks, natural areas, or waterways. Keizer has an existing bicycle route network within the city and a multi-use path just outside of its city limits to the east. Keizer has natural resources and waterways within the city, but currently lacks access to these resources.

Existing Level of Service (LOS)
There are approximately 22.47 miles of designated bicycle routes within the City of Keizer and approximately 2.5 miles of multi-use trail running parallel to Keizer’s eastern city limit. Figure 3: Existing Park Facilities in Chapter 2 depicts the existing system. Existing bicycle routes are noted with a solid purple line and the multi-use trails are represented with a solid orange line. The existing bicycle routes run along major roadways but do not connect to Keizer’s park areas or waterways.

Underserved Areas
There is no defined service area for linkages and connections between parks, natural areas and waterways. Park land connectivity could be improved by designating additional bicycle routes between existing parks and schools, creating a multi-use trail corridor along Claggett Creek and the northeastern city limits, and designating a waterway trail along the Willamette River connecting Keizer Rapids, Palma Ciea, Sunset, and Wallace House Parks.

Service Analysis
The existing LOS standard for bicycle routes in Keizer is .64 acres per 1,000 residents using an assumed bike lane width of eight feet. Using the existing multi-use trail just outside Keizer’s city limits, an existing LOS standard of .11 acres per 1,000 residents can be derived for multi-use trails, assuming a path width of twelve feet. There is no LOS standard calculation for waterway trails.

Summary of Need:

- Connections between the parks through pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and existing waterways will need consideration as Keizer’s park develops and funds become available.

- Keizer should increase park connectivity with the addition of approximately 7.8 miles of bicycle routes, making the recommended LOS standard .86 acres per 1,000 residents.

- Keizer also should consider planning for a multi-use pathway that creates a park system loop. The proposed pathway would be approximately 3.6 miles, making the recommended LOS standard .29 acres per 1,000.
Recreation Facilities

The sports group survey assessed the existing and future demand placed on Keizer’s park and school sports facilities. The analysis focused specifically on facilities for baseball, softball, soccer, football, basketball, and volleyball. The list is not all-inclusive, but represents the variety of organized sports currently at play in Keizer. Recommendations resulting from this report are intended to provide standards for the parks system as Keizer’s population grows.

- **Baseball & Softball Fields**: Keizer Little League sponsors 59 Tee-ball, softball and baseball teams in Keizer, and the Keizer Junior Baseball Association sponsors four senior division teams. Both organizations estimate that 99% of their players are from the Keizer area and both organizations use Keizer park and school facilities for practices and games. The City should **consider maintaining the current ratio of youth and regulation baseball fields**. There is currently a surplus of available facilities for both youth and regulation baseball. Not all of the available facilities are equally maintained or utilized, but the City and schools have adequate supplies of land dedicated to this recreational activity.

- **Soccer Fields**: Keizer Soccer Club sponsors a range of 67-87 teams covering the full range of youth age divisions. All of the league games are played at Whiteaker Middle School during the season and approximately 50% of their participants are from within the City of Keizer. The City should **consider maintaining the current ratio of soccer fields**. There is currently a surplus of available facilities with only two regulation fields being utilized by the Keizer Soccer Club. It should be noted that all of the available facilities are not equally maintained, but the City and schools have an adequate supply of land dedicated to this recreational activity.

- **Football Fields**: The Boys’ and Girls’ Club of America sponsors ten flag and tackle football teams and utilize all of the available football fields provided by the Salem-Keizer School District and estimates that 16% of their players are from Keizer. The City does not currently maintain any of the existing football fields. An adequate supply of fields is provided by the Salem-Keizer Public School District and **there is no expected need for football fields provided by the City’s park system**.

- **Indoor Court Space**: The City does not currently maintain any of the existing indoor court spaces for basketball or volleyball. Demand is high for the existing indoor facilities and approximately 1,800 children participate in a basketball and volleyball program sponsored by the Boys’ and Girls’ Club of America. The City does not currently maintain any of the existing indoor court spaces for basketball or volleyball. Demand is high for the existing indoor facilities. The City will need to **take a measured look at the feasibility of a City funded recreation center or gym**. A feasibility study would assess the capital and operational costs, assist in determining a model of operation that could work within Keizer’s budget, and could assess a cooperative financial strategy with Keizer’s existing sports organizations.
CHAPTER 4: PARK DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
4.1 **Development Guidelines**

The strength of a successful park system is that it provides a variety of park types and recreation opportunities throughout the community to serve residents. Site selection, park design, and development should support the function and purpose of each park type to ensure that diverse recreation opportunities are provided and community recreation needs are met. The design guidelines outline specific design and development guidelines for the following types of parks:

- Large city parks;
- Small city parks;
- Waterfront parks;
- Special use areas; and
- Natural / open space areas.

Design and development guidelines are intended to provide planning and site programming guidance, addressing such things as park size, layout, recommended amenities, and other development concerns for each type of park. However, each site is unique, and these guidelines are not intended to override site-specific concerns or judgments.

Guidelines for the development of Keizer parks include:

- **Description:** A definition is presented to describe the park type.
- **Function:** The primary function or use of this type of park is noted.
- **Site selection considerations:** Criteria to consider in the acquisition and development of new parks include location, site size, and site access guidelines. Existing parks may be smaller or larger than the recommended maximum and minimum park size.
- **Minimum amenities:** These amenities should be provided in every developed park in this category.
- **Additional amenities:** These amenities are appropriate for this type of park, and these and similar features may be considered during the planning and design process for each park.
- **Avoid:** These elements are not compatible with the park type and should be avoided.
### Large City Park

**Description**
Large city parks are planned to provide active and structured recreation opportunities through facilities such as playgrounds, playing fields, and basketball courts, as well as passive opportunities. Large city parks often have sport fields or similar facilities as the central focus of the park, with play equipment, picnic areas, pathways and open spaces available.

**Function**
Provide for active and passive recreation; provide neighborhood or community gathering space.

**Site Selection Considerations**
- The site should front on a public street.
- Access to the site should be provided by means of a street with sidewalks. If access is by means of a collector or arterial street, the street should have bicycle lanes.
- The site should be relatively central to the area it is intended to serve.
- The site should connect to the communitywide trail network if available, or be connectable to the network via sidewalks or a trail.
- Site size should be adequate to support the intended uses, with a minimum size of 10 acres or more. Depending on new site potential and location constraints the acreage could be less.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site identification signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate site furnishings (e.g., picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot and youth playground equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open turf area for unstructured play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General landscape improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway system connecting park elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two additional active recreation amenities from the additional amenities list below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active recreation amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports fields for scheduled organized sports play or practice. Fields may be in complexes within the park, if space permits. Lighting can be considered if the site is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoe pits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park or skate spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouldering features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other small-scale sports facilities (horseshoes, bocce, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters (larger parks should consider including at least one shelter capable of accommodating groups of 25 to 30 people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large group picnic area able to accommodate 75 to 100+ people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance space, such as a stage area or band shell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent or portable restrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking to serve the need using green design when possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water playground or interactive water feature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural area (if present on site)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor recreation center or facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage or maintenance buildings (If visible, these should be architecturally compatible with other park elements and any exterior work areas should be screened from view.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Small City Park

**Description**

Small city parks are designed primarily for non-supervised and unstructured recreation activities. They are generally small in size and attract local residents within a walking distance of one-quarter mile to one-half mile. Facilities typically found in a small city park include children’s play equipment, picnic areas, pathways, open grassy areas for passive use, outdoor basketball or tennis courts, and open lawn areas for informal sports.

**Function**

Provide access to basic recreation opportunities.

**Site Selection Considerations**

- The site should front on a public street.
- Access to the site should be provided by means of a street with sidewalks. If access is by means of a collector or arterial street, the street should have bicycle lanes.
- The site should be relatively central to the area it is intended to serve.
- The site should connect to the communitywide trail network if available, or be connectable to the network via sidewalks or a trail.
- Site size should be adequate to support the intended uses.
- Optimal size is three to eight acres, with a minimum size of one acre, but neighborhood parks can be larger depending on site availability.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site identification signage</td>
<td>Site identification signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate site furnishings (e.g., picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the park</td>
<td>Appropriate site furnishings (e.g., picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot and youth playground equipment</td>
<td>Tot and youth playground equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open turf area for unstructured play</td>
<td>Open turf area for unstructured play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General landscape improvements</td>
<td>General landscape improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway system connecting park elements</td>
<td>Pathway system connecting park elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two additional active recreation amenities from the additional amenities list below</td>
<td>At least two additional active recreation amenities from the additional amenities list below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active recreation amenities</td>
<td>Active recreation amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouldering features</td>
<td>Bouldering features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other small-scale sports facilities such as horseshoe pits or bocce courts</td>
<td>Other small-scale sports facilities such as horseshoe pits or bocce courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent or portable restrooms</td>
<td>Permanent or portable restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking to serve the need using green design when possible.</td>
<td>On-street parking to serve the need using green design when possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signage</td>
<td>Interpretive signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural area (if present on site)</td>
<td>Natural area (if present on site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage or maintenance buildings (If visible, these should be architecturally compatible with other park elements and any exterior work areas should be screened from view.)</td>
<td>Storage or maintenance buildings (If visible, these should be architecturally compatible with other park elements and any exterior work areas should be screened from view.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoid</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking</td>
<td>Off-street parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waterfront Park

**Description**  
Waterfront parks are distinguished by their function of providing access to large bodies of water such as rivers and lakes. These parks are generally designed to support enjoyment of active and passive water-related activities, such as swimming, fishing, boating, and bird or wildlife viewing. Facilities often include boat launches, docks, beaches, viewpoints, picnic areas, trails, and pathways.

**Function**  
While other types of parks may contain rivers, lakes, or waterfront as part of a range of amenities, the primary purpose of waterfront parks is to provide water access.

**Site Selection Considerations**
- Reasonable access to water
- Adequate size to support water access and intended use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Amenities</th>
<th>Additional Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Site identification signage</td>
<td>• Seasonal or permanent dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paved pathway</td>
<td>• Orientation and informational signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate site furnishings (e.g., picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the waterfront park</td>
<td>• Trailhead or entry kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trails or unpaved pathways</td>
<td>• Turf areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ornamental plantings</td>
<td>• Ornamental plantings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fences, landscaping, or other features to control access near adjoining residential areas</td>
<td>• Viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewpoints</td>
<td>• Picnic shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintained natural vegetation</td>
<td>• Maintained natural vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active recreation elements</td>
<td>• Active recreation elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If site size permits, additional non-water oriented amenities (playground, open turf area, ball courts, disc golf, bocce, horseshoe pits, etc.)</td>
<td>• On-street or off-street parking (amount depends on facilities and anticipated use of park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses that conflict with primary water orientation of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avoid
### Special Use Area Park

**Description**
Special use areas are stand-alone recreation sites or miscellaneous park lands designed to support a specific use. Facilities that are typically included in this classification are sports field complexes, community centers, community gardens, skate parks and aquatic centers. Specialized facilities may also be provided within a park of another classification.

**Function**
Meet a specialized community recreation need.

**Site Selection Considerations**
- Site size depends on intended use, but should be sufficient to accommodate the special use and necessary support facilities.
- Access to the site should generally be provided by means of a collector or arterial street.
- The site should connect to the communitywide trail network if available, or be connectable to the network via sidewalks or a trail.
- The feasibility study for the special use will determine additional site selection criteria.
### Minimum Amenities
- Site identification signage
- Appropriate site furnishings (e.g., picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the park
- Portable restrooms.
- Special use facility or facilities
- General landscaping improvements
- On-street or off-street parking using green design when possible.

### Additional Amenities
Additional amenities that are compatible with or that support the primary special use should be considered for the site. These may include:
- Tot and youth playground equipment
- Open turf area for unstructured play
- Courts for basketball, volleyball, or tennis
- Other sports facilities (skate spot, bocce, disc golf, horseshoe pits, etc.)
- Pathway system
- Permanent restrooms
- Picnic shelters
- Water playground or interactive feature
- Concession, vendor space, or commercial lease space
- Restaurant or food concessions
- Other recreation amenities that address new recreation trends
- Storage or maintenance buildings (If visible, these should be architecturally compatible with other park elements and any exterior work areas should be screened from view.)

### Avoid
- Uses that conflict or detract from the special use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Natural Area/Open Space Park</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Site Selection Considerations** | - Site size should be based on natural resource needs, with site size being the amount needed to preserve or protect the resource.  
- Where feasible, public access and use of natural open space areas should be encouraged through trails and other features, but environmentally sensitive areas should be protected from overuse.  
- The site should have access to a public street.  
- The site should connect to the communitywide trail network if available, or be connectable to the network via sidewalks or a trail. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site identification signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate site furnishings (e.g., picnic tables, benches, bike racks, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, etc.) for the intended scale and use of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Amenities should be limited to those appropriate for the numbers and types of visitors the area can accommodate, while retaining its resource value, natural character, and the intended level of solitude.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail and pathway system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailhead or entry kiosk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints or viewing blinds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal or permanent restrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive or educational facilities or classrooms (indoor or outdoor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the natural resource values of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turf areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental plantings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active-oriented amenities (sports fields, paved courts, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Considerations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize the natural environment and interpretive or educational features in the design of these parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect, enhance, and preserve the diversity of species on the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote native plants in a variety of ages and sizes to prevent monocultures from dominating natural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote invasive species removal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION, MAINTENANCE AND PROGRAMS
5.1 Parks and Recreation Department Organizational Structure

The City of Keizer experienced a period of rapid growth during the 1990s in comparison to neighboring communities, but has maintained a limited amount of park and recreation services. The Public Works Department currently manages City parks and recreation facilities as one of its multiple responsibilities. Maintenance of the park system is performed by one full time staff member with support from two seasonal employees. In total, 2.17 FTEs (full time equivalents) are assigned to park maintenance. The division of time is indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 – 2007 Fiscal Budget</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public Works Director</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Works Superintendent</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal Utility Worker</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two Seasonal Utility Workers</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative Support Staff</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This represents 18.3 acres of developed park land\(^1\) area per employee which is a larger proportion of park land per employee than communities of a similar size. The larger number of acres per employee is also reflected in a very low maintenance cost per acre, which for Keizer is $1,432 per acre, compared to other Oregon communities at $3,000 to $5,000 an acre. This plan recommends an expansion of the City’s responsibilities in providing park and recreation services to respond to the increased demand by creating a Parks and Recreation Department.

As Keizer grows and adds more developed park inventory to its system, the City should consider a transition to a more traditional approach of managing park and recreation services. In general the City’s role should include:

- Assessing and meeting park and recreation needs in the community;
- Maintaining and developing a quality park system;
- Coordinating service delivery efforts with organizations in the community; and
- Providing a level of recreation programs and services that meets needs not filled by other recreation service providers.

The recommendations in this chapter are designed to build capacity within a new Parks and Recreation Department to effectively carry out park services. These are organized into five service areas:

- Administration and management;
- Finance and budgeting;
- Park planning and development;
- Maintenance and operations; and
- Recreation programs.

---

\(^1\) Developed park land acreage 39.7 acres; total park acreage 211.6 acres
5.2 Administration and Management

The Public Works Department in Keizer currently manages City parks and facilities as one of many departmental responsibilities. The following recommendations are aimed at providing an organizational framework to establish a Parks and Recreation Department.

A. Establish a Parks and Recreation Department or Division. This plan recommends increases in services in the future to meet community demand. As a result, the City needs to consider the most effective internal organization to provide those services. Currently, the Public Works Department is responsible for parks in Keizer, and there is no dedicated parks division within the department. The City maintains the parks it owns, but does not provide recreation programs, a direction this plan recommends pursuing. Many cities find that a single department or division addressing all aspects of parks and recreation allows for better services and operations. Keizer should transition to a Parks and Recreation Department or Division to facilitate parks and recreation services, allow for better coordination with other providers, and improve cost tracking. Without the focus that such a department provides, Keizer will be unable to successfully carry out the needed administrative, planning and development, maintenance, and recreation functions outlined in this chapter.

B. Establish a trial recreation program. The responses to the sports organization questionnaire demonstrate a high demand for recreation services for youth sports. Demand for these services will likely continue as the large youth population continues to mature in Keizer. In addition, recreation programs provide more service per unit of cost than any other type of park or recreation activity, because a percentage of the cost of providing the programs is recovered through fees. Cost recovery for recreation programs can range from 20 to 25% to 100% or higher, depending on the programs offered. Keizer should hire or contract with a part-time recreation program coordinator, and charge this person with establishing recreation programs in Keizer. A recreation program coordinator would not be responsible for teaching the classes and programs, but rather for finding contract teachers or providers, identifying program locations, publicizing the programs, and establishing a registration system. It is important to recognize that private non-profit groups, neighboring cities, and even commercial businesses are an essential part of a citywide recreation delivery program. The recreation program coordinator should be asked to coordinate new programs with existing services to minimize duplication.

C. Continue Parks Advisory Board. The Parks Advisory Board is critical to the implementation of this plan and the success of the City’s park and recreation services. The Parks Advisory Board should continue to function as the review body for all parks-related issues and policies in Keizer. The Parks Advisory Board should make recommendations on all policies related to parks and recreation, be responsible for review of all
D. **Establish performance goals and an annual work program.** Each year, an annual work program and performance goals should be developed for parks and recreation in Keizer. The Parks Advisory Board and staff should participate in setting the priorities and specific work tasks for the coming year. At the end of the year, an evaluation should be made to measure performance.

E. **Develop a parks and recreation policy manual.** As Keizer increases its park and recreation services, a policy manual should be prepared that defines procedures, policies, and identifies how the City will react to given issues. The policy manual should incorporate the existing park regulations, park advisory board functions, maintenance operations\(^2\) and master plan policy recommendations. This will help maintain a level of consistency and help staff render consistent decisions.

F. **Develop customer service policies as part of the policy manual.** The policy manual should include specific customer service policies that provide methods for collecting complaints, methods for seeking public input (such as evaluation forms for recreation classes), policies on refunds, and standards for response time to complaints. These policies should include ways to solicit positive comments, as well as complaints. The policies should spell out a specific procedure to notify the appropriate staff of maintenance-related comments, including standards for response time.

G. **Establish programs that expand the role of the public in contributing and maintaining the parks system.** Involving Keizer residents with the ongoing development and maintenance of the parks system assists in the provision of high-quality parks and facilities. A few strategies for encouraging community involvement are listed below.

- **Expand publicity efforts:** Keizer should expand on efforts to publicize its park and recreation services once established. To increase awareness of parks and facilities available, the City should continue efforts to update its website with more information. The City should also consider developing a brochure identifying parks and facilities available to Keizer residents. When programs are added, the City should increase its outreach efforts to build interest in programs and services and gain more support. There are many ways to approach this, such as developing a recreation brochure, updating the website, advertising special events, and distributing news releases to the newspapers, newsletters, radio stations, and Keizer channel 23.

---

\(^2\) See Section 5.5 Maintenance and Operations of this chapter

---

5.3
Provide volunteer opportunities: Volunteerism has many benefits. Volunteers can supplement paid staff in maintaining and improving the park system; they can be a major resource for recreation programs and events; and volunteer opportunities provide a recreation activity for some community members. In addition to adult volunteers, a variety of parks projects are suitable for completion by youth, such as Boy and Girl Scouts and high school students in need of community service hours. Specific opportunities should be identified, and publicized on the website and any City publications. A staff person should be assigned responsibility for coordinating volunteers.

Establish an adopt-a-park program: To increase the sense of ownership, pride, and upkeep in local parks, the City should initiate an “adopt-a-park” program. In this type of program, agreements are made with private citizens, neighborhood groups, or service clubs to perform and assume certain responsibilities and duties at specific park sites. Typically, volunteers will provide limited maintenance tasks, such as litter pick-up, watching for and reporting vandalism or other inappropriate behavior, or hosting neighborhood activities.
5.3 Finance and Budgeting

As Keizer increases park and recreation services, careful attention to finance and budgeting will ensure that the City meets community recreation needs while maintaining a solid financial footing. The recommendations below are supplemented by additional budgeting and finance recommendations in the areas of maintenance, operations, and recreation programs.

A. Improve cost and revenue tracking for parks and recreation services.
   One of the most important items in controlling costs and producing revenue is a good budget reporting system. At minimum, the City should be able to review the cost of maintaining its parks, special use areas, and natural areas/open space areas on a per acre and per Full Time Equivalent employee (FTE) basis. As recreation programs are added, program costs and revenues should be tracked by major program area (e.g., sports, general recreation, seniors, and outdoor/environmental programs). This will allow the City to make management, marketing, or programming improvements based on financial realities. As an added benefit, accurate cost tracking also provides information for budgeting and for planning future facilities.

B. Build revenue-generating capability.
   To provide improved services within budget constraints, the City should build its revenue-generating capability. When budgets are tight, the first thought is usually to cut costs. However, increasing revenue can have the same net result while providing additional resources to provide park and recreation services. The City currently provides a basic level of parks maintenance, with capacity to provide little, if any, revenue. As more comprehensive services are offered, revenue can be generated through rental fees, user fees, program fees, and sponsorships. While increased services may result in a bigger budget, the net financial cost to the taxpayer may be nearly the same, or even less.

C. Provide general fund support for parks.
   The City should provide general fund support for the replacement of worn equipment and improvements to existing developed parks. As identified in the review of Keizer’s existing parks, there are significant needs, including the replacement of deteriorating sports courts and improvements to drainage at Keizer’s Little League Park fields. These needs cannot be addressed within existing parks budget allocations. Funding from fees on new development cannot be used for this purpose, but are needed to fund new park acquisition and development to meet the needs associated with the development. Providing general fund support will address the recurring, anticipated costs associated with maintaining attractive and safe public park resources.
5.4 Park Planning and Development

Since Keizer completed its first Comprehensive Park System Development Plan in May of 1992, it has experienced a steady rate of growth requiring a new level of oversight for parks planning and development. The parks planning and development recommendations are critical to implementing this Plan. The following recommendations are intended to provide a framework for developing a park system consistent with the goals and objectives of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan.

A. Assure the City’s Comprehensive Plan policies and implementation is consistent with the Park & Recreation Master Plan.

B. Assign a City staff member the responsibility of working to acquire needed park land in advance of development. Staff review of development plans will ensure that new development does not restrict access to or in other ways degrade Keizer’s park system. Staff should review plans so that the proposed park locations are consistent with the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, meet the City’s design and development guidelines, and serve the needs of Keizer residents.

C. Consider Plan vision, goals, and guidelines before acquiring new park sites. Evaluate opportunities to acquire property by the vision, goals, and guidelines identified in this Plan. Properties that offer a unique function or feature should be considered for acquisition according to the needs of the community. Accept only those parks and facilities that are consistent with the guidelines contained in the Park & Recreation Master Plan.

D. Involve parks staff in the planning process so that maintenance requirements are considered during the site selection and development negotiation stages. When recreation programs are added in the future, the staff responsible for these should also be included so that programming requirements are addressed.

E. Increase the role of the Parks Advisory Board in reviewing plans for public parks. The Parks Advisory Board should review public parks and recreation facility designs, including review of planned public parks proposed by developers. The Board’s role should be to assist the Keizer parks staff in ensuring that all proposed parks are consistent with this Master Plan, meet the City’s design and development guidelines, and will serve the needs of Keizer residents.

F. Follow the design and development guidelines contained in Chapter 4 of this plan. These guidelines are intended to ensure that appropriately sized and scaled parks provide different recreation opportunities, and that needed amenities and facilities are provided in the appropriate locations within the park system.
G. Ensure that private neighborhood parks meet the design and development guidelines for public neighborhood parks contained within this document. This can be accomplished through the planning and development review process. Private parks may be turned over to City government for operations and maintenance if a development no longer wishes to maintain them. If the private park does not meet public park standards, the City could be responsible for a site requiring substantial capital investments, such as new playground equipment or accessibility improvements.

H. Implement the recommended park improvements and new facilities recommended in this Plan. Detailed recommendations on improvements at existing parks and facilities, development of new parks and facilities, and establishment of a trail system are contained within Chapter 6, with recommended implementation phasing in Chapter 7.

I. Incorporate citizen input into park and facility designs. Designs for parks and facilities should be tailored to needs of park users. Opportunities for citizen input should be incorporated into the design process, though the use of workshops, public open houses, questionnaires, and other techniques.

J. Consider ease of maintenance as well as user needs in the design of parks. Labor-saving devices such as mow strips, appropriate path layout, time-activated locks, and other features should be incorporated into parks to facilitate maintenance.
5.5 Maintenance and Operations

To date, Keizer’s main focus in the area of parks and recreation has been on parks maintenance. However, the parks are maintained as part of the Public Works Department’s overall maintenance workload. The recommendations below are intended to help Keizer manage maintenance as the City moves toward a Park and Recreation Division or Department. This chapter provides recommendations for maintaining and operating the park system.

Tiered Levels of Service

In order for Keizer to maintain their parks at a standard that the community will value and enjoy, the parks system will need to efficiently manage resource allocation. This plan recommends that the City implement a tiered level of service. The tiered system will be used to inform the City’s maintenance plan. Four maintenance levels are recommended for traditional parks (detailed in Table 5), two for sports fields (Table 6) and three levels are recommended for natural area/open spaces (Table 7).

Traditional Parks: Traditional park maintenance includes the typical small city park amenities (excluding sports fields, which are addressed separately). To help allocate staff time and resources, four levels of park maintenance are recommended:

- **Level C** is the basic level of care for a Keizer park, includes all of the services, both routine and preventive tasks that keep Keizer’s parks looking great.

- **Level B and Level A** are for parks with higher use or more amenities. These parks receive additional maintenance tasks or frequencies to support the higher level of use and greater variety of facilities.

- **The undeveloped level** is for future park sites. Some of these sites are completely undeveloped, and are maintained to ensure public safety.

Restrooms can significantly increase the basic maintenance needs; the presence of a restroom should increase the allocated resources for any level of park. This increase should be scaled according to use so that there is an appropriate allocation for restrooms in each maintenance level.

Table 6 summarizes each of the maintenance tiers, and identifies which sites fall under each tier. The maintenance management plan will assign frequencies for each task.
### Table 6: Traditional Park Maintenance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example Maintenance Overview</th>
<th>Keizer Park Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A**             | Highest level of detailed maintenance, for signature high visibility and most heavily used parks. | Keizer’s basic level of care PLUS  
- Annual plantings  
- Shrub and landscape beds  
- Maintenance of special facilities, e.g. water spraygrounds  
- Additional urban forest management  
- Additional turf maintenance to offset impacts of heavy use | N/A  
Chalmers-Jones Park/Carlson Skate Park  
Keizer Little Park*  
Keizer Rapids Park**  
*If City maintained  
**At completion of development |
| **B**             | Enhanced level of care due to moderately high use. | Keizer basic level of care PLUS  
- Shrub and landscape beds  
- Additional turf maintenance to offset impacts of use  
- Annual plantings | Claggett Creek Park  
Bob Newton Park  
Ben Miller Family Park  
Keizer Station Park |
| **C**             | Keizer’s basic level of care: regular maintenance to preserve assets, ensure safety, and contribute to community livability. | Standard Tasks  
- Mowing and trimming  
- Playground safety inspections  
- Restroom cleaning*  
- Trash removal  
- Paved surface maintenance  
- Parking lot maintenance  
- Lighting maintenance  
- Irrigation maintenance  
- Edging  
Preventive Tasks  
- Annual fertilization  
- Pruning  
- Structure evaluation  
- Landscape beds  
- Annual plantings  
- Water features | Bair Park  
Clear Lake Park  
Country Glen Park  
Meadows Park  
Northview Park  
Palma Ciea Park  
Wallace House Park  
Sunset Park  
Willamette Manor Park |
| Undeveloped       | Sites reserved for future park use. May contain preexisting non-park uses. | Hazard mowing and tree maintenance to sustain the site and provide for public safety.  
May require additional maintenance to support preexisting non-park use | Mike Whittam Park |
**Sports Fields**

Keizer has a well-developed inventory of youth baseball fields that are supplemented by less formal field areas suitable for practice and casual play. The fields of Keizer Little League Park receive extensive maintenance support from the partnering sports organization Keizer Little League Association. In most parks such as Claggett Creek, the grass field is simply one of a wide variety of amenities.

The cost of maintaining a particular field type can be estimated based on the type of use it will get, the design of the facility, and the underlying conditions of the site. Recognizing the large differences in upkeep of formal and informal fields, two levels of maintenance are recommended. These levels of maintenance can then have budgeted costs that will help to allocate the appropriate level of funding for these important facilities. Table 7 describes the two levels.

**Table 7: Sports Fields Maintenance Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Type</th>
<th>Example Maintenance Overview</th>
<th>Existing Fields Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formal** | Formal sports fields are designed and built to a specification for one or a variety of specific uses. The maintenance of these fields will include all of the basic turf care practices as well as:  
  - Higher frequency mowing  
  - Overseeding  
  - Intensive fertilization  
  - Aeration  
  - Rigorous weed control  
  - Heavy irrigation  
  - Priority repair of irrigation  
  - Priority drainage fixes  
  - Spot sod replacement  
  - Chalking field lines  
  - Infield repair  
  - Priority maintenance of backstops, fencing, goals, etc. | Keizer Little League  
Claggett Creek  
Bob Newton  
Chalmers Jones |
| **Informal** | Informal sports fields include a range of facilities, from open turf areas to casual baseball or soccer fields. These fields should be maintained to the turf standard described in the traditional park maintenance level they are assigned to. | Country Glen Park  
Wallace House Park |
Natural Areas/Open Space

Natural areas/open space have very different maintenance requirements from active use parks. For budgeting and goal setting purposes, each natural area/open space area should be assigned into one of three levels of maintenance. For each of these levels of maintenance, specific maintenance tasks should be assigned that will keep the area up to the standard described below in the maintenance overview. Since very limited maintenance occurs in these areas at the current time, assigning sites to these levels will result in increased maintenance at most sites. Table 8 describes the three levels.

Table 8: Natural Open Space Maintenance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Level</th>
<th>Maintenance Overview</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td>Sites designated Level 1 are the most heavily used natural open space areas or those with the highest natural resource values. Level 1 sites receive more frequent trail maintenance and more forest and vegetation management than levels 2 and 3. Natural resource value should be maintained and improved, if feasible. The goal for Level 1 sites is to eventually develop a specific management plan that provides site-specific direction on topics such as weed control, forestry, revegetation, public use, and litter control.</td>
<td>Claggett Creek Pathway*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labish Creek Pathway*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*See Chapter 6: Park and Facility Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>Level 2 is most appropriate for moderately used sites or sites with good resource value. Sites designated Level 2 should be managed, at minimum, to control invasive species. Trail maintenance and tasks that support public use are completed to the extent feasible within budget and volunteer limitations.</td>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td>Sites designated Level 3 should be managed for hazard mitigation only, such as removal of a tree in danger of falling on a trail or on to neighboring property. This level of service is most appropriate for sites with lower use or with lower resource value.</td>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Maintenance Recommendations

1. **Base capital decisions on the long-term costs and benefits of project options.** During project planning and design, consider lifetime project costs – capital costs plus operating and maintenance costs – when making project decisions. Decisions made during the project design have significant impacts on the cost and level of effort required to maintain parks. Keizer has a skilled operations and maintenance staff who, if involved in the design process, could suggest operational savings opportunities. For example, spending additional money on soil preparation or synthetic turf up front can greatly reduce lifetime maintenance and operations costs, and at the same time result in projects that support increased public use. Other design decisions, such as using path locations to separate turf from planting areas, adding concrete mow strips under fences, and using a consistent palette of materials and site furnishings, also have potential to reduce lifetime maintenance costs. Designing projects that use less energy or water also can reduce the long-term cost of a project.

2. **Implement a preventive weed and pest management program.** Keizer should develop and implement a preventive weed and pest management program for its parks and natural open space areas, with noxious weeds the highest priority. Although devoting staff hours to weed prevention will result in less time available for routine maintenance, preventing weeds before they grow and keeping them from spreading will pay off in the long run, by improved park appearance and reduced weed removal efforts. Part of weed and pest prevention includes horticultural practices, such as aeration or overseeding of turf areas that increase the health and vitality of desired species. In developing a program, careful consideration will need to be given to the long-term benefits and costs involved with various weed and pest control methods, as well as to balancing prevention activities with weed response. If invasive weeds originate from private property and encroach onto the City-owned natural open space network, it will be the homeowner’s responsibility to remedy the problem or shoulder the burden of cost.

3. **Develop a detailed list of the assets at each site and evaluate asset condition annually.** This task is important for the long-term management of the Keizer park system. By developing detailed inventories and rating the condition of the assets on a scale of one to three or one to four, the Parks and Recreation Department will be able to plan its workload more effectively and budget for repairs and upgrades. The City’s facilities staff could be responsible for evaluating the condition of park structures, such as picnic shelters, restrooms, and buildings.
4. **Staff parks and public works departments to meet long-term park maintenance needs.** With the park system reaching maturity, several additional skill sets will be needed to preserve and maintain the many diverse assets in the system. Another important set of skills that should be developed is natural resource management. The specialized skills required for resource management could be further developed in an existing employee, a contractor could be hired, or if necessary, a new position could be created. In any case, natural resource management responsibilities might include, but would not be limited to, oversight of forest and natural area maintenance, volunteer management, wildlife management, trails development and management, and potentially managing mitigation banking. A specialized staff position could also help to coordinate interns to monitor the condition of the City-maintained pathway system. A third important role needed to maintain the health of both parks and natural areas is an arborist or urban forester. An urban forester/arborist could be responsible for management of the woodlands within the parks network, shade and decorative trees planted in parks, and street trees.

5. **Addressing Deferred Maintenance.** Where budgets are inadequate, maintenance tasks are usually limited to turf management, trash pickup, and normal custodial duties. Time and money for addressing infrastructure needs within existing parks such as repairing, upgrading and replacing facilities is put off to another day. This is called *deferred maintenance* and often results in the need to replace complete facilities. By repairing and upgrading facilities on an ongoing basis, park assets can last for many years at a much lower cost than replacement.

To assure that deferred maintenance is addressed, it is recommended that a line item called *deferred maintenance* be placed in the annual budget with a set amount reserved for this activity.
5.6 Recreation Programs

The City of Keizer does not currently offer any ongoing recreation programs as part of its park and recreation services. The recommendations outlined below are guidelines for the City to consider if it decides to provide recreation programming.

A. **Coordinate with existing providers to maintain current services.** Recreational programming and organized sports programming are currently available in Keizer through other providers. The City should coordinate with these providers to maintain these recreation options for Keizer residents.

B. **Revise programming as needed to meet community demand.** Recreation interests change over time. As the community demographics change, programming should respond to these trends.

C. **Provide a variety of options: programs for different ages and abilities, a range of program formats, and an array of program types.** Programming should meet the needs of Keizer residents, and there should be a diverse range of options to accommodate differing interests, time availability, and abilities.

D. **Establish a fees and charges philosophy, cost recovery goals and fee schedule for programs.** The fees and charges philosophy will guide setting the cost recovery goals and fee schedule for recreation programs. In general, fees for programs that provide high individual benefit and low community benefit are set to recover all costs or even turn a profit, and programs with high community benefit are subsidized. In addition, the fees and charges philosophy should address scholarships and affordability to ensure access by all residents. Cost tracking of recreation programs, as outlined in section 5.3 Finance and Budgeting, provides data to inform management, marketing, or programming improvements, while ensuring that Keizer is meeting community recreation needs while maintaining a solid financial footing.

E. **Once programs are provided, institute program performance evaluation protocols.** Programs should be evaluated in terms of cost, revenue, participation levels, and user feedback. Costs that should be attributed and tracked for each program area include: direct costs (supplies, etc.); the fees for the contractor who provides the program; room rental; facility or field maintenance; the Recreation Coordinator; and Recreation Department administration. Some agencies charge a share of administration time out to different program areas as part of identifying the actual cost of services. User evaluation methods should be developed (questionnaires offered after classes, internet comment forms, etc.) and implemented, and the results should be reviewed regularly. Participation should be tracked, and participation rates should be reviewed regularly so that programming can be adjusted to meet demands. Cost and revenue generation of each major program area should be reviewed annually.
CHAPTER 6: PARK AND FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS
6.1 Recommended Park System

This chapter provides recommendations for developing and managing a park and recreation program in the City of Keizer and is a companion to the recommendations on providing services in Chapter 5. These recommendations were developed from staff and park board member input, public input, and a comprehensive analysis of park land conditions and current maintenance operations.

The recommendations address parks, recreation facilities and pathway/trail connections. Improvements to Keizer's existing parks are recommended to meet the needs of current and future residents of Keizer. As development proposals are made, land dedications or easements should be secured for parks and trails/pathways.

Park Concept

Keizer's current park system is heavily focused on a small number of parks largely concentrated in the eastern portion of the city. This pattern of park development is partly attributed to the development of disconnected residential subdivisions. As a result of this development pattern, a large number of Keizer residents live without convenient pedestrian access to existing park facilities and knowledge of park facilities is often limited to the adjacent neighborhood.

The concept for Keizer's park facility plan is a system of parks that is varied, accessible, and linked to the regional parks system. Parks have been classified into categories reflecting the functions provided by the park. Access to small and large city parks, and waterfront parks, are increased through the distribution of park facility locations that are within a half-mile walking distance of most residents. The proposed system expands on the existing bicycle and multi-use path system. It creates connections between park facilities through additions to the existing bicycle network, the regional multi-use trail, and the Willamette waterway.
Chapter 6: Park and Facility Recommendations

Park Facility Plan

Figure 5: Park & Facility Plan is a graphic representation illustrating the overall concept for where future parks and amenities should be located in Keizer. The plan takes into account projected population growth, current land availability and the ability of the City to acquire land in meaningful locations. The plan map is a conceptual representation and is not intended to pinpoint exact locations for these sites.

Park Identification: Existing park sites are labeled by park name. Proposed park site areas are identified with a zone number identified during the needs assessment discussed in Chapter 3. Sites located outside the existing city limits are identified by a reference number.

Park Locations: On the Park and Facility Plan map, general vicinities for proposed parks are identified as park opportunity zones. For parks outside the current city limits, an asterisk identifies the general vicinity for the proposed park location. The actual locations will be determined based on land availability, acquisition cost, park development standards, and property owner’s willingness to sell. Existing parks are color coded by park classification. Parks currently undeveloped but with site master plans have been color coded by their park classification with a red outline.

Pathways & Connectivity: Existing bicycle routes and multi-use paths are identified with purple and orange solid lines. Proposed pathway connections are noted with the corresponding colored dotted line.
Park Site Specific Recommendations

This section makes site specific recommendations for each park site. Park site recommendations are organized by park classifications: small city, large city, waterfront, special use, regional, and undeveloped parks. Refer to Chapter 7: Financing and Plan Implementation for cost estimations associated with these recommendations.

Small City Parks

Small city parks are designed primarily for non-supervised and unstructured recreation activities. They are generally small in size and attract local residents within a walking distance of one-quarter mile to one-half mile. Facilities typically found in a small city park include children’s play equipment, picnic areas, and pathways, open grassy areas for passive use, outdoor basketball or tennis courts, and open lawn areas for informal sports.

Table 9: Summary of Small City Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small City Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park (planned)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park (formerly Wilark)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers-Jones Park / Carlson Skate Park²</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Station Park (planned)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.
² Carlson Skate Park is a special use area within Chalmers-Jones Park

Bair Park

Bair Park is a 2.1 acre undeveloped small city park in the Clear Lake Neighborhood. The property is comprised of both water department property and parks parcels. Access the park is from the north along Northeast Bair Road and from the south at the cul-de-sac of Northeast Zinfandel Court. The western boundary is defined by a water storage facility and the eastern boundary by residential development. Recommendations for this site include:

- Two dog stations;
- ADA Accessible picnic area;
- ADA Accessible trail;
- Removal of invasive plant species;
- Drinking fountain; and
- Privacy screening.

A conceptual master plan has been developed for this site indicating the layout for the recommended features (see Appendix A: Park Inventory).
Ben Miller Family Park

Ben Miller Park is 2.4 acre small city park located in the Southeast Keizer neighborhood. It was originally designated as the Pleasant View Neighborhood Park, when it was acquired by the City in July of 1995. The park's boundaries are defined by Northeast Alder Drive to the south and west, Northeast Beebe Street to the north and Claggett Creek and the wetlands to the east bound by the school district property. The park is surrounded by single family residential housing and provides the neighborhood with a playground, picnic tables, horseshoe pits, open area, and access to Claggett Creek. The developed portion of the park resides along the western edge of Claggett Creek. Across the creek to the east is undeveloped park land that is part of a wetlands restoration project site that is bound by the school property: Claggett Creek Middle School and Weddle Elementary. Recommendations for this site include:

- Small shelter (e.g., one picnic table);
- Pedestrian crossing improvements at Pleasant View Drive;
- Park sign located on corner at Pleasant View Drive and Alder Drive; and
- Connection to parks system with a multi-use trail along Claggett Creek.

Bob Newton Family Park

Bob Newton Family Park is a 5.9 acre small city park located in the Gubser Neighborhood. Vehicle access is limited to Mandarin Way to the east and 12th Avenue to the south. A small parking area is located at the east entrance. Pedestrians can access the park from the northwest off of Northeast Manzanita Street. A service road is located along the northern portion of the park and creates a boundary between the park and adjacent private residents.

The park provides a play area, horseshoe pits, basketball and tennis courts, a small ball field, picnic areas, and an open space area. A stream flows year round from east to west through the park with a pedestrian bridge crossing along the western portion of the park. Recommendations for this site include:

- An update of the sports courts; and
- Improve visibility of park access through street signage.

Chalmers-Jones Park / Carlson Skate Park

Carlson Skate Park/Chalmers-Jones Park, formerly known as City Hall Park, is a 2.9 acre special use area and small city park located in the Claggett Neighborhood adjacent to City Hall. The park's boundaries are defined to the north by City Hall's parking lot, the Police Station to the west, a residential property fence to the south, and NE Rickman Road to the east. Access to the park is primarily from the north through City Hall's parking lot and the eastern parking lot. The park provides the community with an outdoor sheltered meeting place, a skate park, walking trail, open space and parking for large events. Planned amenities for this site include:

- Plaza with interactive water feature.
### Clear Lake Park
Clear Lake Park is a 4.0 acre small city park located in the Clear Lake Neighborhood. The park's boundaries are defined by residential development to the west and south, Clear Lake Elementary School to the north, and NE Meadowglen Street to the east. Primary access to the park is from the east, with pedestrian access through a paved trail connecting the park to NE Cater Court to the west.

The park is primarily a passive open space area with minimal facilities and appears to be an extension of Clear Lake Elementary School. The City of Keizer maintains a maintenance agreement and cooperative use agreement with the 24J School District. A paved trail connects the park and school to the residential development to the west. Recommendations for this site include:

- Installation of a drinking fountain;
- Small shelter;
- Picnic tables and benches; and
- Installation of park sign.

### Country Glen Park
Country Glen Park is a 5.9 acre small city park located in an area intended for the control of storm water overflow, Labish Creek. The park is part of the Clear Lake Neighborhood of north Keizer and connects with the Gubser Neighborhood via a pedestrian bridge at the southwestern boundary.

The park provides a general use field, play equipment, picnic shelter, and drinking fountain. The park also connects to the undeveloped park Hidden Creek through a pedestrian path. Recommendations for this site include:

- Development of a multi-use sports field; and
- Portable toilet.

### Keizer Station Park
Keizer Station Park is a future 1.3 acre small city park located in the Keizer Station shopping center located west of Interstate Five off Exit 260B. The site is visible from the interstate exit and is not accessible from any residential neighborhoods. Its primary service area is the Keizer Station shopping center and travelers on the multi-use bicycle path adjacent to the interstate and park site. A master site plan was created by the developer of the shopping center and the site plans are available through the City of Keizer Public Works office. Additional recommendations for amenities at this site include:

- Walking paths and trails; and
- Children's play area and equipment.
The Meadows Park

The Meadows Park is a 3.0 acre small city park located in the Clear Lake Neighborhood of north Keizer. The park is situated along the eastern boundary of the Meadows subdivision. A chain link fence runs the length of the park’s eastern border along River Road and access to the park is limited to pedestrians along the western edge and southwestern corner. Vehicle access is through the subdivision on Northeast Park Terrace Drive off of Northeast Parkmeadow Drive. Recommendations for this site include:

- Additional picnic tables;
- Multi-use turf area;
- Vegetative buffer along River Road; and
- Bicycle Rack (River Road entrance).

Northview Terrace Park

Northview Terrace Park is a 2.1 acre small city park located north of Weissner Drive between Verda Lane and 18th Avenue. Pedestrian access is available along the southern boundary and the northeast corner. The northeast entry is shared by a community swimming pool, which defines its northern boundary. The rest of the park is surrounded by single family housing and its west and east boundaries are defined by the back ends of the housing property lines. The southern boundary is Weissner Drive. The park provides play equipment, a basketball court, picnic tables, and open areas. Recommendations for this site include:

- Update play equipment;
- Update basketball court;
- Improve ADA accessibility into the park and equipment; and
- Create pathways.

Willamette Manor Park

Willamette Manor Park is a 2.4 acre small city park located between 3rd and 5th Avenues just south of Dennis Lane. The western boundary, which serves as the main entrance to the park along 5th Avenue, is shared with a pump station and the Holliday Swim Club pool. Pedestrian access is available along the eastern boundary of the park by means of a paved trail. The rest of the park is surrounded by single family housing to the north and south.

A paved trail runs across the northern portion of the park connecting both entryways and creating access to the play equipment and picnic shelter. The park contains a large open space area along its southern edge and a tennis court with a basketball hoop along the eastern edge. Recommendations for this site include:

- Upgrade play equipment;
- Signage at eastern entrance; and
- Replace drinking fountain.
New Small City Park – Partnerships with School Sites

A new small city park is recommended on school grounds in partnership with the school district. The City should enter into a joint use agreement with the school district for the use of a school site for park facilities. The park site should serve a portion of the underserved areas identified on the Park & Facility Plan Map in western or southern Keizer. Recommendations for the site are:

- Utilize a portion of the site approximately three to five acres. Once the site size is agreed upon, a master plan should be prepared to guide the future development of the site.
- Develop a master plan for the site that is consistent with the Design Guidelines for a small city park.
- Provide local linkages between the park and existing bike route and trail systems.
- Implement the master plan as the area develops.

New Small City Parks

New small city parks are needed in the park opportunity zones identified on the Park & Facility Plan Map. The zones depicted on the map are areas identified during the needs assessment process. Recommendations for the new sites are:

- Acquire a site approximately three to five acres. Once the site is acquired, a master plan should be prepared to guide the future development of the site.
- Develop a master plan for the site that is consistent with the Design Guidelines for a small city park.
- Provide local linkages between the park and existing bike route and trail systems.
- Implement the master plan as the area develops.
Large City Parks

Large city parks are planned to provide active and structured recreation opportunities, through facilities such as playgrounds, playing fields, and basketball courts, as well as passive opportunities. Large city parks often have sports fields or similar facilities as the central focuses of the park with play equipment, picnic areas, pathways, and open spaces available.

Table 10: Summary of Large City Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large City Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.

Claggett Creek Park

Claggett Creek Park is a 10.6 acre large city park located in the Claggett Neighborhood. The park is situated between Chemawa Road to the north, Dearborn Avenue to the south, Claggett Creek and farmland to the east and single family residential to the west. Access to the park is through the parking areas along the north and south boundaries.

The park provides a soccer field with bleachers in the northern area and baseball fields and basketball courts at its center. The southern half of the park contains a covered shelter area, picnic tables, play areas, and an accessible water fountain. Recommendations for this site include:

- Purchase adjacent farm property east of Claggett Creek;
- Pathway development within park (separate from Claggett Creek Pathway);
- Softball field improvements (skinning of field);
- Soccer field improvements (goals, benches, field);
- Dog station (southern parking lot);
- Bike rack (northern parking lot);
- Replace drinking fountain;
- Update play equipment; and
- Security lighting.
New Large City Park (LP-1)
A new large city park will be needed in north Keizer once the City’s population exceeds the current 2030 population projection or if the urban growth boundary expands to the north. Recommendations for the new site are:

- Acquire a site at least ten acres in size and consistent with site selection guidelines outlined in the Design Guidelines.
- Develop a master plan for the site that is consistent with the Design Guidelines.
- Provide local linkages between the park and existing bike route and trail systems.
- Implement the master plan as the area develops.
6.13 Waterfront Parks

Waterfront parks are distinguished by their function of providing access to large bodies of water such as rivers and lakes. These parks are generally designed to support enjoyment of active and passive water related activities, such as swimming, fishing, boating, and bird or wildlife viewing. Facilities often include boat launches, docks, beaches, viewpoints, picnic areas, trails, and pathways. Keizer has three waterfront park locations totaling 14.3 acres (Table 10). Two of the three parks are undeveloped; during the planning process site master plans were developed for Palma Ciea and Wallace House Parks (Appendix B: Park Site Master Plans).

Table 11: Summary of Waterfront Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterfront Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palma Ciea Park (planned)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace House Park (planned)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.

Palma Ciea Park

Palma Ciea Park is a 1.6 acre undeveloped waterfront park along the Willamette River in the West Keizer Neighborhood. The park is surrounded by single family residential homes and access to the park is limited to its eastern boundary from North Cummings Lane. Recommendations for this site include:

- ADA path;
- Unpaved trails to river;
- Seasonal dock;
- Horseshoe pit;
- Dog station;
- Vegetative buffer for homes;
- Remove invasive plants;
- Annual clearing of driftwood;
- Viewing platform;
- Picnic tables;
- Parking;
- Portable toilet;
- Remove rocks from power pole;
- Reinforce embankment; and
- Dog splash zone.

A conceptual master plan has been developed for this site indicating the layout for the recommended features (see Appendix A: Park Inventory).
Sunset Park
Sunset Park is a 1.58 acre waterfront park in the West Keizer Neighborhood. The park is surrounded by single family residential housing. Access is limited to pedestrians and cyclists through a gate along its eastern boundary at the junction of North Rivercrest Drive and North Sunset Avenue. The park provides seasonal picnic tables, benches, and a rock beach for river access. Recommendations for this site include:

- Keep existing amenities;
- Install an ADA path;
- Retain natural feel of the park; and
- Minimize park access conflicts with adjacent park residents.

Wallace House Park
Wallace House Park (previously River’s Edge Park) is an 11.2 acre undeveloped waterfront park on the Willamette River waterfront in southwestern Keizer. The park’s boundaries are defined by the Willamette River to the west and single family homes to the north, east, and south. The home located in the northeast portion of the park is privately owned and is bordered by the park on three of its sides. Access to the park from the south is Willamette Drive and from the north is Rivercrest Drive. A pedestrian and bicycle connection is made between these two streets by a paved bicycle path. Pedestrians can also access the park from the east off of North Garland Court.

The site has a unique history within Keizer. Portions of the site served as a nursery and the cement foundations for the greenhouses remain covered by thick hedges of blackberry. The location is also the speculated location of the Wallace House, which was a fur trading post sometime during 1811 to 1813. The post was established by William Wallace who was sent from Astoria to gather furs. Recommendations for this site include:

- Children’s play area;
- Basketball court;
- Parking;
- An additional dog station;
- Picnic Shelter;
- Interpretive signage;
- Wallace house interpretive information;
- Small parking lot;
- Trail access to the river;
- Update park sign;
- Sign at north entrance;
- Portable toilet;
- Bike rack;
- Viewing platform;
- Two seasonal bridges;
- Seasonal dock;
- Dog splash zone;
- Trails to river;
- ADA trail;
- Basketball court; and
- Removal of invasive plant species.

A conceptual master plan has been developed for this site indicating the layout for the recommended features (see Appendix A: Park Inventory).
Natural Area/Open Space Parks

Natural areas are undeveloped or partially developed lands primarily left in their natural state with recreation use as a secondary objective. They are usually lands owned or managed by a governmental agency and may have limited public access. This type of land often includes informal open spaces, wetlands, steep hillsides, and heavily wooded areas. Environmentally sensitive areas that include wildlife habitats, stream and creek corridors, or unique and/or endangered plant species can also be considered natural open space. Natural open spaces may serve as trail corridors, wildlife viewing areas, or open areas for quiet contemplation. Natural open space parks generally support non-organized recreational activities and can vary in size.

Table 12: Summary of Natural Area/Open Space Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Area/Open Space Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.

Hidden Creek Park

Hidden Creek Park is a 3.7 acre undeveloped park located in the Country Glen Neighborhood, along the shared boundary with the Gubser Neighborhood. The park is surrounded by single family and limited density residential housing. Labish Creek defines the eastern portion of the property and NE Whisper Creek Loop defines the park’s western boundary. There is a 30 foot natural buffer along the east side of the property adjacent to Labish Creek that is required to remain as a natural area as part of the subdivision agreement. The park is connected to Country Glen Park to the north via a pedestrian path; to the park’s south is a connection to a multi-use pathway, connecting the park to Keizer’s bikeway network. Recommendations for this site include:

- Park signs;
- Benches; and
- Picnic tables.
Northridge Park

Northridge Park is a 9.5 acre undeveloped natural area along the eastern banks of Claggett Creek, which forms the park’s western boundary. The park is bisected and surrounded by single family residential lots except for the northern portion of the property, which is flanked by retail and medium density residential. Access to the park is currently limited to a private parking lot of a multi-family housing complex along the northern property line and a deeded access way along Verda Lane is not currently accessible. Recommendations for this site include:

- Create two eastern access points from Verda Lane;
- Create access into the park from the northwest;
- Multi-use trail connecting to larger trail system;
- Wetlands restoration, and site cleanup as needed; and
- Signage at park entry points.
Regional Parks

Regional parks are sites planned to provide recreational activities for the city and surrounding region. These parks often have a mix of passive and active recreational activities. Regional parks are typically larger sites with a defining feature such as a butte, water feature, wildlife area, or other natural element. Regional parks often have their own trail network connecting facilities on the site and facilities able to accommodate large numbers of visitors throughout the course of the seasons.

Table 13: Summary of Regional Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Rapids Park</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>120.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.

Keizer Rapids Park

The Keizer Rapids Park site is a 120-acre regional park located at the western end of Chemawa Road just outside the city limits and along the eastern bank of the Willamette River. The undeveloped regional park site is comprised of both City and State owned property. The City of Keizer is responsible for the maintenance of the park site. Plans for this site are outlined in the Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan adopted by City Council in October 2006 and recommendations include:

- Multi-use path;
- Nature trails;
- BMX area;
- Picnic areas;
- Wetland interpretive area and trails;
- Education facility;
- Amphitheater;
- Off-leash dog area;
- Demonstration garden;
- Playground;
- Fitness stations;
- Playfields;
- Marine facility;
- Canoe lockers; and
- Boat-in camping.
Special Use Area Parks

Special use areas are stand-alone recreation sites or miscellaneous park lands designed to support a specific use. Facilities that are typically included in this classification are sports field complexes, community centers, community gardens, skate parks, and aquatic centers. Specialized facilities may also be provided within a park of another classification. No additional special use areas are proposed at this time.

Table 14: Summary of Special Use Area Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Area Park</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League Park</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.

Keizer Little League Park

Keizer Little League Park is a self-contained little league softball complex supported by the Keizer Little League Association. It is located in northeast Keizer along Ridge Drive Northeast north of Keizer Road Northeast.

Recommendations for this site include:

- Improve field drainage;
- Improve pathways;
- Light an additional field; and
- Promote wider public use of the park by groups unaffiliated with Keizer Little League Association.
Undeveloped Parks

Undeveloped parks are parcels of land managed by the Public Works Department without a park classification or amenities. Keizer has one parcel of land falling into this classification: Mike Whittam Park.

Table 15: Summary of Undeveloped Park Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undeveloped Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whittam Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.

Mike Whittam Park

Mike Whittam Park is a 6.1 acre undeveloped park site in east Keizer. The park is located along Northeast Keizer Road where it transitions into Northeast Ridge Drive as it heads toward Keizer Little League Park. The park is due south of Keizer Little League Park and is flanked to the west by a church parking lot.

The 1992 Comprehensive System Development Plan recommended a passive day use park that would link to Keizer Little League. The park was originally planned to handle overflow parking from the Keizer Little League Park but the adjacent church has worked with the Little League Association to manage parking overflow. There are currently no recommendations for this park site, but some ideas for this location include:

- Community gardens;
- Off leash dog park; and
- Picnicking facilities.
Other Park Resources

Keizer is fortunate to have a wealth of park and recreation resources in and around the city that are managed by other agencies. These sites provide a variety of opportunities for Keizer residents, and contribute to the City’s park system. The recommendations below address Keizer’s relationship with the other providers.

**Minot-Brown Island Park – Salem**
Minot-Brown Island Park is a 890 acre natural area park located along the Willamette River. The park contains paved, soft surface, and dirt trails throughout the park connecting visitors to a picnic area and shelter, portable toilets, orchards, farm fields, duck pond, and an off-leash dog area.

**River Road Park – City of Salem Park**
River Road Park is a 16.1 acre park located just south of Keizer along River Road that is currently under redevelopment. When completed, the park will provide residents with a river overlook, two soccer fields, tennis and basketball courts, open areas, and picnicking facilities.

**Riverfront Park – City of Salem Park**
Riverfront Park is a 23 acre park located in downtown Salem along the Willamette River waterfront. The park is host to a number of annual Salem events that utilize its network of trails connecting the amphitheater, pavilion, carousel, picnic and play areas, and public boat dock.

**Spong’s Landing – Marion County Park**
Spong’s Landing is a 62 acre seasonal day use county park located on the eastern bank of the Willamette River northwest of Keizer off Naples Road. Its location along the Willamette River makes it a natural stopping point for those exploring the reaches of the Willamette Water Trail. The park provides waterfront access and fishing spots, a picnic shelter and tables, fire pits, potable water, play equipment and horseshoe pits, restrooms, and a ball field.

**Wallace Marine Park – City of Salem Park**
Wallace Marine Park is a 114.5 acre park located in downtown along the Willamette River waterfront. The park provides access to the river, soccer and baseball fields, picnic facilities, a play area, restrooms, and dog stations.

**Willamette Mission State Park – Oregon**
Willamette Mission State Park is a 1,680 acre historic park site in the Willamette Valley, just north of Keizer and Spong’s Landing along the Willamette River, and can be accessed via the Willamette Water Trail. The park provides various services and recreational activities. Day users can enjoy boating and fishing, picnic facilities, walking, hiking and horse trails, natural areas, and historic sites. The park also provides tent and horse camping throughout the year.
6.2 Recreation Facility Recommendations

Keizer's existing recreation facility inventory consists primarily of children's play areas, athletic fields, and a skate park. The City has no indoor court spaces maintained by the City. The following recommendations address, children's play areas, athletic facilities, other outdoor recreation facilities, and indoor facilities to meet Keizer's growing recreation needs.

Children's Play Areas

Keizer is a family-oriented city and places for children to play are important for family socialization and children's physical development. As available developable land decreases and housing densities increase outdoor areas for play will become increasingly scarce. The importance of having family recreation areas within walking distance for small children was a recurring theme of the public involvement process. One-quarter mile is the maximum distance a small child can be expected to walk with a parent to access a playground.

Playground Distribution: Playgrounds should be adequately distributed throughout the City to provide services within a quarter to a half-mile of all residential areas of Keizer. If the City pursues finding locations for children's play areas to address facility deficiencies of playground space, the City could consider: acquiring additional park land; negotiating joint use agreements on school property; or working with homeowners associations (HOAs). At a minimum the potential site should be ¼ acre (10,890 sq.ft.) with an ideal size of one acre.

Athletic Facilities

Athletic programs in Keizer are offered by private organizations that use City and School District fields. Sports are important recreation activities in Keizer and the following recommendations address current and future needs.

Provide Functional Athletic Fields: The most functional types of athletic fields are those adequately developed and specifically designed to serve particular functions. However, for various reasons (e.g., facility shortages or poor condition), sport facilities are often used for activities for which they were not designed. Descriptions of different types of athletic facilities are provided below. Keizer should build new athletic fields to meet these dimensional standards, and should retrofit existing fields to the extent possible when fields are renovated.

- **Regulation baseball field dimensions:** 320’+ outfield, 90’ baselines, grass infield; permanent backstop and support facilities.

- **Youth baseball field dimensions:** 200’+ outfield, 60’ baselines, dugouts; grass infield not required; permanent backstop and support facilities.

- **Softball field dimensions (slow-pitch):** 250’ minimum outfield - women, 275’ minimum outfield - men, 60’ baselines; (fast pitch) 225’ outfield, 60’ baselines; skinned infield; permanent backstop and support facilities.

- **Youth softball field dimensions:** 200’+ outfield, 60’ baselines, dugouts;


skinned infield; permanent backstop and support facilities.

- **Regulation soccer field dimensions:** 195’ to 225’ by 330’ to 360’; grass or all weather surfacing; adequate perimeter space; permanent or portable goals.

- **Youth soccer field dimensions:** Varies according to age: U14 (60 yds. x 110 yds.) - U6 (20 yds. x 30 yds.); permanent or portable goals.

**Demand Standards:**
Use the following guidelines for sports field provision:

- 1 regulation baseball field per 35,000 residents;
- 1 youth baseball field per 2,700 residents;
- 1 soccer field per 5,800 residents;
- 1 football field per 8,700 residents;
- 1 tennis court per 10,000 residents; and
- 1 basketball court (full) per 5,000 residents.

**Recommendations:**

- **Children’s Play Areas:** The City should pursue finding locations for playgrounds by acquiring additional park land, negotiating joint use agreements on school property, or working with homeowners associations. If the City pursues finding locations for playground space, the site size should at a minimum be ¼ acre (10,890 sq.ft.) with an ideal size of one acre.

- **Field Lighting:** As part of the recommended park improvements, lighting should be added to an additional field at Keizer Little League Park.

- **Field Upgrades:** As part of the recommended park improvements, the fields at Keizer Little League and Claggett Creek Park should be improved. Keizer Little League Field needs improvements to drainage and Claggett Creek’s soccer and baseball fields need to be upgraded to meet the future demand.

- **Bob Newton Family Park:** If demand for little league baseball practice fields increases, Bob Newton Family Park’s softball field should be upgraded to meet the demand.

- **New Fields in Proposed Large City Park:** Sports fields should be provided in the proposed large city park to meet community needs for these facilities. The number and mix of fields should be determined based on the guidelines listed above, with consideration given to geographic dispersal of athletic facilities throughout the community.

- **Claggett Creek Middle School Baseball Fields:** Currently all games for the Keizer Junior Baseball Association are played at the one field at Whiteaker Middle School, maximizing the field use at this location. Coordination with the School District for use of the three fields at Claggett Creek Middle School could fill the demand for fields should the organization expand, find it needs
more fields for games and practices, or if another baseball organization needs practice/game space.

- **Outdoor Basketball Courts**: Outdoor basketball courts should be provided in all community parks. Full or half courts should be provided in neighborhood parks where the park configuration allows and where neighbors desire these facilities.

- **Outdoor Tennis Courts**: Outdoor tennis courts should be provided at new large city parks, if desired by residents.

- **Outdoor Volleyball Courts**: Keizer currently has no outdoor volleyball courts. These should be considered for inclusion in future large city parks if desired by residents.

- **Skateboard/BMX Facilities**: Keizer should continue to maintain the popular Carlson Skate Park. No specific capital improvements are recommended at the skate park at this time. The City should consider incorporating small-scale skateboard/BMX features at future large city park sites.
Other Outdoor Recreation Facilities

During the planning process, community members expressed interest in a variety of other outdoor recreation facilities. Keizer’s parks currently have traditional recreation amenities such as playground areas, but lack other recreation facilities that have become increasingly popular. The following recommendations address providing additional outdoor recreation facilities in Keizer.

- **Spraygrounds**: Spraygrounds are water play features that are very popular and provide a means of integrating aquatics into parks at a relatively low cost. Keizer should provide spraygrounds at park locations where there is access to water, adequate sunlight hours, and low likelihood for vandalism.

- **Off-Leash Dog Area**: An off-leash dog area provides a location where residents can exercise dogs off-leash. The City should consider incorporating one or more off-leash dog areas into new and even existing large and small city parks. An off-leash area should be at least one acre in size; be fenced with a double-gated entry; have nearby parking; and include amenities such as pooper scooper stations, water, benches, and trash cans. The site should also be safe not isolated, and noise impacts on neighbors should be considered. Existing park sites that may be suitable for an off-leash dog area are Northridge, Keizer Rapids, and Mike Whittam Parks.

Dog splash zones have been identified in the waterfront park site master plans for Wallace House and Palma Ciea Parks. These areas are informal play area for dogs to run and fetch along the banks of the river. The areas identified for this activity will not have site amenities as specified above for more formal dog parks. Special attention should be paid to the potential impact of a dog park on the sensitive environments and habitats surrounding the site.

- **Community Gardens**: Community gardens provide a location where community members can grow plants and vegetables on individual plots, usually for a small fee. Keizer should consider establishing a small community garden (about 15 plots) for a trial period of at least three years. Palma Ciea, Mike Whittman, Hidden Creek, and Clear Lake Parks are all potential locations that may be suitable. The site selected should have:
  - At least six hours of sunlight per day;
  - Access to water; and
  - A means of vehicular access so that soil, mulch, and other materials can be brought into the site.
Indoor Recreation Facilities

The City does not currently maintain any of the existing indoor court spaces. Demand is high for the existing indoor school facilities and the existing programs are maximizing use of the available facility schedules. The future Kroc Center site may relieve some of the pressure on Keizer’s facilities, but with the existing demand for indoor facilities, the City will need to take a measured look at the feasibility of a city-funded recreation center or gym. A feasibility study would assess the capital and operational costs, assist in determining a model of operation that could work within Keizer’s budget, and could assess a cooperative financial strategy with Keizer’s existing sports organizations.

Indoor Recreation Center: A need for indoor recreation space was identified during the planning process. More and more communities in the Northwest are offering multi-use recreation centers because of the region’s inclement winter weather and the multiple opportunities possible in an indoor facility. If designed correctly, recreation centers can offer a wide variety of community activities at a reasonable cost. Most progressive community centers now provide rooms for receptions, meetings, and large group gatherings, as well as gymnasium and recreation space. An indoor recreation center should be designed to meet the City’s financial goals for such a facility. Some communities plan recreation centers to maximize revenue generation and minimize operating subsidies. In the future, if the City decides to pursue a recreation center whether alone or in partnership, a detailed feasibility study should be conducted to determine what programs should be offered and the type of facility.
6.3 Pathways and Connectivity Recommendations

The recommendations provided in this section establish an off-street multi-use pathway system for Keizer that provides a partially off-road loop along the Claggett Creek corridor and bicycle route connections between existing and future park locations (see Figure 6: Multi-Use Pathways & Connections).

Multi-Use Pathways and Connections Concept
Keizer’s bicycle and multi-use pathway system will connect all parts of the city to each other, with linkages to the waterfront, schools, and recreation facilities. The multi-use pathway and connections system focuses on recreation opportunities, while also serving non-motorized transportation needs to commercial centers and neighborhoods. The on-street system is focused on meeting transportation needs, but will also supplement the off-street system by providing linkages to the off-street system and offering a connection when no off-street connection is possible. Pathways will also be a feature of natural open space parks, with linkages provided to existing privately owned pathway systems. Wherever possible, linkages between individual developments and the citywide pathway system should be encouraged. In addition, the City should provide on-street transportation linkages that connect to the off-street system.

Proposed Multi-Use Pathway Corridors
The proposed multi-use pathway is depicted in Figure 6: Multi-Use Pathways & Connections on the next page. The path corridors depicted on the map represent conceptual linkages, not specific path alignments, with approximately 7.8 miles of additional bicycle routes and 3.6 miles of multi-use pathway.

Claggett Creek Pathway: The Claggett Creek Path provides an important north-south connection in Keizer, as well as providing wildlife viewing opportunities along Claggett Creek. This pathway segment would connect Ben Miller Family Park, Claggett Creek Park, and Northridge Park. The path should be paved if possible to facilitate use by pedestrians, cyclists, non-motorized vehicles, and individuals with mobility devices. Additional landscaping, with native plants and shrubs, would provide screening and nature walk opportunities. Access points to the multi-use path should be frequent enough to encourage use of the path. The proposed path would intersect with existing bicycle routes at Alder Drive, Dearborn Avenue, Chemawa Road, and Lockhaven Drive and have access points into Northridge Park via Verda Lane. Specific recommendations for the Claggett Creek Path include:

- Create two access points along Verda Lane in Northridge Park;
- Create access through Northridge Park from the northwest;
- Integrate the pathway into the landscape of Claggett Creek Park; and
- Link the path with the pedestrian crossing improvement recommended at Ben Miller Family Park.
Labish Creek Pathway: An east-west path through northeast Keizer along Labish Creek would enhance the existing connection between Hidden Creek and Country Glen Park and connect the parks to the developing Keizer Station Park. Development of the Labish Creek Path would complete a loop that encompasses Keizer's central water features.

Bicycle Route Connections: The proposed bicycle route street segments were chosen for their directness of route between parks, school fields, and playgrounds. Connectivity between developed parks and open spaces could be improved through and extension of the existing multi-use pathway system.

Water Trails: To capitalize on Keizer’s unique water resources, the City should develop launch points and routes should be indicated on maps. These maps should also provide information about waterfront facilities and points of interest (historic sites visible from the water, significant habitats, etc.). Improving floater and kayak access to the Willamette River is a key step in developing usable water trails.
Multi-Use Pathway Planning and Design

Policy statements and design guidance for multi-use path planning and design are contained in this section. These guidelines are intended to assist the City in developing an off-street path system that is user friendly and functional.

Planning

When planning occurs, dedication of right-of-way for recreational pathways shown on the Park & Facility Plan map should be required.

- A minimum 25’ wide right-of-way should be secured for multi-use paths; if possible, a width of 44’ to 50’ is optimum.

- Whenever possible, recreation pathways and trails should be separated from the roadway.

- Additional easements or dedications should be sought to complete missing pathway segments, link parks, and expand the overall pathway network into areas that are already developed. If no other means can be found to provide missing links, on-street linkages should be used.

- Local paths should be required in residential subdivision planning and should connect to the City’s pathway system and neighboring local multi-use paths. Path locations can be determined during the land use review process.

- Pathway alignments should take into account soil conditions, surface drainage and other physical limitations that could increase construction and/or maintenance costs.
Design
Multi-use pathways are the preferred trail type for Keizer, because they have the potential to serve the broadest spectrum of the public, including walkers, hikers, runners, cyclists, non-motorized vehicles and mobility device users. Multi-use paths can even serve equestrian users. Pathways should be planned, sized, and designed for multiple uses except where environmental or other constraints preclude this goal.

- An 8-12’ paved width should be developed, with 2’ wide unpaved shoulders on each side. Approximately 16’ should be provided from the shoulder to each neighboring property line, if the path runs adjacent to a private property. Figure 7 below provides a schematic cross-section of a multi-use path. If the path runs adjacent to the Willamette River or another sensitive area, it should be located at least 20’ away unless a larger buffer is recommended by an environmental scientist.

**Figure 7: Cross Section of Multi-Use Pathway**

- Where routes use existing streets, the pathway should be designed to minimize potential conflicts between motorists and pathway users.

- Wayfinding and orientation signage should be provided to facilitate path users. Signage should be provided at each major intersection and pathway entrances, and should include route and mileage information.
CHAPTER 7: FINANCING AND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
7.1 Overview

This chapter lays out the probable cost to implement the recommendations in this Parks & Recreation Master Plan. Keizer’s existing park system is underfunded and as a consequence inadequately supports its residents. Keizer is at a pivotal point in deciding whether it is willing to take the next step in providing a parks system that is responsive to community need, provides varied and unique experiences, incorporates waterfront access, promotes environmental stewardship, and connects Keizer to the region. This chapter is intended to provide an understanding of the financial realities facing the future of the Keizer’s park and recreation system. The information has been organized into five sections:

- **Estimating Costs.** This section outlines the parameters utilized for estimating the probable cost of all the park and facility projects.

- **Capital Projects.** The costs for the projects have been summarized into a ten year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)\(^1\), which prioritizes projects into three categories: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, and as funds become available.

- **Improvement Actions.** Costs are then summarized into improvement action categories: land acquisition, new park development, major park improvements, minor park improvements, and trail development.

- **Establishing Priorities.** To be able to direct funding toward the most significant projects in terms of meeting community needs a framework for prioritizing projects was developed.

- **Financing Strategy.** Two optional short-term (five year) capital project packages are presented along with additional funding options the City will want to explore.

---

\(^1\) The *Planning Cost Model of Probable Construction Costs* for a 10 year time frame has been supplied to City Staff
7.2 Estimating Costs

Development costs can vary considerably from community to community, based on local conditions, off-site costs, application of System Development Charges (SDCs)\(^1\) quality of development, and various physical constraints. A spreadsheet was developed that listed all of the improvements and actions needed for all existing and proposed park sites. A parameter of costs was forecasted for each project within a site. These cost parameters were based on past MIG projects and other data.

- **Land Acquisition**: The cost of land acquisition can vary within the Keizer community. However, for estimating probable project costs, land prices were estimated at $200,000 per acre.

- **New Park Development**: New park development was estimated at $200,000 per acre for small city parks and $250,000 per acre for large city parks. The estimate includes street frontage improvement costs but no other off-site costs or non-park SDCs.

- **Park Upgrades**: Specific cost parameters were developed for each improvement within the park.

- **Professional Fees**: While some minor projects can be completed by City staff, all project costs were based on a competitive public bid process. Professional fees included a 20% contingency, 2.5% management fee, and a 25% professional fee.

7.3 Capital Projects

The costs for the projects have been summarized into a 10 year CIP. On the following page, in Table 16 is a list of proposed and existing parks sites with the total estimated cost for the projects recommended in the Plan. Project costs were developed based on 2007 dollars and can be used for planning and budgeting purposes. The total ten year cost for all the improvements identified is estimated at $23,522,000 based on today’s prices. This is more than the City can afford considering the average amount a year spent on park improvements has been less than $300,000. At the current funding rate, it would take over 50 years to pay for the projects identified in the Capital Improvement Plan.

\(^1\) SDCs are fees paid by residential developers for park and facility improvements
Table 16: Total Probable CIP Costs for All Park Projects (10 year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Probable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WATERFRONT PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Palma Ciea Park</td>
<td>$ 170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Wallace House Park</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 870,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SMALL CITY PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Chalmers-Jones Park/Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Keizer Station Park</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>New Small City Park – Joint use schools</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>New Small City Park – Site unidentified</td>
<td>$ 2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,070,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LARGE CITY PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>$ 1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Large City Park (LP-1)</td>
<td>$ 8,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 10,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REGIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>Keizer Rapids Park¹</td>
<td>$ 7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 7,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SPECIAL USE AREAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Keizer Little League Park</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 350,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NATURAL AREA / OPEN SPACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 82,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNDEVELOPED PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Mike Whittam Park</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 30,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INDOOR RECREATION FACILITY STUDY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility Analysis</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PATHW AND CONNECTIVITY²</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8 miles</td>
<td>Multi-Use Pathway (Claggett Creek)</td>
<td>$ 230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 miles</td>
<td>Multi-Use Pathway (Labish Creek)</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trail signs, garbage cans, etc.</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 370,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Cost** **$ 23,522,000**

¹ Calculation includes only 30 acres of planned developed park land.
² Calculation includes only segments proposed within existing parks.
³ Listed costs are totals and do not imply that the City will fund 100% of the costs.
7.4 Improvement Actions

Each of the projects for the parks was then categorized into an improvement action category. Table 17 below summarizes the cost of all the park improvement into five categories: land acquisition, new park development, major park improvements, minor park improvements, and trail development. New park development and land acquisition take up the majority of the project costs at $21,800,000, with major and minor park improvements totaling $1,349,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Park Development</td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Park Improvements</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Park Improvements</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Development</td>
<td>$373,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,522,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 Establishing Priorities

To be able to direct funding toward the most significant projects in terms of meeting community needs, all the projects were prioritized on a scale of one to three. If possible, priority one projects should be completed in the five year time frame of the CIP. Priority two projects should be completed in a five to ten year time frame. Priority three projects have the lowest priority and should be completed as additional funding becomes available. These priorities reflect current need and financing possibilities. In implementing the projects, the City should retain the maximum degree of flexibility to adjust projects as new and unforeseen opportunities and funding become available.

Criteria

The following criteria were used for prioritizing the projects. The criteria are not listed in order of importance.

- **Serving underserved areas.** Some of Keizer’s existing neighborhoods are underserved with park facilities and trails. In some cases, this is because additional park sites are needed, while in other cases, existing parks lack facilities. Addressing areas that are underserved because of distance from existing developed parks, density of population that would particularly benefit from park access, and insufficient park facilities for activities that are in high demand is a high community priority.

- **Upgrading and improvements to existing parks.** Most of Keizer’s existing parks are older and in need of upgrading or rehabilitation. Information gathered from public input and City staff indicated a strong need to improve existing parks before parts of the infrastructure are lost. Because of this, park rehabilitation is a high priority.

- **Improving river access.** Because waterfront property is a limited resource in Keizer, the development of waterfront parks should have a high priority. Because the development of Keizer Rapids Park is of one of the top priorities in the community, the development of other existing waterfront parks should have a medium to low priority.

- **Acquiring land.** It is important for the City to acquire land while it is still available. In fact, land acquisition should occur in advance of development. As a result, land acquisition should occur on a case by case basis as the community develops.

- **Match funds and grants.** Projects with funding available in the form of matching funds and grants should have a high priority.

- **Developing pathways & linkages:** Considerable interest was shown during the planning process for trail development. Local trails and pathways should occur as individual developments occur. Regional and community wide trails take considerable time to acquire and develop, and should be constructed as grants and access become available.
7.6  Financing Strategy

In the past, nearly all the funds for park improvements were reserved in the City Park Improvement Fund. This fund gets its revenue from SDCs, and occasional allocation from the General Fund. Keizer has experienced a steady period of growth since its incorporation in 1982 and has reached 87% of its projection population for 2030. The population projection is based on the availability of developable lands. The City has nearly reached its development potential within the UGB and is nearly out of developable lands. The existing utilization of SDCs will not adequately fund new parks in the future and new sources of funding will need to be identified.

Anticipated Funding Sources

- **Park Improvement Fund**: The fund currently has a balance of $1,035,000. Of that amount $296,000 is dedicated to specific projects.

- **General Fund**: Occasionally the City will provide additional funding to park projects that are not specifically dedicated to the Park Improvement Fund. It is assumed that over the course of five years an average of $30,000 per year will become available.

- **System Development Charges**: Last year the City received about $150,000 in fees from residential development. While housing starts are expected to be fewer than earlier years, it is also expected that the fee schedule will increase. Another consideration is that the City is reaching build-out and fewer lots will be available in the future. Based on these assumptions, a rate of $75,000 per year is forecasted.

- **Grants**: While in the past few grant requests have been submitted, a joint application to the State Marine Board and U.S. Department of Fisheries for $300,000 has been submitted. In addition, other grants are available, especially for trail development. The City should be able to receive about $575,000 in total over the next five years, if the City aggressively pursues available grant funding.

- **Donations**: The City should actively encourage its local citizens to donate either cash or in-kind services for park and facility improvements. If actively pursued, about $25,000 per year should be accrued.

Table 18 on the next page summarized potential funding sources from the above named sources over a five year period.
### Table 18: Funding Sources (five years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Balance Carried Over¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$1,035,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minus money dedicated to specific projects</td>
<td>-296,000²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>739,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development Charges</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,964,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Balance from previous budget year plus interest
² $96,000 dedicated to Country Glen & Hidden Creek Parks and $200,000 to general parks system improvements
Project Package A & B

Two short-term (five year) capital improvement project packages are presented in Tables 19 and 20 on the following pages. In both cases the anticipated funding is inadequate and results in a deficit that must be covered by other unidentified sources.

Project Package A represents 70% of the priority one parks projects identified in the CIP.

Project Package B represents 100% of the priority one parks projects identified in the CIP. Because the funding sources are the same as in Project Package A, the deficit is larger.

Project Package A

Description:
This option maintains the status quo for parks financing and directs the majority of funding to new park development. This plan will result in a deficit of $1,186,000. The deficit will need to be offset by increases to the general fund contribution to parks or other yet to be identified sources. Table 19 identifies Parks Advisory Board recommended priority one park improvement projects.

Table 19: Projects Funded (five years) – Project Package A¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Park Name</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers-Jones Park / Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Rapids Park² (Phase 1 )</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Witham Park</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Small City Park (Joint use school site)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma Ciea Park</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace House Park</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All parks listed in Project Package A are identified by the 2007-2008 Parks Advisory Board as funding priorities.
² Phase 1 cost estimate from existing plan minus funds already spent.
Project Package B

Description:
Project Package B utilizes the same financial resources, but a larger development package is shown. The cost of improvements listed in Table 20 represents $2,586,000 more than the revenue forecasted in Table 18. Table 20 identifies the Parks Advisory Board-recommended priority one park improvement projects and totals all other priority one capital projects into one line item. The lump sum of $1,400,000 represents all other parks projects that meet the priority one capital project criteria of improving existing parks, enhancing river access, serving underserved areas, acquiring additional land, and developing linkages and pathways.

Table 20: Projects Funded (five years) – Project Package B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Park Name</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers-Jones Park / Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Rapids Park¹ (Phase 1)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Witham Park</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Small City Park (Joint use school site)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma Ciea Park</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace House Park</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Priority One Park Projects²</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,550,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Phase 1 cost estimate from existing plan minus funds already spent.
² All other projects categorized as 0-5 year priority projects. Categorization based on project priority criteria outlined in Section 7.5.
Additional Funding Opportunities

Because anticipated funding does not meet the capital needs of either project packages, additional funding sources will need to be secured. Below are some options the City of Keizer may want to pursue.

**General Obligation Bond:** These are voter-approved bonds with the authority to levy an assessment on real and personal property. The money can only be used for capital improvements but not maintenance. This property tax is levied for a specified period of time (usually 15-20 years). Passage requires a double majority (a majority of registered voters must vote and a majority of those voting must approve the measure), unless during a general election in even-numbered years, in which case a simple majority is required.

The City of Keizer could utilize a general obligation bond to cover the shortfall for both Project Packages A and B. An example of the impact to the taxpayer would be as follows. A $0.15 per $1,000 assessed valuation will pay the debt service on a $2,830,000 bond, assuming a 20 year bond at 5.25% interest. For a home assessed at a value of $250,000 the cost per year would be $37.50 a year. The contribution of a general obligation bond to the City’s funding sources is listed in Table 21 below.

**Table 21: Contribution of a General Obligation Bond**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount Balance Carried Over¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$1,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minus money dedicated to specific projects</td>
<td>-296,000²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>739,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development Charges</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Obligation Bond³</td>
<td>2,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,794,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Balance from previous budget year plus interest
² $96,000 dedicated to Country Glen & Hidden Creek Parks and $200,000 to general parks system improvements
³ The additional revenue from a General Obligation Bond would cover the shortfall identified in Project Package B.

**General Fund:** This is the City’s primary source for operating revenue and comes primarily from taxes. Since park and recreation services must compete with other City operations for these funds, this source can change from year to year. Keizer has historically not funded parks improvements through the general fund. Using the general fund as the sole source for the capital project deficit would require for Project Package A an increase of $237,500 a year to the projected $30,000. Project Package B would require an increase of $517,200 a year to fill the capital project deficit. This amount is more than the City can bear over the course of the next five years and other options for funding must be explored.
**Revenue Bonds:** These bonds are sold and paid from the revenue produced from the operation of a facility. Keizer does not have any recreational facilities that are funded in this manner. If Keizer were to build a recreation center this source of funding could be explored.

**Other Donations:** The donations of labor, land, or cash by service agencies, private groups, or individuals are a popular way to raise small amounts of money for specific projects. Such service agencies as Lions and Rotary often fund small projects such as playground improvements. Real estate trusts are another source of land donations that can be explored by the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department.

**Exchange or Sale of Property:** If the City has an excess piece of property with some development value it could be traded for a private piece of property more suitable for park use.

**Corporate Sponsors:** The City of Keizer could opt to seek corporate sponsorship of park projects and facilities. In return for the financial sponsorship the City could allow advertising or naming rights at park facilities. Before implementing such a practice, the City of Keizer would need to craft a corporate sponsorship policy that requires the sponsorship to support the mission and policies of the Keizer Parks and Recreation Department.

**Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) Funds:** Grants from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) are available for a wide variety of projects. These funds are mainly used for projects and programs in the lower income areas of the community. This could offer a source of funds for park projects or recreation programs meeting the program criteria.

**Park Utility Fee:** A park utility fee creates dedicated funds to help offset the cost of park maintenance. Most city residents pay water and sewer utility fees. Park utility fees apply the same concepts to City parks and a fee is assessed to all businesses and households. The monthly fee would be paid upon connection to the water and sewer system. Creating a new source of maintenance funding could free up general fund dollars for other capital project uses. Park utility fees have a potential to be a significant and stable revenue stream for local jurisdictions.
APPENDIX A: PARK INVENTORY
### Bair Park & Reservoir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park (planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>2.1 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- Unpaved trail; and
- On-street parking (north entrance).

**Description**
Bair Park is a 2.1 acre undeveloped park in the Clear Lake Neighborhood. The property is comprised of both water department property and parks parcels. Access the park is from the north along NE Bair Road and from the south at the cul-de-sac of NE Zinfandel Court. The western boundary is defined by a water storage facility and the eastern boundary by residential development. The park is primarily a natural area with trails weaving through the property.

**Park History**
February 2, 1998: The Keizer City Council authorizes the City Manager to purchase four half-acre parcels of property from the Bair family for the sum of $99,900.00. Two of the parcels were purchased by the Parks fund and two by the Water fund for the location of a water storage reservoir.

**Documents**
A park site plan was developed during the planning process. No previous documents exist.

**Plan Recommendations**
A master plan was developed and recommendations for the site include:
- Two dog stations;
- ADA Accessible picnic area;
- ADA Accessible trail;
- Privacy screening;  
- Removal of invasive plant species;
- Drinking fountain; and
- Enhancements to existing trails.
Opportunities
Preservation of the natural area, ivy removal, and a tree assessment.
Connections to the Park’s network through the existing bicycle lanes.

Deficiencies
Southern boundary flanks private property creating a potential for use conflicts.

Location
Ben Miller Family Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>2.4 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- Playground equipment;
- Two picnic tables;
- One barbeque;
- Open area;
- Two horseshoe pits (will be removed);
- Drinking fountain;
- On-street parking (north boundary);
- Portable toilet (seasonal); and
- Irrigation.

**Description**
Ben Miller Park is 2.4 acre small city park located in the Southeast Keizer neighborhood. It was originally designated as the Pleasant View Neighborhood Park, when it was acquired by the City in July of 1995. The park’s boundaries are defined by NE Alder Drive to the south and west, NE Beebe Street to the north and Claggett Creek and the wetlands to the east bound by the school district property. The park is surrounded by single family residential housing and provides the neighborhood with a playground, picnic tables, horseshoe pits, open area, and access to Claggett Creek. The developed portion of the park resides along the western edge of Claggett Creek. Across the creek to the east is undeveloped park land that is part of a wetlands restoration project site that is bound by the school property: Claggett Creek Middle School and Weddle Elementary.
Park History

July 10, 1995: Pleasantview Park was purchased by the City of Keizer from Elsie R. Mathews for the purpose of developing the land into a neighborhood park. The property is approximately 2.5 acres and was purchased for the $65,000 with Park System Development Fees, a fund that is dedicated to the acquisition and development of park land.

2005: Park renamed to Ben Miller Family Park

Documents

1996 Master Plan for Ben Miller Family Park

Plan Recommendations

- Small shelter (e.g. one picnic table);
- Pedestrian crossing improvements at Pleasant View Drive;
- Park sign located on corner at Pleasant View Drive and Alder Drive; and
- Connection to parks system with multi-use trail along Claggett Creek.

Opportunities

Reinforce connection with Claggett Creek and the adjacent wetland shared with the elementary school. Emphasis could be placed on the connection to the greater park’s system through the use of the bicycle network. Suggestions have been made regarding a multi-use path running along Claggett Creek.

Deficiencies

The pedestrian crossing on Alder / Pleasant View Road needs increased visibility considering the proximity to school grounds and the park attractor for children. The addition of a park sign at the corner of Pleasant View Drive and Alder Drive would increase the park’s visibility to north bound traffic on Pleasant View.

Location

[Map of Ben Miller Family Park with location identified]
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Bob Newton Family Park
(formerly Wilark Park)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>5.9 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- One youth ball field;
- One backstop;
- Playground equipment;
- Two horseshoe pits;
- One tennis court;
- Two basketball hoops;
- Drinking fountain;
- Bike Rack;
- Six picnic tables;
- Two benches;
- Two barbeques;
- Portable toilet (year round);
- Parking area (east entry); and
- Irrigation.

**Description**
Bob Newton Park is a 5.9 acre small city park located in the Gubser Neighborhood. Vehicle access is limited to Mandarin Way to the east and 12th Avenue to the south. A small parking area is located at the east entrance. Pedestrians can access the park from the northwest off of NE Manzanita Street. A service road is located along the northern portion of the park and creates a boundary between the park and adjacent private residents.

The park provides a play area, horseshoe pits, basketball and tennis courts, a small ball field, picnic areas, and an open space area. A stream flows year round from east to west through the park with a pedestrian bridge crossing along the western portion of the park.

**Park History**
- **June 1961**: 2.50 acres donated to Marion County by Kenneth and Anna Neilson (County paid for recording)
- **July 30, 1965**: 5.941 acres donated to Marion County by Kenneth and Anna Neilson (County paid for recording)
June 30, 1983: Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Wilark Park to the City of Keizer.

March 2007: Park is renamed Bob Newton Family Park.

Documents 1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan

Plan Recommendations
- An update of the sports courts; and
- Improve visibility of park access through street signage.

Opportunities
The park is adjacent to the existing bikeway network and is in close proximity to the undeveloped Hidden Creek Park site. Connections to the greater park system could be enhanced and emphasized.

Deficiencies
Visibility of the park to the general public is limited.

Location
Appendix A: Park Inventory
Carlson Skate Park/Chalmers-Jones Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Area / Small City Park</td>
<td>2.9 Acres</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;  
- 21,000 square foot skate park (Special Use Area);  
- Gazebo (reservations available);  
- Wood chip walking path (Edgell Fitness Trail);  
- One youth ball field;  
- Five picnic tables;  
- Beverage vending machine;  
- Portable toilet (one year round/one seasonal);  
- Parking available (adjacent to skate park/City Hall);  
- Shared parking lot with City Hall;  
- Drinking fountain; and  
- Three benches.

**Description**
Carlson Skate Park/Chalmers-Jones Park, formerly known as City Hall Park, is a 2.9 acre special use area and small city park located in the Claggett Neighborhood adjacent to City Hall. The park’s boundaries are defined to the north by City Hall’s parking lot, the Police Station to the west, a residential property fence to the south and NE Rickman Road to the east.

Access to the park is primarily from the north through City Hall’s parking lot and the eastern parking lot. The park provides the community with an outdoor sheltered meeting place, a skate park, walking trail, open space and parking for large events.

**Park History**
March 1986: City Council was in negotiations to purchase the Salem Private School buildings to house Keizer City Hall and Police Department. After considerable deliberation it was decided to include the 4.1 acres of land adjacent to the buildings. The inclusion of the acreage was for possible expansion for facilities or a community center complex. It was further decided to use the acreage for park and playground purposes until such a time for expansion was warranted.
July 1, 1986: The City of Keizer purchases the property.
1992: The Park was detailed as “City Hall Park” in the Comprehensive Park System Development Plan.
October 1994: The pedestrian walkway through the park became the “Edgell Fitness Trail”, by official proclamation. The project was a cooperative effort between the City of Keizer and a volunteer group spearheaded by Joe and Marty Edgell.
March 1996: City Councilors renamed the Park Chalmers Jones Park in recognition
of Keizer resident Chalmers Jones, described in the March 1, 1996 issue of the
Statesman-Journal newspaper as being best known for "breaking racial barriers and
his long time service in State government".
July 1999: The skate park was completed and dedicated.
2001: The Oregon Army National Guard Civil-Military Projects Group based in
Salem, Oregon erected the gazebo. In October of that year, City Councilors adopted
the present delineation for Chalmers Jones Park.

Documents
1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan
2002 Master Plan for: Chalmers Jones Park

Plan Recommendations
The Parks Division has a house adjacent to the park on the east side that is currently
used as an equipment shed, which will be removed. The July 2002 Chalmers Jones
Master Plan recommends an ADA play area adjacent to the skate park. Previous
capital improvements planned for the park include: permanent restrooms,
concessions stand, lawn-turf renovation, trees, landscaping, irrigation and a bike
rack. A well has been drilled on the site along the south portion of the new storage
building. The water storage facility is located on the site near Rickman Road
between the house site and parking lot. At present the design of the pump station
building is in progress. The site plans for Keizer’s new City Hall and Police Station
currently include a park plaza with a water feature in the space currently occupied
by the ball field and portions of the Edgell Fitness Trail.

Opportunities
Enhance the connections to the rest of the parks system through improvements to
the safety of the walking and cycling routes.

Deficiencies
ADA accessibility to the park’s grounds.

Location

![Map of Keizer Parks](image)
Civic Center site plan provided by the City of Keizer.
Claggett Creek Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Large City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>10.6 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- Playground equipment;
- Two horseshoe pits;
- Two basketball hoops;
- Picnic shelter (reservable);
- 8-10 picnic tables;
- Five barbeques;
- Two benches;
- Two youth ball fields;
- Dog station (northern parking lot);
- ADA accessible drinking fountain;
- One full sized soccer field;
- Bleachers;
- Irrigation;
- Parking lots (north & south boundary);
- Bike rack (south lot); and
- Two portable toilets (north & south lot – year round and two seasonal).

**Description**
Claggett Creek Park is a 10.6 acre large city park located in the Claggett Neighborhood. The park is situated between Chemawa Road to the north, Dearborn Avenue to the south, Claggett Creek and farmland to the east and single family residential to the west. Access to the park is through the parking areas along the north and south boundaries.

The park provides a soccer field with bleachers in the northern area and baseball fields and basketball courts at its center. The southern half of the park contains a covered shelter area, picnic tables, play areas and an accessible water fountain.

**Park History**
June 20, 1963: Marion County purchases Claggett Creek Park property from members of the Hardman family for the sum of $9000.00
June 30, 1983: Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Claggett Creek Park to the City of Keizer.

**Documents**

1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan

**Plan Recommendations**

- Purchase adjacent farm property east of Claggett Creek;
- Pathway development within park (separate from Claggett Creek Pathway);
- Softball field improvements (skinning of field);
- Soccer field improvements (goals, benches, field);
- Dog station (southern parking lot);
- Bike rack (northern parking lot);
- Replace drinking fountain;
- Update play equipment; and
- Security lighting.

**Opportunities**

Increase access to the creek through a trail system connected to a future open space network along Claggett Creek. There are opportunities to expand the park by acquiring a portion the property to the east side of the park.

**Deficiencies**

The bleachers and benches are outdated.

**Location**

![Park Map](image)
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## Clear Lake Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4.0 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Partially developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Facilities
- Dog and garbage station;
- Open area;
- Paved trail; and
- On-street parking.

### Description
Clear Lake Park is a 4.0 acre park located in the Clear Lake Neighborhood. The park's boundaries are defined by residential development to the west and south, Clear Lake Elementary School to the north, and NE Meadowglen Street to the east. Primary access to the park is from the east, with pedestrian access through a paved trail connecting the park to NE Cater Court to the west.

The park is primarily a passive open space area with minimal facilities. A paved trail connects the park and school to the residential development to the west. The City of Keizer maintains a maintenance agreement and cooperative use agreement with the 24J School District.

### Park History
- **November 1992:** Salem-Keizer School District granted a zone change and conditional use to build Clear Lake Elementary School. Part of that granting included a park site.

- **August 7, 1995:** Keizer City Council enters into a land sales contract with Salem-Keizer School District to purchase 5 acres of the Clear Lake School property as a park site for the sum of $125,000 paid from SDC funds. This contract included a joint use and maintenance agreement.
### Documents

Joint use agreement between the City of Keizer and the Salem-Keizer Public School District.

### Plan Recommendations

- Installation of a drinking fountain;
- Small shelter;
- Picnic tables and benches; and
- Installation of park sign.

### Opportunities

Connections to the greater park system. One block south is a designated bicycle shared roadway along Northeast Parkmeadow Drive.

### Deficiencies

No restroom facilities, seating areas, drinking water, irrigation or acknowledgement through signage that the property is a public park. Elementary school parking circle gives impression the property is a continuation of the school grounds.

### Location

![Location Map](image-url)
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### Country Glen Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>5.9 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Partially developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**

- Signage;
- Open area;
- Multi-use pathway;
- Pedestrian bridge;
- Lighting along bridge and bridge trail;
- ADA accessible playground equipment;
- Picnic shelter;
- Two picnic tables;
- ADA accessible drinking fountain;
- On-street parking;
- Dog station; and
- Irrigation.

**Description**

Country Glen Park is 5.9 acre small city park located in an area intended for the control of storm water overflow, Labish Creek. The park is part of the Clear Lake Neighborhood of north Keizer and connects with the Gubser Neighborhood via a pedestrian bridge at the southwestern boundary.

The park provides a general use field, play equipment, picnic shelter and drinking fountain. The park also connects to the undeveloped park Hidden Creek through a pedestrian path.

**Park History**

1997: Country Glen Park was acquired after several years of negotiations with Epping Construction. The time of these negotiations were influenced by the flooding of 1996 and 1997. At the direction of the Keizer City Council, City staff began compiling a Master Plan in autumn 2000.
Documents

2001 Master Plan for: Country Glen – Hidden Creek Park

Plan Recommendations

- Development of a multi-use sports field; and
- Portable toilet.

Opportunities

Increase connections to open space network. Enhance the connection to Hidden Creek Park and the existing multi-use path and shared bicycle roadways in close proximity. Multi-use path along Claggett Creek and Labish Creek connecting park to other system parks

Deficiencies

No restroom facilities. Access to the park is perceived to only be through Northeast Parkside Court, access from NE Lazy Creek Court and NE 14th Avenue could be enhanced.
Existing & Recommended Park Facilities
### Hidden Creek Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Natural Area / Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>3.7 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use pathway;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park is a 3.7 acre undeveloped park located in the Country Glen Neighborhood, along the shared boundary with the Gubser Neighborhood. The park is surrounded by single family and limited density residential housing. Labish Creek defines the eastern portion of the property and NE Whisper Creek Loop defines the park's western boundary. There is a 30 foot natural buffer along the east side of the property adjacent to Labish Creek that is required to remain as a natural area as part of the subdivision agreement. The park is connected to Country Glen Park to the north via a pedestrian path, and to the park's south is a connection to a multi-use pathway connecting the park to Keizer's bikeway network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000: Hidden Creek Park was acquired to complete the Country Glen-Hidden Creek Property. At the direction of the Keizer City Council, City staff began compiling a Master Plan in Autumn 2000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Master Plan for: Country Glen – Hidden Creek Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park signs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic tables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities
Increased connections to the existing open space and bicycle network. Multi-use path along Claggett Creek and Labish Creek connecting park to other system parks.

Deficiencies
At present the trail in the 2001 Hidden Creek Park master plan has been completed but none of the other amenities have been installed or vegetation planted.

Location

![Map of Country Glen Park and Hidden Creek Park]
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- picnic table
- tree planting
- ADA path
- lighting
- parking
- park bench
- park boundary
- park sign

Appendix A: Park Inventory
Keizer Little League Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Special Use Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>15.4 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- 11 youth ball fields;
- Paved trail through ball fields;
- Portable toilet (seasonal);
- Permanent restrooms;
- Storage building;
- Bike Rack;
- Concessions;
- Gravel parking lot; and
- Paved parking.

**Description**
Self contained park supported by the Keizer Little League Association.

**Park History**
May 6, 1985: Keizer City Council votes unanimously to purchase 2 parcels of property (21.4 acres total) on Ridge Drive for $103,660.00. This vote included language that indicated an agreement be made with Keizer Little League for operation and maintenance.

**Documents**
1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan
Plan Recommendations

The Keizer Little League Association has been tending to the park’s maintenance and has a maintenance agreement with the City.

- Improve field drainage;
- Improve pathways;
- Light an additional field; and
- Promote wider public use of the park by groups unaffiliated with the Keizer Little League Association.

Opportunities

The park has been fully developed by the Keizer Little League Association, which maintains the property and continues to make improvements. The City has made improvements to the parking facilities and storm water drainage.

Deficiencies

Insufficient parking and inadequate field drainage.

Location
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## Keizer Rapids Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Regional Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>120 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Under construction / undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Facilities

None currently exist.

### Description

The Keizer Rapids Park site is a 120 acre located at the western end of Chemawa Road just outside the city limits and along the eastern bank of the Willamette River. The undeveloped regional park site is comprised of both City and State owned property. The City of Keizer is responsible for the maintenance of the park site.

### Park History

**2001:** The Keizer City Council established a long-term goal to explore ways to better connect the citizens of Keizer and the region to the Willamette River and the City became a founding member of the Mid-Willamette River Connections group.

**2003:** The Keizer City Council formed the Regional Intergovernmental Visions Enhancing Rivers Resources Task Force (RIVERR) with the task of facilitating the creation of a West Keizer community park (See site specific master plan)

**October 2, 2006:** Keizer City Council adopted the Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan.

### Documents

2006 Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan

### Plan Recommendations

The Keizer Rapids Park Master Plan was adopted in October 2006. Planned facilities include:

- Multi-use path;
- Nature trails;
- BMX area;
- Picnic areas;
- Wetland interpretive area and trails;
- Education facility;
- Amphitheater;
- Off-leash dog area;
- Demonstration garden;
- Playground;
- Fitness stations;
- Playfields;
- Marine facility;
- Canoe lockers; and
- Boat-in camping.
Opportunities

The park will provide a primary access point to the Willamette River and future connections to Palma Giea, Sunset and Wallace House Parks. The park’s master plan aims to provide guidance in making the park into a regional facility with statewide significance.

The plan contains eight objectives to guide future development and facility provisions:

- **Water-related** recreation increasing access to the Willamette River.
- **Land-based** recreation that will increase access to healthy lifestyles.
- **Conservation** through maintaining the park’s natural areas.
- **Education** opportunities in both recreational and environmental activities.
- **Accessibility** for pedestrians and bicycle, with connections to the local and regional transportation system enhanced.
- **Park shape** will become more uniform through the acquisition of adjacent properties as they become available in the future.
- **Security and safety** will be provided through access and traffic calming measures.
- **Neighborhood compatibility** will be maintained through design techniques such as buffering, fences, and signage.

Deficiencies

None currently exist.

Location

![Map showing the location of Keizer Rapids Park and Palma Giea Park](image)
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Existing 2006 Keizer Rapids Master Plan.
### Keizer Station Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park (under construction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>1.3 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Existing Facilities
- Under construction

#### Description
A record drawing has been filed with the City.

#### Park History
2005: Parcel was created and deeded to the City as part of the Keizer Station Development Master Planning process.

#### Documents
No documents available at this time.

#### Plan Recommendations
The master site plan for Keizer Station park includes a picnic shelter, picnic tables, benches, a pedestrian trail and a wetlands area.
- Walking paths and trails; and
- Children’s play area and equipment.

#### Opportunities
Keizer Station park will be situated on the existing bicycle network with a connection to the regional bikeway.

#### Deficiencies
Adjacent to highway and on the edge of a big box shopping center, access will be limited.
Location

KEIZER STATION PARK
Appendix A: Park Inventory
Record drawing created by W&H Pacific and image provided by the City of Keizer.
## The Meadows Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>3.0 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- Play equipment;
- Paved trail;
- Two picnic tables;
- One bench;
- Drinking fountain;
- Irrigation; and
- On-street parking.

**Description**
The Meadows Park is a 3.0 acre park small city park located in the Clear Lake Neighborhood of north Keizer. The park is situated along the eastern boundary of the Meadows subdivision in the Clear Lake Neighborhood. A chain link fence runs the length of the park's eastern border along River Road and access to the park is limited to pedestrians along the western edge and southwestern corner. Vehicle access is through the subdivision on NE Park Terrace Drive off of NE Parkmeadow Drive.

**Park History**
May 1990: 3.25 acres donated to City of Keizer by Reimann and Associates as required by land use decision. This was for both Park and Pump Station sites.

**Documents**

- 1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan
- 1993 Master Plan for: The Meadows Park
### Plan Recommendations
- Additional picnic tables;
- Multi-use turf area;
- Vegetative buffer along River Road; and
- Bicycle Rack (River Road entrance).

### Opportunities
Connections to the existing park’s network through the existing bicycle network could be emphasized. Designated bicycle lane and shared roadway along River Road and Parkmeadow Drive.

### Deficiencies
Parking only available through the residential area. Access is limited to a pedestrian trail off of NE Park Terrace Drive and a fence opening on River Road. During the site visit it appeared that drainage is a problem in the play areas.

### Location
![Map of Clear Lake and Meadows Parks](image-url)
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### Mike Whittam Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Not Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>6.1 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage; and
- Parking available on adjacent church lot.

**Description**
Mike Whittam Park is a 6.1 acre undeveloped park site in east Keizer. The park is located along NE Keizer Road where it transitions into NE Ridge Drive as it heads toward Keizer Little League Park. The park is due south of Keizer Little League Park and is flanked to the west by a church parking lot.

**Park History**
**January 15, 1990:** Keizer City Council, on the recommendation of the Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board voted to name parcel “B” (5.99 acres) of the Little League Park after Mike Whittam. Mr. Whittam was a Parks Advisory Board member from June 1984-June 1987.

**Documents**
1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan

**Plan Recommendations**
There are currently no recommendations for this park site, but some ideas for this location include:

- Community gardens (irrigation will need to be explored);
- Off leash dog park; and
- Picnicking facilities.
Opportunities

- Emphasis of the linkages to the existing trail system along Salem Parkway and Keizer Little League Park. Existing wetland improvements and educational opportunities.

Deficiencies

Open area is exposed to traffic flows of the church and Little League events. Water tower and a steep slope prevent a clear connection to the Keizer Little League Park.

Location

![Map of City Limits, School, Park Site, Other Park, Keizer Little League Park, and Mike Whittam Park. Scale is 1" = 1,000 feet.]
Existing & Recommended Park Facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Natural Area / Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>9.5 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Northridge Park**

- **Type**: Natural Area / Open Space
- **Size**: 9.5 Acres
- **Status**: Undeveloped

**Existing Facilities**
- None

**Description**
Northridge Park is a 9.5 acre undeveloped natural area along the eastern banks of Claggett Creek, which forms the park’s western boundary. The park is bisected and surrounded by single family residential lots except for the northern portion of the property, which is flanked by retail and medium density residential. Access to the park is currently limited to a private parking lot of a multi-family housing complex along the northern property line and a deeded access way along Verda Lane that is not currently accessible.

**Park History**
- **August 1964**: 4.42 acres donated to Marion County by L.D. Reimann as required by subdivision ordinance.
- **October 1968**: 10 feet donated to Marion County by L.D. Reimann as required by subdivision ordinance.
- **June 30, 1983**: Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Northridge Park to the City of Keizer.

**Documents**
- 1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan
- 1999 Environmental Site Report/ Wetland Enhancement Proposal
Plan Recommendations
- Create two eastern access points from Verda Lane;
- Create access into the park from the northwest;
- Multi-use trail connecting to larger trail system;
- Wetlands restoration, and site cleanup as needed; and
- Signage at park entry points.

Opportunities
Opportunity to highlight watershed, wildlife viewing, a multi-use trail along Claggett Creek and educational viewpoints with interpretative information.

Deficiencies
Access is restricted to the entire park. There are two existing right of ways along Verda Lane that are currently not accessible as entry points to the natural area. One is located at the junction of NE Kalmia Drive between taxlot 063W35DC03200 and 063W35DC03300 and the other north along Verda Lane between 063W35DC02100 and 063W35DC02200. Additionally the City is working toward attaining deeded access from the east on Verda Lane.

Location
- City Limits
- School
- Park Site
- Other Park

[Map of Northridge Park]
Appendix A: Park Inventory
Northview Terrace Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>2.1 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- One basketball court;
- Four picnic tables;
- One barbeque;
- Playground equipment;
- On-street parking;
- Lighting; and
- Irrigation.

**Description**
Northview Terrace Park is a 2.1 acre small city park located north of Weissner Drive between Verda Lane and 18th Avenue. Pedestrian access is available along the southern boundary and the northeast corner. The northeast entry is shared by a community swimming pool, which defines its northern boundary. The rest of the park is surrounded by single family housing and its west and east boundaries are defined by the back ends of the housing property lines. The southern boundary is Weissner Drive. The park provides play equipment, a basketball court, picnic tables and open areas.

**Park History**
- **October 1958**: 1.22 acres donated to Marion County by Jim and Anita Weissner as required by subdivision ordinance.
- **September 1959**: .68 acres donated to Marion County by Jim and Anita Weissner as required by subdivision ordinance.
- **October 1960**: .175 acres donated to Marion County by Jim and Anita Weissner as required by subdivision ordinance.
June 30, 1983: Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Northview Terrace Park to the City of Keizer.

Documents
1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan

Plan Recommendations
- Update play equipment;
- Update basketball court;
- Improve ADA accessibility into the park and equipment; and
- Create pathways.

Opportunities
The park is located within a block of the existing bicycle network. Access and connections to the park could be enhanced.

Deficiencies
The main access to the park is along the southern boundary using two stairways and a path along the northeast entrance that is not maintained by the City. The existing play equipment needs an update and the tether ball pole should be removed if not maintained.

Location
Existing & Recommended Park Facilities
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- play area
- picnic table
- lighting
- barbecue
- ADA path
- park boundary
- park sign
- parking
Palma Ciea Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Waterfront Park (planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>1.6 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Facilities
- Army Corps of Engineers River Wall;
- Gate onto the property; and
- Power utility pole.

Description
Palma Ciea Park is 1.6 acre undeveloped park along the Willamette River in the West Keizer Neighborhood. The park is surrounded by single family residential and access to the park is limited to its eastern boundary from N Cummings Lane.

Plans had not been created for this park at the start of the master planning process. The site has a large electric power pole near the eastern entrance and flood control dyke along its full riverside length. The site is currently used by the neighboring residents for gardening.

Park History
- **May 1958:** 80 acres donated to Marion County by Edwin J. Becke as required by subdivision ordinance.
- **June 30, 1983:** Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Palma Ciea Park to the City of Keizer.

Documents
A park site plan was developed during the planning process. No previous documents exist.
## Plan Recommendations

- ADA path;
- Unpaved trails to river;
- Seasonal dock;
- Horseshoe pit;
- Dog station;
- Vegetative buffer for homes;
- Remove invasive plants;
- Annual clearing of driftwood;
- Viewing platform;
- Picnic tables;
- Parking;
- Portable toilet;
- Remove rocks from power pole;
- Reinforce embankment; and
- Dog splash zone.

## Opportunities

Create an access point to the Willamette River waterfront. Create waterway connections to Sunset, Wallace House, and Keizer Rapids parks. Connect the entry of Palma Ciea Park to existing bikeway network.

## Deficiencies

Access to the park is along the residential portion of N Cummings Lane. No parking is currently available and will need to be added to the site as it is developed. Thick brush obscures access to the waterfront and rogue trails are interspersed along the waterfront side of the river wall.

## Location

![Map of Palma Ciea Park and its surrounding area]
Sunset Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Waterfront Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>1.5 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Partially developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Facilities**
- Signage;
- Picnic table (seasonal);
- Two benches (seasonal);
- Garbage can (seasonal);
- Natural rock beach; and
- Dog station.

**Description**
Sunset Park is 1.58 acre waterfront park in the West Keizer Neighborhood. The park is surrounded by single family residential housing. Access is limited to pedestrians and cyclist through a gate along its eastern boundary at the junction of N Rivercrest Drive and N Sunset Avenue. The park provides seasonal picnic tables, benches and rock beach for river access.

**Park History**
- **May 10, 1938**: Recorded plat for Rivercrest Acres stated: “Lot 2 Block 3 reserved as a Park for exclusive use of owners of Rivercrest Acres.”
- **May 27, 1957**: Warranty deed to Marion County for vesting in trust for the public use as a park all the right, title and interest of the grantors (John and Anna Kaeser) It was at this time it became known as Sunset Park.
- **June 30, 1983**: Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Sunset Park to the City of Keizer.

**Documents**
- 1988 Proposed Sunset Park Master Plan
- 1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan
Plan Recommendations
- Keep existing amenities;
- Install an ADA path;
- Retain natural feel of the park; and
- Minimize park access conflicts with adjacent park residents.

Opportunities
Waterway connections could be established to Wallace House, Palma Ciea and Keizer Rapids Park. Existing connections to Keizer’s bicycle network and park system could be emphasized.

Deficiencies
User conflicts are an issue for neighbors adjacent to the park. The park has no restroom facilities.

Location

![Map of Sunset Park and Willamette Manor Park](image-url)
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### Wallace House Park

*(formerly River’s Edge Park)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Waterfront Park (planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>11.2 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Existing Facilities

- Signage; and
- Paved path (eastern boundary).

#### Description

Wallace House Park (formerly River’s Edge Park) is an 11.2 acre undeveloped park on the Willamette River waterfront in southwestern Keizer. The park’s boundaries are defined by the Willamette River to the west and single family homes to the north, east and south. The home located in the northeast portion of the park is privately owned is bordered by the park on three of its sides. Access to the park from the south is Willamette Drive and from the north Rivercrest Drive. A pedestrian and bicycle connection is made between these two streets by a paved bicycle path. Pedestrians can also access the park from the east off of N Garland Court.

The site has a unique history within Keizer. Portions of the site served as a nursery and the cement foundations for the greenhouses remain covered by thick hedges of blackberry. The location is also the speculated location of the Wallace House, which was a fur trading post sometime between 1811-1813. The post was established by William Wallace who was sent from Astoria to gather furs.

#### Park History

1968: City of Salem/Regional Park and Recreation Agency acquires from the Weeks, Cline and Gottenberg families, 10.29 acres of property subsequently called Wallace House Park.

May 17, 1993: The City of Keizer purchases Wallace House Park from the City of Salem for the sum of $20,000.00.
A park site plan was developed during the planning process. No previous documents exist.

**Plan Recommendations**
- Children’s play area;
- Basketball court;
- Parking;
- An additional dog station;
- Picnic Shelter;
- Interpretive signage;
- Wallace house interpretive information;
- Small parking lot;
- Trail access to the river;
- Update park sign;
- Sign at north entrance;
- Portable toilet;
- Bike rack;
- Viewing platform;
- Two seasonal bridges;
- Seasonal dock;
- Dog splash zone;
- Trails to river;
- ADA trail;
- Basketball court; and
- Removal of invasive plant species.

**Opportunities**
The site has potential for educational and interpretive information. It can provide a place to reflect Oregon’s history with the Willamette River and increase access to the waterfront. Waterway connections to Palma Ciea, Sunset, and Keizer Rapids could be created. Existing connections to the Keizer bikeway network could be emphasized.

**Deficiencies**
No formal parking is available.

**Location**

![Map of Wallace House Park](image)
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## Willamette Manor Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small City Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>2.4 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Facilities
- Signage;
- Paved trail (northern boundary);
- Picnic Shelter;
- Five picnic tables;
- One bench;
- Portable toilet (seasonal);
- Basketball hoop;
- One tennis court;
- Playground equipment;
- Drinking fountain;
- Irrigation; and
- On-street parking.

### Description
Willamette Manor Park is a 2.4 acre small city park located between 5th and 3rd Avenue just south of Dennis Lane. The western boundary, which serves as the main entrance to the park, along 5th Avenue is shared with a pump station and the Holliday Swim Club pool. Pedestrian access is available along the eastern boundary of the park via a paved trail. The rest of the park is surrounded by single family housing to the north and south.

A paved trails runs across the northern portion of the park connecting both entryways and creating access to the play equipment and picnic shelter. The park contains a large open space area along its southern edge and a tennis court with a basket ball hoop along the eastern edge.

### Park History
- **December 1960**: .5143 acres donated to Marion County by Ron Jones as required by subdivision ordinance.
- **August 1962**: .3176 acres donated to Marion County by Ron Jones as required by subdivision ordinance.
October 1963: .3332 acres donated to Marion County by Ron Jones as required by subdivision ordinance.

December 1970: 1.0250 acres donated to Marion County by Ron Jones as required by subdivision ordinance.

June 30, 1983: Bargain and Sale Deed from Marion County conveying Willamette Manor Park to the City of Keizer.

Documents

1992 Comprehensive Park System Development Plan

Plan Recommendations

- Upgrade play equipment;
- Signage at eastern entrance; and
- Replace drinking fountain.

Opportunities

Increasing the connectivity to other parks and the river through existing bikeways and trails (possibly through the existing utility corridor).

Deficiencies

The tennis court is due for a resurfacing.

Location

[Map showing park locations]
Existing & Recommended Park Facilities
Other Parks and Open Space:

**City of Salem**

Minto-Brown Island Park is an 890-acre natural park located along the Willamette River.
- Play equipment
- Shelter
- Picnic tables
- Benches
- Jogging, walking, and bike paths
- Portable toilets
- Off-leash dog area
- Dog stations

River Road Park is a 16.1-acre park located just south of Keizer along River Road.
- Tennis courts
- Play equipment
- Picnic tables
- Ball field
- Drinking fountain
- Restroom

Riverfront Park is a 23-acre park located in downtown Salem along the Willamette River.
- Salem’s Riverfront Carousel
- A.C. Gilbert Discovery Village
- Eco Earth Globe
- Amphitheater
- Picnic tables
- Play equipment
- Pavilion
- Bike racks
- Boat dock
- Jogging, walking, and biking path
- Open area
- Restrooms
- Dog stations

Wallace Marine Park is an 114-acre park located in west Salem along the Willamette River.
- Play equipment
- Ball fields
- Soccer fields
- Picnic tables
- Benches
- Restrooms
- Dog stations

**Marion County**

Spong’s Landing is a 62-acre seasonal day-use county park located on the eastern bank of the Willamette River northwest of Keizer off Naples Road.
- Picnic shelter
- Picnic tables
- Fire pits
- Ball field
- Play equipment
- Horseshoe pits
- Waterfront access
- Fishing locations
- Drinking water
- Restrooms

**State of Oregon**

Willamette Mission State Park is a 1,680-acre park with north of Keizer and Spong’s Landing along the Willamette River. The park provides various services and recreational activities.
- Tent camping
- Horse camping
- Day use area
- Group shelter
- Picnic tables
- Boating and fishing area
- Walking and hiking trail
- Bicycle trail
- Horse trail
- Historic site/resources
- Natural areas
School Facilities:

Clear Lake Elementary School

- Play equipment
- One sports field (football and soccer)
- Youth back stop
- Two covered basketball courts
- Gymnasium
- Indoor basketball

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
Keizer Little League Baseball (KLLB)

Basketball
Keizer Youth Basketball Association (KYBA)

Cummings Elementary School

- Play equipment
- One cover blacktop with two basketball hoops
- One open area blacktop
- Bark chip running trail
- Two back stops on large field
- Open space area
- Gymnasium
- Indoor basketball

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Basketball
KYBA
Forest Ridge Elementary School

- Soccer field
- Youth baseball field (1 backstop)
- Play equipment
- Covered basketball (4 backboards)
- Running track
- Walking path
- Indoor basketball
- Gymnasium

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Basketball
KYBA

Gubser Elementary School

- Soccer field
- Youth baseball field
- Play equipment
- Walking track
- Indoor basketball
- Gymnasium

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Volleyball
Boys & Girls Club of America (BGC)

Basketball
KYBA
Keizer Elementary School

- Play equipment
- One soccer field
- Two youth baseball
- Two covered play areas: one with basketball, the other general play
- Walking path
- Indoor basketball
- Gymnasium

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Volleyball
BGC

Basketball
KYBA, Department of Community Services (DOCS), Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA)

Kennedy Elementary School

- One soccer field (no goals)
- Track surrounds field
- Two 'Big Toy' play areas
- One gravel play area with bars and rings
- Blacktop with two basketball hoops
- Covered general play area
- Gymnasium

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Basketball
KYBA, BGC
Weddle Elementary School

- One soccer field
- One open field
- Three youth backstops
- One multi-purpose blacktop area
- Play equipment
- Four covered basketball hoops
- Two adjustable outdoor basketball hoops
- Gymnasium

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Basketball
KYBA

Claggett Creek Middle School

- One irrigated multipurpose field (temporary soccer goals)
- One football field
- One paved track approx. ½ mile around the fields
- One sprinting track
- Three baseball backstops
- One small basketball court with two backboards
- Gymnasium
- Auxiliary gym

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB

Basketball
KYBA, Salem-Keizer Youth Basketball (SKY)
Whiteaker Middle School

- One football field
- Two full sized soccer fields
- One ½ size soccer
- One full size baseball field with back stop
- One ½ mile bark trail around athletic fields
- One paved 100m sprint tract
- Main gymnasium
- Auxiliary gym
- Small gym

Organization Facility Use:
Little League
KLLB, Junior Baseball of Oregon

Soccer
Keizer Soccer Club

Basketball
KYBA, SKY

McNary High School

- One football field
- ¼ mile track around field
- One grandstand
- Two baseball fields
- Two multi-use fields
- Track & field sports area
- Main gymnasium
- Two auxiliary gyms
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1.1 REGIONAL CONTEXT

The City of Keizer is situated in Marion County, Oregon to the west of the I-5 corridor and directly north of the State’s capital, Salem. Its location in the center of the Willamette Valley provides its residents access to a wide variety of destinations; the Pacific Coast, the Cascade Mountains and the greater Portland-Vancouver metro area are all within an hour to an hour and a half drive of Keizer’s central valley location.

The City is bounded by the Willamette River to the west, unincorporated farmland and wetlands to the north, Interstate 5 (I-5) and the railroad lines to the east, and the northern city limits of Salem to the south (Fig. 1.1).

Figure 1.1
Regional Context

Portland - 45 miles north, Lincoln City - 60 miles west, and Mt. Hood – 80 miles east
1.2 PLANNING AREA
The primary planning area includes the lands within the city limits of Keizer designated in the long-range comprehensive plan adopted in January of 1987. The secondary planning area includes the shared urban growth boundary (UGB) with the City of Salem. Expansion of the existing UGB will most likely be explored in the coming year. Keizer’s close proximity to Salem provides its residents with additional park and recreational opportunities that will be considered during the parks planning process.

1.3 NATURAL RESOURCES
The natural resources in the Keizer area are important for a number of reasons. The city’s terrain, water resources, and natural open space affect a site’s potential for development. While lands containing natural resources can be considered environmentally sensitive with limited development potential, they are often conducive to both active and passive recreational uses.

Keizer has a number of undeveloped park locations along the Willamette River and Claggett Creek where the natural environment and public access to these sites will need to be considered. Creating connections to the Willamette River and enhancing recreational opportunities is a long-term goal of the City Council. Creating connections among the existing developed parks and undeveloped park locations will foster a comprehensive parks system that can meet the demands of Keizer’s growing and changing population.

Aside from providing park and recreation opportunities, the protection of natural resource areas can have a number of other benefits such as protecting unique landforms, maintaining habitat, preserving riparian and vegetative cover, creating educational opportunities, and preserving and maintaining water quality. Keizer’s Comprehensive Master Plan designates a number of areas as conservation resource areas; these areas could be looked to as potential locations for future park land acquisitions.

Terrain
The City of Keizer is located in a relatively flat area of land, making portions of it susceptible to the 100 year floodplain and constraining development. The banks of the Willamette River, the full length of Claggett Creek and portions of Labish Ditch are located within the 100 year floodplain. Each of these water features has existing
developed and undeveloped parks along their corridors. The most varied topography is along the Claggett Creek corridor, which currently provides natural open spaces, areas of limited access, and wetland habitat along the length of its corridor within residential neighbors.

**Water Resources**

Keizer maintains four waterfront park properties located along the Willamette River: Keizer Rapids, Palma Ciea, Sunset and River’s Edge Parks. These park locations can provide the community with access to the river and opportunities to create waterway connections to other parks along the Willamette River corridor: Salem’s River Road, Wallace Marine and Minto-Brown Parks, Spong’s Landing County Park, and the Willamette Mission State Park.

A long term goal adopted by Keizer’s City Council is to connect Keizer citizens with the region and the Willamette River. City Council formed the Regional Intergovernmental Visions Enhancing River Resources Task Force (RIVERR), to address this goal. The efforts of this task force have resulted in the creation of the Keizer Rapids Master Plan located just outside Keizer’s western boundary along the Willamette River.

The city partnered with Marion County, the City of Salem, Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department (OSPRD), the National Parks Service, the State Marine Board and various nonprofits to acquire the riverfront property and develop a park master plan. The plan was developed through the extensive outreach efforts of the RIVERR task force, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Keizer Parks Board and the Keizer Community Development Department. Opportunities for input were provided through booths at festivals and fairs, and a mail survey. Informational materials were developed and distributed to set forth the master plan goals and objectives, outline the park’s history and process, and address the upcoming parks needs and anticipated funding.

The City has entered into a long-term lease with OSPRD allowing for the operation of the future park facility, which has been planned to have waterfront access and activities, a boat dock, nature trails, a wetland interpretive area, a demonstration garden and education facilities, picnic areas, playfields, play equipment and an amphitheater. Keizer Rapids Park will become a regional park along the Willamette
River Greenway connecting Keizer and its citizens to the greater region.

**Wildlife Habitat, Open Space, and Vegetation**
When the *City of Keizer Comprehensive Plan* was adopted in 1987, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife found no significant wildlife habitat areas within Keizer. Open spaces were considered to be the existing city parks, the Willamette River and Claggett Creek corridors, McNary golf course, school grounds and the floodplains along the northwestern edge of the city.

The Willamette River, Labish Ditch and Claggett Creek provide vegetation and habitat for wildlife. Much of the land around these water features has either been left in their natural state for purposes of storm water management or as a consequence of limited existing access to these locations. The Willamette River is protected by a greenway boundary but much of this area is already developed for residential uses.

**1.4 CLIMATE**
Keizer’s weather is largely determined by weather systems moving west to east from the Pacific Ocean and then over the Coast Range. Average daily temperatures in the summer range from 52 ° to 82 ° Fahrenheit and in the winter from 34 ° to 47 ° Fahrenheit. Keizer’s annual precipitation is approximately 40 inches, with the majority of rainfall occurring between October and May. Keizer typically experiences five or fewer days with snow cover each year. Overall, the climate of Keizer is similar to that of the rest of the Willamette Valley with mild wet winters and warm dry summers.
1.5 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Demographic characteristics can influence recreational interests and level of participation. Factors such as age and income can significantly affect an individual’s ability to pursue and participate in recreational activities. To a lesser extent, employment, education and ethnicity also play a role. The demographic information presented herein is obtained from the 2000 decennial Census unless otherwise noted.

Population Trends

The City of Keizer experienced a period of rapid growth during the 1990s (Table 1.1). The rate of growth appears to be leveling off, but Keizer is experiencing a higher rate of growth than the City of Salem, Marion County and the State.

Table 1.1
Population Growth 1990-2004: City of Keizer, Marion County, Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,842,321</td>
<td>3,421,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>228,483</td>
<td>284,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Keizer</td>
<td>21,884</td>
<td>32,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Salem</td>
<td>107,786</td>
<td>136,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Age

The age distribution of a population can indicate the type of recreation opportunities that are most needed. In general, youth tend to participate in recreation activities more frequently than any other age group. Youth generally favor more active and competitive activities, such as basketball, baseball, and soccer. Typically, as people age, their participation in competitive recreation decreases, but not their interest in walking, jogging and cycling.

Younger adults (ages 18-35) also participate in active recreation and typically form the core of adult competitive sports. Older adults (ages 35-65) typically have less time to devote to recreational activities and tend to have a more passive interest in organized recreation.
programs. For them, recreational time is scarce and is often limited to weekends and occasional evenings. Table 1.2 compares age distributions in Keizer with the cities of Salem, Albany, McMinnville and Woodburn, Marion County and the State of Oregon.

Table 1.2
Age Distributions, 2000: Selected Geographic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Population</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 19 and Younger</td>
<td>Age 20 to 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Oregon</td>
<td>3,421,399</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>284,834</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>136,924</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>32,203</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>40,852</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1.2 illustrates Keizer has a slightly larger youth population than its neighbor Salem. The median age is slightly higher than Salem and Marion County, but falls just below the state’s median age. Keizer has the smallest retiree-aged population of all the compared cities, but varies little from the County and State. Keizer has a demographic distribution similar to communities its size, Marion County and the State of the Oregon.

Table 1.3 breaks down Keizer’s age groups even further to reveal that the largest percentage of children in 2000 were under age 5, with the next two largest percentage groups of children’s being between the ages 5 to 9 and 10 to 14. Young adults (ages 15 to 24) represent a smaller percentage of the youth population respectively.
### Table 1.3
Age Breakdowns, 2000: City of Keizer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group (years)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and older</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32203</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000*

The low number of young adults aged 20-24 years suggests an outmigration of Keizer youth as they reach adulthood. The largepopulation of adults in the 25-54 suggests that people migrate toKeizer when starting a family. Combining the information from bothTable 1.2 and 1.3, Keizer appears to attract young families,particularly those with children under the age of 15.
Educational Attainment

An individual's level of education can affect his or her recreation participation for several reasons. Lower education levels are generally associated with lower levels of income, which may mean people have less income available to spend on non-essentials such as recreation activities, particularly high-cost activities like golf and skiing. In addition, education levels can impact the types of marketing and outreach materials the City sends, because these should be geared toward the audience to ensure that they are understandable to everyone in the community. Table 1.4, below, details the comparison of educational attainment among Keizer, Salem, Marion County and the State of Oregon.

Table 1.4
Educational Attainment, 2000: Selected Geographic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment, Population Age 25 and Older</th>
<th>City of Keizer</th>
<th>City of Salem</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th Grade, no diploma</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate, includes equivalency</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Population Age 25 and Older                       | 20,740        | 86,209        | 177,683       | 2,250,998 |

Keizer has a larger percentage of individuals with an associate’s degree, some college (with no degree), and a high school diploma or equivalency than the City of Salem, Marion County and the State of Oregon. In contrast, Keizer has a smaller percentage of individuals who have earned an advanced degree, but has a higher percentage than the county with a bachelor’s degree.
**Income**

Income levels also provide important information for recreation planning. In general, people with higher incomes tend to be more active and participate in more expensive types of activities. Due to financial constraints, lower-income communities may face limitations in recreation planning and programming. In addition, such communities may need to evaluate whether their pricing policies and scholarship programs make recreation activities reasonably accessible.

A comparison of the 2000 household incomes and per capita income are shown in Table 1.5 below.

**Table 1.5**

Per Capita and Household Income, 2000: Selected Geographic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Median Household Income (1999 Dollars)</th>
<th>Per Capita Income (1999 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Oregon</td>
<td>$40,916</td>
<td>$20,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>$40,314</td>
<td>$18,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>$38,881</td>
<td>$19,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td><strong>$45,052</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,119</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>$39,409</td>
<td>$18,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>$38,953</td>
<td>$17,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>$33,722</td>
<td>$12,954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000*

Keizer has a median household income higher than that of Salem, Marion County and the State of Oregon and falls slightly below the State for per capita income. The higher income level could be a reflection of the high percentage of the population with some college and associate’s degrees.
Employment
Overall Keizer has a similar employment distribution as Salem, but the variations between Marion County and the State of Oregon are marginal (Table 1.6). The largest proportion of occupations is in the management and professional related careers with the second largest occupation being sales and service. The distribution of jobs could result in the higher median incomes for Keizer.

Table 1.6
Occupation Types, 2000: Selected Geographic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>City of Keizer</th>
<th>City of Salem</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>State of Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, professional and related</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 16 years and older</td>
<td>15,425</td>
<td>60,661</td>
<td>126,682</td>
<td>1,627,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000*
Ethnicity

Ethnicity can be important from a recreation participation standpoint, because higher participation levels in some types of recreational activities are associated with certain ethnic groups. This could increase the demand for certain types of facilities. Table 1.7 compares the ethnic composition of Keizer to the City of Salem, Marion County, and State of Oregon.

Table 1.7
Ethnic Composition, 2000: Selected Geographic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>City of Keizer</th>
<th>City of Salem</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>State of Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>32,203</td>
<td>136,924</td>
<td>284,834</td>
<td>3,421,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latino or Hispanic¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>City of Keizer</th>
<th>City of Salem</th>
<th>Marion County</th>
<th>State of Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic¹</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>19,973</td>
<td>48,714</td>
<td>217,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Individuals selecting this category can be of any race category

Keizer’s ethnic composition is predominantly White with small Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Asian populations. Keizer has a larger population identifying with two or more races or some other race.

In addition to the data shown in Table 1.7, 12.3% of Keizer residents identified themselves as Latino or Hispanic, which lies between the percentage of the State of Oregon at 8% and Marion County with 17.1%. The Latino or Hispanic category is an additional category to
the Census race question and individuals selecting this category can be of any race.

1.6 LAND USE
Land use plays an important role in the location, distribution, and availability of park and recreational facilities. In terms of recreation planning, residential areas need parks to fulfill the day-to-day recreation needs of community residents. Higher density residential areas may have different recreation needs from lower density areas. Commercial and industrial areas typically do not generate as much need for parks and recreation facilities. However, there may be specific park needs for commercial and industrial areas, depending on the types of development and the City’s goals for these areas.

The majority of land is zoned single family residential throughout all sections of the city. Small areas of medium density residential are concentrated around Staats Lake and northern central portions of Keizer. Commercial uses are concentrated along the southern portion of the city along River Road. Industrial areas are located along the I-5 corridor in the northeast corner of the city and the southeast corner along Cherry Avenue. The City of Keizer Comprehensive Master Plan states that when the urban growth boundary expands, it will primarily be to the north end of town toward Clear Lake.

Table 1.8 on the next page describes the amount of land designated for the major use categories according to the City’s available GIS data. Based on the available zoning data 69.0% of Keizer’s land is dedicated to residential uses, 6.6% public use, 5.4% commercial uses, 4.8% agricultural and farm use, 4.6% mixed use, 3.1% industrial use, 2.6% urban transition and 2.5% employment.
### Table 1.8

#### Amount and Percent of Land by Planned Use - Built and Buildable Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Classification</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO - Commercial Office</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR - Commercial Retail</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EG - Employment General</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IBP - Industrial Business Park</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MU - Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>174.7</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P – Public¹</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>253.9</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT - Urban Transition</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI - Agriculture Industrial</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CG - Commercial General</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CG-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CM - Commercial Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CM-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFU - Exclusive Farm Use</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFU-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IG - Industrial General</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IG-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RL - Limited Density</strong></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RL-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>680</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RM - Medium Density</strong></td>
<td>605</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RM-LU Limited Use</strong></td>
<td>614</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RS - Residential Single</strong></td>
<td>9,091</td>
<td>2,152.5</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RS-OIO - Odor Improvement</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlay</strong></td>
<td>9,096</td>
<td>2,183.8</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Data Value Assigned</strong></td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,552</td>
<td>3,822.8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: July 2006 GIS zoning data.

¹ Does not include road right-of-way
1.7 HOUSING
As of the 2000 census, there were 12,774 housing units in Keizer. Of these 94.8% were occupied and 65% of these household units were owner occupied, with the remaining 35% renter occupied. This pattern is similar to Marion County and the State. As previously noted, Keizer has experienced rapid growth in recent years. In the past five years, housing construction has continued at a steady pace and many additional units have been completed and occupied, but as the availability of developable land decreases Keizer’s population growth will slow.

Table 1.9
Available Housing and Occupancy, 2000: Selected Geographies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Available Housing Units</th>
<th>Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>Percent Owner</th>
<th>Percent Renter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Oregon</td>
<td>1,452,709</td>
<td>1,333,723</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>108,174</td>
<td>101,641</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>53,817</td>
<td>50,676</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>12,774</td>
<td>12,110</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>17,374</td>
<td>16,108</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>9,834</td>
<td>9,367</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>6,824</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000
1.8 POPULATION PROJECTIONS
Keizer has been experiencing a steady period of growth since its incorporation in 1982. The most current population projection was conducted for the 2000 City of Keizer Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), amended in 2004. The Mid Willamette Valley Council of Governments based the projection on the amount of developable land (Table 1.10). At this point in time Keizer is nearly out of developable lands and a discussion regarding the expansion of the UGB has not taken place.

Table 1.10
Summary Population Forecast of 2000 Population and 2030 Forecast Salem-Keizer UGB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salem UGB</td>
<td>171,072</td>
<td>242,761</td>
<td>71,689</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer UGB</td>
<td>32,203</td>
<td>39,994</td>
<td>7,791</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem-Keizer UGB</td>
<td>203,275</td>
<td>282,755</td>
<td>79,480</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Excerpt from the 2030 Regional Transportation Systems Plan Table 3-1

The current certified population estimate for 2005 for Keizer is a population of 34,735, which is 87% of the projected growth through 2030. The current population projection is limited by the assumption of a static UGB. If there is no expansion of the UGB little population growth would be expected in the coming years.

1.9 CONCLUSION
The Community Profile for the City of Keizer and its planning area highlights several key issues that will be addressed through the parks and recreation planning process. Specifically, preliminary examination of the City’s large populations of youth under the age of 15 and middle-aged adults may be underserved. In addition, the growing young adult and aging populations may require specially tailored facilities and programming. As the City’s population multiplies and when the UGB expands, it will be important to ensure provision of additional parkland, recreational facilities and programming. The current planning effort will suggest the best means of accommodating a Keizer population that is growing in both size and complexity.
APPENDIX C:
Discussion Paper #2- Existing Resources
City of Keizer, Parks Master Plan Update

March 2007
2.1 INTRODUCTION

This document reviews the city of Keizer’s current role in park and recreation services, defines park classifications, and reviews the park and recreation facility inventories. It also provides an overview of park maintenance and the types of recreation programs available in the community.

Role in Park and Recreation Services

Keizer provides and maintains a basic system of parks commonly found in small communities. Due to the proximity of recreation resources throughout Marion County, Keizer is not the sole recreation provider in the area. This means that residents have the choice among multiple providers for many leisure services.

The City has a park system that supports a range of recreation experiences that include both active and passive recreation. Athletic fields and courts are provided at Bob Newton Family, Carlson Skate/Chalmers Jones, Claggett Creek, Keizer Little League, Northview Terrace, and Willamette Manor parks. Play equipment and picnicking facilities are available at Bob Newton Family, Ben Miller Family, Claggett Creek, Country Glen, Meadows, Northview Terrace and Willamette Manor parks. Many of Keizer’s park lands are undeveloped, providing opportunities for future recreational activities.

The City does not currently offer recreation programming. Organized sports are provided by private organizations such as Keizer Youth Basketball Association, the Boys and Girls Club, Keizer Soccer Club, Keizer Little League and other volunteer organizations.

2.2 PARK LAND

Park land is classified to assist in planning for a community’s recreation needs. A park system is composed of a hierarchy of various park types, each offering recreation and/or natural area opportunities. Separately, each park type may serve only one function, but collectively the system will serve the entire needs of the community. By classifying park land by its function, a community can evaluate its needs and plan more easily, providing a more efficient, cost effective and usable park system that minimizes conflicts between park users and neighbors.
Park Classifications

The 1992 City of Keizer, Comprehensive Park System Development Plan addresses parks and open space classification in Section 1: Park Classifications, and includes the following six categories:

- Community Parks
- Neighborhood Parks
- Natural Areas
- General Open Space
- Specialty Areas and Facilities
- School Facilities

Community parks are defined as larger sites developed for organized play and containing a wide range of facilities. They usually have multiuse sport fields or other active use facilities as well as the more passive oriented facilities.

Neighborhood parks are defined as small park areas designed for limited uses, utilized for passive and unstructured play. They often contain multiuse open space, children’s playground, multipurpose paved areas, picnic areas and trail systems.

Natural areas are defined as areas which are undeveloped and left in a natural state of minimal development to preserve the natural character of the site.

General Open Space is defined as open space under City control and accessible as a passive use area but without structured functions.

Specialty areas and facilities are defined as facilities within the City that serve a single specialized purpose.

School facilities are included in the park classifications given their contribution to the City’s recreational opportunities.
Park Reclassification

After review of the Comprehensive Plan park classifications, MIG recommends revising these categorizations to describe the existing park system more fully and capture the range and potential of the future park system. While several classifications are quite appropriate, others fail to provide adequate operational definitions. The recommended park classifications are:

- Regional Parks
- Large City Parks
- Small City Parks
- Waterfront Parks
- Special Use Areas
- Natural Area/Open Space

**Regional Parks:** Regional parks are sites planned to provide recreational activities for the city and surrounding region. These parks often have a mix of passive and active recreational activities. Regional parks are typically larger sites with a defining feature such as a butte, water feature, wildlife area or other natural element. Regional parks often have their own trail network connecting facilities on the site and facilities able to accommodate large numbers of visitors throughout the course of the seasons.

**Large City Parks:** Large city parks are planned to provide active and structured recreation opportunities, as well as passive and non-organized opportunities for individual and family activities. Large city parks often have sport fields or similar facilities as the central focus of the park with play equipment, picnic areas, pathways and open spaces available. The recommended distribution of large city parks is a park location within 1-2 miles of all residents. Park size can range from five acres to 20+ acres, with an optimal size of at least 10 to 15 acres.

**Small City Parks:** Small city parks are a combination playground and park, designed primarily for non-supervised, non-organized, recreation activities. They are generally small in size and attract local residents within a walking distance of one-quarter mile to one-half mile. Facilities typically found in a small city park include children’s play equipment, picnic areas, pathways, open grassy areas for passive use, outdoor basketball or tennis courts, and multi-use sports fields for soccer, softball and baseball. The size of these parks ranges between 1 to 5 acres.

**Waterfront Parks:** Waterfront parks are distinguished by their function of providing access to large bodies of water such as rivers and lakes. These parks are generally designed to support enjoyment of active and passive water related activities, such as swimming, fishing, boating, and bird or wildlife viewing. Facilities often include boat launches, docks, beaches,
viewpoints, picnic areas, trails, and pathways. While other types of parks may contain rivers, lakes, or waterfront as part of a range of amenities, the primary purpose of waterfront parks is to provide water access.

**Special Use Area Park:** Special use areas are stand-alone recreation sites or miscellaneous park lands designed to support a specific use. Facilities that are typically included in this classification are sports field complexes, community centers, community gardens, skate parks and aquatic centers. Specialized facilities may also be provided within a park of another classification.

**Natural Area/Open Space Park:** Natural areas are undeveloped or partially developed lands primarily left in its natural state with recreation use as a secondary objective. It is usually land owned or managed by a governmental agency and may have limited public access. This type of land often includes informal open spaces, wetlands, steep hillsides, and heavily wooded areas. Environmentally sensitive areas that include wildlife habitats, stream and creek corridors, or unique and/or endangered plant species can also be considered natural open space. Natural open spaces may serve as trail corridors, wildlife viewing areas, or open areas for quiet contemplation. Natural open space parks generally support none organized recreational activities and can vary in size.

**Existing Park Inventory**

Table 2.1 on page six depicts Keizer’s park inventory by recommended classification. In addition to developed park sites, this inventory includes undeveloped and planned sites. A complete inventory is included as an appendix in with this document. The ‘Existing Park Facilities’ map on the following page depicts the park type and locations of Keizer’s parks.
Table 2.1
Summary of Existing Park Land: Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Park Land¹</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Park</strong></td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Rapids Park</td>
<td>120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large City Park</strong></td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small City Park</strong></td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park <em>formerly Wilark</em></td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers-Jones Park / Carlson Skate Park²</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Park</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Use Area Park</strong></td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League Park</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Area/Open Space Park</strong></td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Park</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Park</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge Park</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undeveloped Park</strong></td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bair Park</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Station Park</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whittam Park</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma Ciea Park</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River's Edge Park</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Park acreage calculations based on GIS parcel information.
² Carlson Skate Park is a special use area within Chalmers-Jones Park

Current Park Land Level of Service

The current level of service is the ratio of the existing amount of park land minus undeveloped parks to the population, and it is expressed in terms of acres per 1,000 residents. This figure offers a means for comparison with other communities and can be used to help project future park land needs.
The population figure used to calculate these ratios is the U.S. Census 2005 American Community Survey estimate of 34,735. The acreage figures are based on the City of Keizer’s park inventory, as contained in Table 2.1.

Table 2.2
Existing Park Level of Service: Developed Parks Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Park Land</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Existing LOS (acres per 1,000 residents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large City Park</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small City Park</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Area</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area/Open Space</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearby Resources

The Keizer planning area enjoys proximity and easy access to several park and recreational amenities in the Willamette Valley. The closest State Park facility serving a regional population is Willamette Mission State Park located to the north of Keizer. It is a 1,680 acre park located on the eastern bank of the Willamette River with waterfront access and activities, picnicking facilities, tent and horse camping, natural areas, hiking and biking trails.

Marion County has 15 developed and four undeveloped park facilities throughout the county with seven developed parks in close proximity to Keizer. The closest of these facilities is Spong’s Landing along the eastern bank of the Willamette River. The 62 acre park provides waterfront access and activities, picnicking facilities, play areas and ball fields.

The City of Salem has 47 developed and 23 undeveloped parks on approximately 1,600 acres of park land. Salem has three parks facilities accessible from the Willamette River waterway connections: Riverfront, Wallace Marine and Minto-Brown Island Parks. Riverfront Park is a 23 acre park located in downtown Salem with waterfront access, picnic facilities, play areas, multi-use pathways, an amphitheater and educational facilities. Wallace Marine Park is a 114 acre park with play equipment, ball fields, picnicking facilities and open areas. Minto-Brown Island Park is a 890 acre natural park with a play area, picnicking facilities, multi-use paths, and an off-leash dog area.
School Sites

Schools are an important resource for recreation facilities such as sports fields, playgrounds, and gymnasiums. The Salem-Keizer School District is the public school organization serving Keizer. Table 2.5 details the facilities available on public school sites in the planning area.

Table 2.5
Summary of Existing Public School Facilities: Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>Play equipment, 1 multi-use sports field, 1 youth backstop, 2 covered basketball courts, Gymnasium, Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>Play equipment, 1 covered blacktop, 2 basketball hoops, 1 open area blacktop, Bark chip running trail, 2 back stops on large field, Open space area, Gymnasium, Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge</td>
<td>1 soccer field, 1 youth baseball field, Play equipment, 4 covered backboards, Running track, Walking path, Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser</td>
<td>1 soccer field, 1 youth baseball field, Play equipment, Walking track, Indoor basketball, Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>Play equipment, 1 soccer field, 2 youth baseball, 2 covered play areas, 2 covered backboards, Walking path, Indoor basketball, Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1 soccer field (no goals), 2 ‘Big Toy’ play areas, 1 gravel play area, 2 backboards, Track surrounds field, Covered general play area, Gymnasium, Indoor basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle</td>
<td>1 soccer field, 3 youth backstops, 4 covered backboards, 2 adjustable backboards, Play equipment, Gymnasium, 1 open field, 1 multi-use blacktop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>1 multipurpose field, 1 football field, 1 paved half mile track, 1 sprinting track, 3 baseball backstops, 1 small basketball court, Gymnasium, Auxiliary gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteaker</td>
<td>1 football field, 2 soccer fields, 1 youth soccer field, 1 baseball field, 1 half mile bark trail, 1 paved 100m sprint tract, Main gymnasium, Auxiliary gym, Small gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNary</td>
<td>1 football field, 1 quarter mile track, 1 grandstand, Gymnasium, 2 auxiliary gyms, 2 baseball fields, 2 multi-use fields, Track &amp; field sports area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 RECREATION FACILITIES

Athletic Fields

The most functional types of athletic facilities are those adequately developed and specifically designed to serve particular functions. Table 2.6 contains an inventory of park athletic fields categorized by type.

Table 2.6
Summary of Athletic Fields by Type: Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keizer Park</th>
<th>Youth Baseball Field</th>
<th>Soccer Field</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Basketball Hoop/Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family (formerly Wilark)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The athletic fields in the Keizer parks inventory are maintained by one full time public works staff with seasonal employees. The exception is Keizer Little Park, which is maintained by the Keizer Little League Association. Keizer’s school sites provide the majority of athletic facilities available in the community. Table 2.7 contains an inventory of Keizer school athletic fields categorized by type. The majority of available sports fields are managed by the City of Salem with assistance from Salem–Keizer Public Schools. The sports fields are scheduled by the Recreation Coordinator for Salem or by the Facility Rental Coordinator of the school district.

Table 2.7
Summary of Salem-Keizer Public Schools Athletic Fields: Keizer Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keizer School</th>
<th>Baseball Field</th>
<th>Softball Field</th>
<th>Youth Baseball</th>
<th>Youth Soccer</th>
<th>Youth Field</th>
<th>Multi-Use Field</th>
<th>Football Field</th>
<th>Basketball court (full)</th>
<th>Basketball court (half)</th>
<th>Basketball hoop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-Use Trails

Except for pathways within developed parks, Keizer has no developed public trails in its inventory. The Chalmers Jones/Carlson Skate Park contains a portion of the Edgell Fitness Trail and Willamette Manor, Meadows, Country Glen and Clear Lake parks have paved paths on the properties.

Indoor Facilities

Keizer has no indoor recreational facilities. The Salem-Keizer Public School District provides indoor facilities such as gymnasiums, basketball courts and classrooms for various purposes.

2.4 RECREATION PROGRAMS

The City of Keizer does not, at this time, provide recreational programs. However, a variety of organized sports programming is available to both youth and adults in the area. These programs are operated by private organizations and the City of Salem.

Salem currently provides year round aquatics programming for all ages at the Olinger Pool facility. Youth sports programs are available for grades kindergarten through eight: soccer, basketball, karate, dance, kayaking, skiing, environmental education, and summer sports camps. Senior recreational activities are provided by the Salem Senior Center with activities such as painting, discussion groups, aerobics, performing arts and special events hosting.

During 2006 the city of Salem was awarded a $50 million grant from the Salvation Army to build the Kroc Community Center on a 10.6 acre site in northeast Salem near Keizer’s city limits. The site is located in the Northgate Urban Renewal District, which places the center in close proximity to Claggett Creek Middle School and the residents of southeast Keizer. The building will house an aquatics center, gymnasium, fitness center, classrooms and a daycare center when completed.
2.5 PARKS MAINTENANCE

The parks budget is housed within the City’s general fund and staffed from Public Works with a labor allotment totaling a 1.17 full time equivalency position (FTE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 - 2006</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Superintendent</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Utility Worker</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support Staff</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance of Keizer’s parks system is performed by one full time Public Works staff with the support of seasonal employees. Keizer’s staffing ratio is 1 staff per 31 acres of developed park land and this is a smaller ratio than communities of a similar size. Table 2.8 summarizes the annual expenditures for parks over the past four years. An average of $75,804 has been paid in personnel expenses for parks. Personnel expenses include salaries, Medicare, retirement, insurance benefits, unemployment and worker’s compensation. Operations expenses which include basic utilities, office materials, travel, equipment maintenance, engineering and contractual services has averaged $45,617 a year over the past four years.

Table 2.8
Four Year Parks Expenditures 2003 – 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>$69,696</td>
<td>$67,809</td>
<td>$81,421</td>
<td>$84,291</td>
<td>$89,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$37,960</td>
<td>$42,989</td>
<td>$40,505</td>
<td>$56,877</td>
<td>$62,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,137</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,989</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>$56,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.9 details Keizer’s capital projects fund for parks. The total resources available dramatically increased during the 2005-2006 budget with the addition of $750,000 in community development grants for Keizer Rapids Park. The total amount of system development fees has decreased in the past couple of years. The decrease could be attributed to the dwindling supply of developable land within the Salem-Keizer UGB and the slow down of new housing developments.
Table 2.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$750,000²</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$9,497</td>
<td>$9,769</td>
<td>$20,282</td>
<td>$22,074</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development Fees</td>
<td>$194,950</td>
<td>$193,070</td>
<td>$68,971</td>
<td>$125,534</td>
<td>$172,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>$8,419</td>
<td>$22,299</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Resources</td>
<td>$212,866</td>
<td>$225,138</td>
<td>$91,383</td>
<td>$897,608</td>
<td>$191,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Open fund balance of restricted capital for 2002-2003 budget $473,628
² All funds are earmarked for Keizer Rapids Park

Keizer has historically spent very little in preventive parks systems maintenance with a slight increase in the 2006-2007 budget. Table 2.10 details the capital outlay expenditures for the past four years.

Table 2.10
Capital Outlay 2003 – 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,942</td>
<td>$20,426</td>
<td>$16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GFP Capital Outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,942</td>
<td>$20,426</td>
<td>$24,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project Funds Capital Outlay (CPF)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$1,722</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$41,722</td>
<td>$1,184,929¹</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>22,967</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td>$130,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,277,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CPF Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$2,597</td>
<td>$332</td>
<td>$64,689</td>
<td>$1,198,073</td>
<td>$1,682,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Capital Outlay                      | $2,597           | $332             | $75,631          | $1,218,499      | $1,706,900        |

¹ Much of the land acquisition costs were for Keizer Rapids Park funded with Community Development Grants.

The 2005-2006 total operating costs for Keizer parks was $56,877. This figure is used to derive the cost per acre for maintaining developed parks (Table 2.11). Keizer’s cost per acre is $1,558.
Based on MIG experience, a typical average cost of maintenance for a parks and recreation system is about $3,500-$5,000 an acre in the Pacific Northwest. This means Keizer is spending an insufficient amount to maintain its existing 36.5 acres of developed parks.

2.6 CONCLUSION

The City of Keizer’s park system contains several different facility types and a relatively diverse set of amenities, but the existing level of service is insufficient for a city of its size. The addition of Keizer Rapids Park as a regional facility will assist in bringing Keizer’s level of service up on a city-wide scale, but small and large city park access will need further assessment. Keizer has a unique opportunity to increase connections to the Willamette River with its four waterfront properties and enhance waterway connections to regional facilities.

The distribution of Keizer’s developed parks is primarily east of Claggett Creek and in southeast Keizer. There are opportunities for passive and active park sites within the current stock of undeveloped park land, but if the park system is to expand, maintenance expenditures will need to increase. The current maintenance budget is inadequate to serve the existing 36.5 acres of developed parks. The addition of Keizer Rapids Park at 120 acres and the development of Palma Ciea, River’s Edge and Bair Parks will place additional strains on an already thin budget.
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3A.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Recreation Needs Assessment is to establish in quantifiable terms the need for park land, park amenities, and recreation facilities in Keizer. This document presents the methods, data, and trends used to analyze community needs, along with the findings from the analysis related to park locations and basic amenities. The companion to this report is entitled Discussion Paper 3B: Recreation Needs Assessment: Recreation Facilities, addresses the need for sports fields and outdoor recreation amenities in Keizer.

The process for completing the needs assessment in Keizer included the following:

- Inventorying and assessing the existing park and recreation amenities in the community;
- Evaluating public input on park and recreation needs;
- Analyzing park land and amenities using a combination of methods to determine a recommended level of service (LOS); and
- Applying the LOS standards to determine current and future park land and amenity needs.

The community needs identified in this report will be used as a basis for determining recommendations for system-wide improvements, including potentially acquiring or developing new park sites, improving existing parks, and partnering with other service providers. The Recreation Needs Assessment report provides the information necessary to make informed decisions on how many parks and facilities to provide in Keizer now and in the future. However, it is possible that the City will decide on actions that do not meet all needs identified during the needs assessment. A portion of future community needs may be met by other agencies, such as school districts or private developers. The community may also decide to prioritize some needs higher than others, and to make compromises about meeting other needs. The provision of parks and facilities will also be influenced by funding options, land availability, potential partnerships, and other opportunities and constraints.
IDENTIFYING SERVICE INDICATORS

Keizer is an almost fully built out community with an established system of developed parks providing various amenities. The developed parks are a source of pride for the community but do not satisfy the full range of recreation needs of Keizer’s residents. Based on input received through the Parks Advisory Board, three community meetings and a community forum, three indicators for basic park service provision were identified for Keizer:

- **Public Park Access.** Every resident should have convenient access to some type of developed public park.

- **Children Play Areas.** Every resident should have convenient walking access to children play areas, and the walking distance should be manageable even by young children.

- **Linkages & Connections.** Connections between the parks via pedestrian walkways, bicycle trails, and existing waterways were identified as a major need by Keizer residents. Residents feel that viewing Keizer parks as a complete system with local and regional connections is vital to increasing community ownership of the parks system.

Each of these services is described and analyzed within this report.
3A.2 METHODOLOGY

MIG developed the following methodology for the evaluating the parks in Keizer’s planning area.

A. GEOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

A four step process was devised to determine the level of service for each.

(a) Step 1 – Identify Barriers
The first step in assessing need for Keizer’s basic park services included identifying the applicable barriers for each class of City Park. Barriers within Keizer include:

- Lack of park connectivity,
- Lack of access points to park sites, and
- Major roadways: River Road., Wheatland Road., Chemawa Road. and Lockhaven Drive

(b) Step 2 – Identify Modal Type
The barriers that affect access to each basic park type depend primarily on the mode of travel that is expected. If recreation participants are expected to drive, the only barriers are gaps in the street network. If most park users are expected to walk or bike, then all of the barriers listed above should be considered. In Keizer, all barriers apply to city parks because residents should be able to walk or bike to a basic recreational amenity. This concept is supported by the City’s transportation system plan objective for Keizer to increase the number of trips made by pedestrians: *Encourage local land use patterns, densities, and designs that decrease trip lengths and that support walking as a practical and attractive transportation mode. (City of Keizer Transportation Systems Plan, September 2000, Amended May 2004).*

(c) Step 3 – Identify Service Area Reach
The distance people are willing to travel to access a park is dependent on the appeal of its amenities and, as mentioned above, the mode of travel chosen for the trip. People are willing to travel further for amenities that are more unique and larger in scale. Recreation participants are also willing to travel further when traveling by car versus when traveling by foot or by bike. Based on public input, basic park services should be accessible on foot or by bicycle. The service area reach for each amenity is listed in Table 3A.2a, below.
Table 3A.2a
Service Area Reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Service Area Reach</th>
<th>Modal Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Public Park</td>
<td>1-2 miles</td>
<td>Automobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small City Park</td>
<td>.25-.5 mile</td>
<td>Bicycle or Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Play Areas</td>
<td>.25-.5 mile</td>
<td>Bicycle or Walk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Step 4 – Determine Service Area Type

Service areas can be determined using two types of methods: 1) Euclidian straight-line measure, also known as the ‘as the crow flies’ distance, or 2) network distance method. A straight line distance assumes that park users can travel directly from point A to point B with no diversions. The network distance method evaluates the route the park user travels using the road and/or trail network to get from point A to point B. Network distance analysis assesses the proximity and access of park facilities. Considering the network routes actually used by residents is especially important when connectivity is less than ideal. In Keizer only existing roads were considered for assessing the current level of park service, since there is no existing off road trail system within the city.

B. Evaluating Current Level of Service

A geographic analysis was conducted for two of the three indicators (park access and children play areas), using the four-step process outlined above. The result is depicted graphically on a map, which shows gaps in service as well as overlaps.

C. Recommending a Level of Service

The planning team developed a strategy to serve the areas identified as underserved through the current level of service evaluation. In some cases, specific recommendations are proposed to address service deficiencies. For park land, specific acreage standards are proposed that will provide adequate service for the projected build-out population of 39,994 residents. These standards are expressed in terms of acreage per 1,000 residents. Each standard was then applied to the current population of 34,735 residents to determine existing needs. Existing surplus/need was then calculated by subtracting the calculated need from the existing inventory.

---

1 Population figure from 2005 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- **Public Park Access**: Keizer will eventually provide 4.98 acres of developed parks per 1,000 residents upon the completion of Keizer Rapids, Keizer Station, Palma Ciea, River’s Edge and Bair Parks. The available undeveloped parks will be needed to adequately serve Keizer’s projected 2030 population and any future growth estimates. If Keizer expands its urban growth boundary an additional large city park will be needed to serve the north Keizer population.

- **Children Play Areas**. Playgrounds should be provided within ¼ to ½ mile of all residential areas in Keizer. Keizer will need to provide four additional playgrounds to adequately serve the existing population.

- **Linkages & Connections**. Connections between the parks through pedestrian walkways, bicycle trails, and existing waterways will need consideration as Keizer’s park develops and funds become available. Keizer should increase park connectivity with the addition of approximately 7.8 miles of bicycle routes making the recommended LOS standard .86 acres per 1,000 residents. Keizer also should consider planning for a multi-use trail to create a park system trail loop. The proposed trail would be approximately 3.6 miles making the recommended LOS standard .29 acres per 1,000.
3A.3 Public Park Access

Public parks are an important element of community livability, and each resident should have access to a park of some type. Keizer parks vary in size, amenities provided and availability of vehicle parking. In order to assess the access of Keizer’s existing developed parks and the type of amenities provided a walking distance of one-quarter mile to one-half mile was utilized. One-quarter mile represents the ideal distance a resident should have to walk to reach a park facility and one-half mile is the maximum distance most people are willing to walk to access a park.

A. Existing Conditions

At this time Keizer has eight developed large and small city parks with six additional undeveloped or planned park sites, one special use area, a partially developed waterfront park, and three natural area/open space parks for a total of 19 park locations (See Map 1: Existing Park Facilities p.11). These parks vary greatly in size, design and amenities, but all supply some type of recreational opportunity either in their current state or planned development in the future. The table below summarizes the existing partially developed waterfront park, along with the small and large city park properties.

Table 3A.3a
Developed & Partially Developed Park Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>5.9 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>2.4 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers Jones/Carlson Skate Park</td>
<td>2.9 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>10.6 acres</td>
<td>Large City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>5.9 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>3.0 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>2.1 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>1.5 acres</td>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>2.4 acres</td>
<td>Small City Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.7 acres</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 2: Existing Developed and Partially Developed Park Access (p. 13) illustrates the areas served by all developed public parks with a one-quarter mile to a one-half mile walking distance along the existing road network. Map 3: Potential Park Access (p. 15) depicts the coverage resulting from the development of currently undeveloped park sites. The coverage areas are indicated by two tones of shading. The dark navy indicates the areas within ¼ mile of access to a public park. The lighter teal indicates areas within ½ mile access area of a public park.
Map 4: Existing Large City Park Access (p. 17) illustrates the areas served by amenities and features provided by a large city park as described in Discussion Paper 2, within a one-quarter mile to two mile network distance. The service reach depicted is for Claggett Creek and the future Keizer Rapids Park. Since the scale of the park and amenities provided attract people from a greater distance no barriers were calculated in to the service area reach with assumption that the mode taken to the park would be by car.

Existing Level of Service
The existing level of service for public parks is calculated by dividing the current population of 34,735 by the acreage of developed and partially developed public parks in Keizer’s inventory, 36.7 acres. This calculation results in an existing level of service for public parks of approximately one acre per 1,000 residents. This is a lower than typical amount of developed and partially developed park land than in most Oregon communities that average between four to six acres per thousands residents.

Under Served Areas
Map 5: Under Served Park Access Areas (p. 18) illustrates, the concentration of existing developed and partially developed parks in Keizer with ¼ to ½ mile pedestrian access located east of River Road in southern and in northeastern Keizer.

When the gaps in the service area reach are compared with the existing zoning information four distinct underserved areas are revealed. Zone 1 is located along the southwestern portion of the Clear Lake Neighborhood and is primarily zoned single family residential. Zone 2 is located in west Keizer south of Staats Lake and just north or the future service reach areas of Keizer Rapids and Palma Ciea, residential zoning is primarily single family residential with medium density residential areas east of McNary High School. Zone 3 is located in central Keizer north of Chemawa Rd. and up to the southeastern portion of the Gubser Neighborhood. The area closest to River Rd. is medium density residential with the remaining area designated single family. Zone 4 is located in the southern tip of Keizer’s city limits and it is located in a medium density residential area adjacent to the commercial corridor along River Rd.

B. DETERMINING THE LEVEL OF SERVICE

Service Analysis
If one were to take the current population and calculate the existing parks with the future development of Keizer Rapids, Bair Park, Keizer Station, Palma Ciea and River’s Edge Parks a recommended level of service standard can be derived. The five planned parks bring an additional 136.2 acres into the developed park inventory bringing the level of service up to...
approximately five acres per 1,000 people, resulting in a **recommended LOS Standard for Developed Parks of 4.98 acres per 1,000 residents.**

**C. SUMMARY OF NEED**

*Current Need*
In terms of the need for land for parks, the basic level of service calculation indicates that no additional park land is needed in the near future. However the distribution of park facilities is unevenly distributed throughout the city creating gaps in park access.

*Future Need*
The available undeveloped parks will be needed to adequately serve Keizer’s build-out population and any future growth estimates. However, some additional park land may be required to address facility or amenity deficiencies, such as playground space.

In the very long-term future, additional park land will be needed to serve population increases with any future expansions of the urban growth boundary. Additional park acreage will be needed to serve these areas, using the same geographic parameters for developed park access. In particular a location for an additional large city park in northern Keizer will need to be explored, since this area is currently under served by the amenities provided by a large city park.
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3A.4 CHILDREN’S PLAY AREAS

Keizer is a family-oriented city and places for children to play are important for family socialization and children's physical development. As available developable land decreases and housing densities increase outdoor areas for play will become increasingly important. The importance of having family recreation areas within walking distance for small children was a recurring theme of the public involvement process. One-quarter mile is the maximum distance a small child can be expected to walk with a parent to access a playground.

A. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Keizer currently has seven play equipment areas at existing parks, with eight play areas available at each elementary school sites. The play areas at these locations vary in condition and quality. The complete inventory of playgrounds in Keizer is listed in the table below.

Table 3A.4
Existing Playgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Playgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Miller Family Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Glen Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Level of Service

Playgrounds are not typically reviewed in terms of residents served. However, playgrounds and play equipment is a standard feature in developed parks in most communities.
Unserved Areas

Map 6: Existing Children’s Play Area Access (p. 23) depicts the playgrounds listed in Table 3A.4 and the areas of Keizer within a ¼ and ½ mile walking distance of the play areas. The ¼ mile distance is represented by the color navy and the ½ mile distance is represented by black diagonal lines with a grey background. As the map depicts, there are significant gaps in service for playgrounds. The largest gaps are in West Keizer, the residential area north of Chemawa Rd in central Keizer and the southwest area of the Gubser Neighborhood.

B. DETERMINING THE LEVEL OF SERVICE

Service Analysis

Based on community input there is need for more locations where families and children can play. Additionally, there is a strong desire for water features, or spray grounds, at these locations. If the City plans to accommodate Keizer’s family oriented residents new playgrounds are needed to meet the demand. Based on a geographic analysis and planned zoning the highest need for playgrounds is in western and south Keizer.

To provide a desired level of service for the projected population, four additional playgrounds should be added to the system, bringing the total number of publicly accessible playgrounds in Keizer to nineteen. The general locations of the new playgrounds are depicted on Map 7: Proposed Children’s Play Areas (p. 25) by yellow stars. The Parks Department currently has no land holdings in these areas and the stars represent the general vicinity for a children’s play area. If the city expands its urban growth boundary additional play areas will need to be sited.

C. SUMMARY OF NEED

Current Need

Playgrounds are currently needed in locations where there are no existing developed parks, schools, or undeveloped park properties. There is a need for four additional children’s play areas.

Future Need

There are four areas in Keizer where play areas will be needed in the future. The locations are indicated by stars on Map 7: Proposed Children’s Play Areas. The stars indicate areas currently under served by children’s play areas.

In the very long-term future, additional playgrounds will be needed to serve any residential development should the City expand its urban growth boundary.
3A.5 LINKAGES & CONNECTIONS

Connections between the parks through pedestrian walkways, bicycle trails, and existing waterways have been identified as a major need by Keizer residents. Residents feel that viewing Keizer parks as a complete system with local and regional connections is essential to increasing community ownership of the parks system.

Along with access to developed city parks, Keizer residents desire convenient access to local natural resources and waterways such as the Willamette River and Claggett Creek, which are preserved in both large and small natural areas within the community. These areas provide places for residents to experience nature and wildlife, and they also provide opportunities for environmental education through interpretive features and programming. Increasing connections to nearby natural areas, waterways and parks is a key component of Keizer’s livability.

A. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Keizer has no formal trail system connecting residents to its parks, natural areas or waterways. Keizer has an existing bicycle route network within the city and a multi-use trail just outside of its city limits to the east. Keizer has natural resources and waterways within the city, but currently lacks access to these resources.

Existing Level of Service
There is approximately 22.47 miles of designated bicycle routes within the city of Keizer and approximately 2.5 miles of multi-use trail running parallel to Keizer’s eastern city limit. Map 8: Existing Bike Routes & Multi-Use Trails (p. 29) depicts the existing system. Existing bicycle routes are noted with a purple dotted line and the multi-use trails are represented with a dotted orange line. The existing bicycle routes run along major roadways but do not connect to Keizer’s park areas or waterways.

Unserved Areas
There is no defined service area for linkages and connections between parks, natural areas and waterways. Park land connectivity could be improved by designating additional bicycle routes between existing parks and schools, creating a multi-use trail corridor along Claggett Creek and the northeastern city limits, and designating a waterway trail along the Willamette River connecting Keizer Rapids, Palma Ciea, Sunset and River’s Edge Parks. Map 9: Proposed Bicycle & Trail Connections (p. 31) depicts proposed alignments for bicycle routes, multi-use trails and waterway trails.
Proposed bicycle routes are depicted with a yellow and purple dotted line. These street segments were chosen for their directness of route between parks, school fields and playgrounds. Connectivity between developed parks and open spaces could be improved through and extension of the existing multi-use trail system. The proposed multi-use trail is depicted with a green and orange dotted line. Through public input a trail alignment running from the southeast Keizer off of the existing multi-use trail through the Claggett Creek water corridor has been proposed. The proposed trail would intersect with existing bicycle routes at Alder Dr., Dearborn Ave., Chemawa Rd., and Lockhaven Dr. and have access points into Northridge Park via Verda Ln. Additionally, an extension of the existing multi-use path has been proposed that runs along Keizer’s northeastern boundary and would create a multi-use trail loop connecting eight of Keizer’s parks. Lastly, a proposed waterway trail is depicted with a blue and orange dotted line. Connections to the Willamette River could be enhanced through the formalization of a waterway trail connecting all of Keizer’s waterfront parks.

B. DETERMINING THE LOS STANDARD

Service Analysis
The existing level of service standard for bicycle routes in Keizer is .64 acres per 1,000 residents using an assumed bike lane width of eight feet. Using the existing multi-use trail just outside Keizer’s city limits an existing level of service standard of .11 acres per 1,000 residents can be derived for multi-use trails, assuming a path width of twelve feet. There is no level of service standard calculation for waterway trails.

SUMMARY OF NEED

Current Need
The proposed bicycle routes for Keizer total 7.8 miles making the recommended LOS standard .86 acres per 1,000 residents assuming an eight foot width bicycle lane. The multi-use trails for Keizer total 3.6 miles making the recommended LOS standard .29 acres per 1,000 residents assuming a twelve foot trail width.

Future Need
If Keizer acquires more park land or expands its urban growth boundary, connectivity to existing parks, natural areas, waterways and existing trails will need examination.
SUMMARY
The result of the sports group survey administered by MIG assesses the existing and future demand placed on Keizer’s park and school sports facilities. The report focuses specifically on facilities for baseball, softball, soccer, football, basketball, and volleyball. The list is not an all-inclusive list, but represents the variety of organized sports currently at play in Keizer. Recommendations resulting from this report are intended to provide standards for the parks system and Keizer’s population grows.

- **Baseball & Softball Fields**
The City should consider maintaining the current ratio of youth and regulation baseball fields. There is currently a surplus of available facilities for both youth and regulation baseball. Not all of the available facilities are equally maintained or utilized, but the city and schools have an adequate supply of land dedicated to this recreational activity.

- **Soccer Fields**
The City should consider maintaining the current ratio soccer fields. There is currently a surplus of available facilities with only two regulation fields being utilized by the Keizer Soccer Club. It should be noted that all of the available facilities are not equally maintained, but the city and schools have an adequate supply of land dedicated to this recreational activity.

- **Football Fields**
The City does not currently maintain any of the existing football fields. An adequate supply of fields is provided by the Salem-Keizer Public School District and there is no expected need for fields provided by the City’s park system.

- **Indoor Court Space**
The City does not currently maintain any of the existing indoor court spaces for basketball or volleyball. Demand is high for the existing indoor facilities. The City will need to take a measured look at the feasibility of a city funded recreation center or gym. A feasibility study would assess the capital and operational costs, assist in determining a model of operation that could work within Keizer’s budget, and could assess a cooperative financial strategy with Keizer’s existing sports organizations.
3B.1 RECREATION FACILITY NEED

This section discusses the community’s need for outdoor and indoor recreation facilities and amenities within the parks and open space system. This report discusses the need for different types of indoor and outdoor recreation facilities, including:

- Baseball & Softball Fields
- Soccer Fields
- Football Fields
- Gymnasiums (Indoor Court Spaces)

To determine the need for sports facilities such as baseball, softball and soccer fields, and gymnasiums a demand model was created that compares the supply of fields or courts against the demand created by the number of sports teams utilizing the facilities in the Keizer. Within this demand model there are many variables (or service levels) that will affect the eventual need statement. Information collected during the parks inventorying process, the responses to a sports group survey and the Salem-Keizer Public Schools facilities schedule was used to supply information necessary for sports facility assessment. The variables included in the assessment are:

- **Demand Variables**
  - Number of Teams
  - Number of games and practices permitted per team per week

- **Supply Variables**
  - Number of fields/courts
  - Number of games/practices permitted per field/court per week
  - Existence of lighted or unlighted fields

The discussion of sports fields includes both developed fields designed for league play as well as informal flat turf areas used by community members for casual sports. Both uses are important to Keizer residents and both are limited in the existing park system. Currently sports organizations reserve school facilities for team games and practices. For the purposes of the sports facility assessment, all available school facilities will be calculated in the supply of facilities.
RECREATION FACILITY INVENTORY

In Keizer, there are recreation facilities at existing parks and at Salem-Keizer Public School locations. The inventory of existing facilities is detailed in the table below.

**Table 3B.1a: Recreation Facility Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Baseball Field</th>
<th>Softball Field</th>
<th>Youth Baseball</th>
<th>Youth Soccer Field</th>
<th>Multi-Use Field</th>
<th>Football Field</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Basketball court (full)</th>
<th>Basketball court (half)</th>
<th>Basketball hoop</th>
<th>Gymnasium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Newton Family Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northview Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claggett Creek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Facilities</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 McNary High School facilities are not scheduled through the City of Salem or the Keizer-Salem Facility Rental Coordinator.
3B.2 BASEBALL / SOFTBALL FIELDS NEEDS

Baseball / Softball Elements:
Baseball and softball field dimensions vary depending upon the age and gender of the team. Table 3B.2a below outlines the variations in the field requirements and the approximate amount of land required for each type of game play.

Table 3B.2a: Baseball / Softball Basic Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Field Elements¹</th>
<th>Regulation Baseball</th>
<th>Youth Baseball</th>
<th>Men’s &amp; Coed Slow Pitch</th>
<th>Women’s Slow Pitch &amp; Fast Pitch</th>
<th>Youth Softball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bases</td>
<td>90’</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>65’</td>
<td>65’</td>
<td>60’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foul line</td>
<td>310-325’</td>
<td>185’</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center field</td>
<td>375-410’</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfield</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>275-300’</td>
<td>200-250’</td>
<td>175-200’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Acres</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All fields should have a backstop and foul line fencing.

A. EXISING CONDITIONS

Current Supply:
The City of Keizer has 24 youth baseball fields, two softball fields, and six regulation baseball fields. The 24 youth baseball fields are spread out among the city’s parks and elementary schools. All of the youth baseball fields are utilized by the Keizer Little League throughout the season. The youth baseball fields can be found at:

- Bob Newton Family Park – 1 field
- Claggett Creek Park – 2 fields
- Keizer Little League Park – 11 fields (1 lighted)
- Clear Lake ES – 1 field
- Cummings ES – 2 fields
- Forest Ridge ES – 1 field
- Gubser ES – 1 field
- Keizer ES – 2 fields
- Weddle ES – 3 fields

The regulation baseball and softball fields are located solely on school property. The Whiteaker Middle School fields are utilized by the Keizer Junior Baseball Association. The fields available in Keizer are located at:

- Clagget Creek MS – 3 fields (regulation baseball)
- Whiteaker MS – 1 field (regulation baseball)
- McNary HS – 4 fields (2 regulation baseball, 2 softball)

**Current Level of Service:**
The *youth baseball* fields currently serve approximately 59 little league baseball and softball teams comprised of approximately 700 children. Games are played at Keizer Little League Park (K LLP) and practices are held at K LLP or at the school or city park sites during the game season.

- **Current Field Use:**
  Each field at K LLP accommodates an average of one game or practice/day Monday – Friday and an average of three games on Saturday.

- **Team Participation:**
  The average number of games and practices per team in the Keizer Little League is two games and two practices a week.

The *regulation baseball* field at Whiteaker Middle School currently serves approximately four Junior Oregon Baseball Association teams comprised of approximately 48 players. Games and practices are played at the Whiteaker Middle School location.

- **Current Field Use:**
  The one field accommodates two games or practices per day during the course of a week.

- **Team Participation:**
  The average number of games and practices per team in the Junior Oregon Baseball Association is two games and four practices a week

**B. ANALYSIS**

**Trends:**
According to the National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA), baseball participation has declined 6.4% and softball has increased 0.8% between 2000 and 2005 nationally. Based on NSGA statistics, youth baseball participation has decreased 7.0% and youth softball participation has decreased 20.0% from 1995 to 2005.

The development of complexes (fields in groupings of three or more) has become increasingly common due to their ability to host tournaments. Many baseball organizations have developed their own ‘home’ league facilities.
Input from Sponsoring Agencies:
Baseball and softball programs operating in Keizer are sponsored by the Keizer Little League Association and the Keizer Junior Baseball Association. Keizer has an adult Class A Minor League Baseball team, the Salem–Keizer Volcanoes. Their games and practices are held at Volcano Stadium. A list of organizations providing baseball and softball activities in Keizer are identified below:

Table 3B.2b: Baseball / Softball Organizations & Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Little League Association</td>
<td>April-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Juniors Baseball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Majors Baseball</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· AAA Baseball</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· A Baseball</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· T-ball Baseball</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Majors Softball</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· AAA Softball</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· AA Softball</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· T-ball Softball</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Junior Baseball Association</td>
<td>February-July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Senior Division Baseball</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Supply and Demand:
The available unlighted youth baseball fields can accommodate 13 games/practices per week. The one lighted field at KLLP can accommodate 20 games/practices per week. The 24 available fields create a total supply of 319 games/practices per week.

Assuming an average play for each team (two games/two practices)\(^2\), the 59 youth teams create a demand of 177 games/practices per week.

Based on a supply and demand analysis, there is a surplus of 142 games/practices a week for youth baseball facilities.

---

\(^2\) 2 practices = 2 field slots and 2 games = 1 slot for 2 teams playing each other for a total of 3 slots.
The four available fields for scheduling regulation baseball games/practices are unlighted accommodating 13 games/practices per week. The four available fields create a total supply of 52 games/practices per week.

Assuming an average play for each team (two games/two practices), the four senior division teams create a demand of 12 games/practices per week.

Based on a supply and demand analysis, there is a surplus of 40 games/practices a week.

C. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Field Use Guidelines:
The City should consider maintaining the current ratio of youth and regulation baseball fields. There is currently a surplus of available facilities for both youth and regulation baseball. It should be noted that all of the available facilities are not equally maintained or utilized, but the city and schools have an adequate supply of land dedicated to this recreational activity.

If the surplus of eleven youth fields is deducted from the existing inventory of 24 fields and then divided into the current population, a suggested recommended standard of youth baseball field per 34,735 people can be derived.

Table 3B.2c: Youth Baseball Field Demand Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Demand Guideline</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of fields</td>
<td>24 youth fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minus surplus = field demand total</td>
<td>13 youth fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current demand ratio</td>
<td>1 field per 2,672 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the field demand guideline of one youth baseball field per 2,672 people is applied to the existing 2030 population projection of 39,994, then there will be an eventual need for two more youth baseball fields. The future demand can easily be filled by the surplus eleven fields.

If the surplus of three regulation fields is deducted from the existing inventory of four fields and then divided into the current population, a suggested recommended standard for youth baseball fields is one field per 34,735 people.

---

3 2 practices = 2 field slots and 2 games = 1 slot for 2 teams playing each other for a total of 3 slots.
Table 3B.2d: Regulation Baseball Field Demand Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Demand Guideline</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of fields</td>
<td>4 regulation fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minus surplus = demand total</td>
<td>1 regulation field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current demand ratio</td>
<td>1 field per 34,735 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a field demand guideline of one regulation baseball field per 34,735 people, Keizer will have an eventual need for one more regulation baseball field. The future demand can be filled by the three surplus field sites. However, all of the regulation baseball fields are located on school grounds and scheduling of these facilities could present and issues for general community use.

Site Specific Issues:
The demand for fields created by the Keizer Little League Association saturates the supply of fields at Keizer Little League Park. Additional field lighting at Keizer Little Park and the addition of Sunday into the play schedule would increase the number of available game/practice slots for each week.

The fields at Keizer Little League Park all have poor drainage. It is reported that with minimal rain games have to be rescheduled or canceled. If the city funds the improvements to the ball fields an agreement would need to be reached allowing for more general public field time at the park.

The Keizer Little League Association could schedule practices at other available facilities freeing up KLLP fields for other community groups during peak season.

Currently all games for the Keizer Junior Baseball Association are played at the one field at Whiteaker Middle School maximizing the field use at this location. Claggett Creek Middle School has three fields available for practice/games and could be utilized if the organization expands or finds it needs more fields for games and practices.

It is unknown if Keizer has a demand for adult regulation sized fields outside of organized youth sports organizations. Keizer currently has no regulation ball fields within its existing parks. If there is demand for adult ball fields by an adult league, teams must rent the facility space from the Salem-Keizer School District. ORS 332.105 and ORS 332.172 (subject to
ORS 330.430 give the Salem-Keizer School District the authority to create regulations and policies regarding the use of school property, which can be found on the ‘District Facility Rental’ web page at http://www.salkeiz.k12.or.us/districtcenter/FacilityRent/Index.htm.

4 “ORS 330.430 Functions of local school committee. (1) Notwithstanding ORS 332.172, under rules of the district school board, the local school committee shall determine the use of the school property for civic purposes not inconsistent with its primary use…”
3B.3  **SOCCER FIELDS NEEDS**

**Soccer Basic Elements:**
Soccer field dimensions vary depending upon the age group. Portable goals may be used and fields should be lined or cones used. Fields must be level without holes or mounds and have good growth of turf. Table 3B.3a below outlines the variations in the field requirements, the approximate amount of land required for each type of game play, and the potential number of youth games playable on one adult regulation field.

**Table 3B.3a: Soccer Basic Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Type</th>
<th>Field Dimensions</th>
<th>Play Area Acreage</th>
<th>Approximate Acreage Needed</th>
<th>Number of Youth Fields per Adult Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Regulation¹</td>
<td>225' x 360'</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4 acres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11-U14 Youth</td>
<td>150' x 240'</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2 acres</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U10 Youth</td>
<td>120' x 210'</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9 acres</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U9 Youth</td>
<td>105' x 180'</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 acres</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U8 Youth</td>
<td>75' x 150'</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5 acres</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Minimum 180’ x 300’

**A. EXISING CONDITIONS**

**Current Supply:**
The City of Keizer has eight full size soccer fields and one youth soccer field. The nine soccer fields are primarily on school property with only one adult size field located on park property. Fields under this category are located at:

- Claggett Creek Park – 1 field
- Forest Ridge ES – 1 field
- Gubser ES – 1 field
- Keizer ES – 1 field
- Kennedy ES – 1 field
- Weddle ES – 1 field
- Whiteaker MS – 2 full size fields and 1 youth field

**Current Level of Service:**
The available soccer fields currently serve a range of 67-87 soccer club teams comprised of approximately 645 to 845 children. All Keizer Soccer Club games and practices are played at Whiteaker Middle School during the game season.

Discussion Paper #3B: Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment
Current Field Use:
The two and one-half fields at Whiteaker Middle School accommodate an average of nine games or practices a day Monday - Saturday.

Team Participation:
The average number of games and practices per team in the Keizer Soccer Club is one game and three practices a week.

B. ANALYSIS

Trends:
According to the NSGA, soccer participation has increased 9.8% between 2000 and 2005 nationally. Based on NSGA statistics, youth soccer participation has increased 18.1% from 1995 to 2005.

Similar to other organized sports, many communities have begun developing soccer fields in large complexes that are dedicated to that activity. This approach is more efficient to maintain and permits field configurations to change, providing more fields and reducing field wear.

Input from Sponsoring Agencies:
There are currently no adult soccer programs in Keizer and the youth programs are sponsored by the Keizer Soccer Club. All games for the club are played on the fields at Whiteaker Middle School. The two full size fields and one youth field are configured for up to five games at once, utilizing smaller size fields for younger players. Soccer practice is Monday through Friday with game days on Saturday.

Table 3B.3b: Soccer Organization & Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keizer Soccer Club</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March-November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Kinderick U5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Recreation Girls U6-U10</td>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Recreation Boys U6-U10</td>
<td>20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· MVSL Girls U12-U14</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· MVSL Boys U12-U14</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· All Stars</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Competitive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67-87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Supply and Demand:
Keizer has a supply of eight regulation size soccer fields. Assuming that the ‘All Stars’ and ‘Competitive’ teams are playing other league teams once
a week and practicing five times a week each, these teams create a demand of 36 games/practices per week.

The demands placed on the soccer fields by the other division teams is calculated by taking into account the number of games playable on a regulation field. The model is modified to take into consideration the flexibility of available soccer fields. In Keizer the existing soccer teams are organized into four distinct age groups: U5, U6-U10, U12-14, and Competitive/All Stars. Knowing that soccer fields are subdivided for various age division games, the calculation of land required for these age divisions in Table 3B.3a can be used to estimate an average number of games per field and a potential demand for the fields. The other division teams create a demand of 100 games/practices per week.

Table 3B.3c: Soccer Field Demand Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Type</th>
<th>Avg. # of Games per Regulation Field</th>
<th>Number of Teams¹</th>
<th>Potential Number of Fields Used²</th>
<th>Avg. Practices &amp; Games per Week</th>
<th>Maximum Demand³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Stars/Competitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 practices/1 game</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12-U14 Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2 practices/1 game</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U6-U10 Youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>2 practices/1 game</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinderick U5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1 practice/0 games</td>
<td>1 youth field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Assumption is made that Competitive and All Star teams play teams from other leagues.
² Potential Number of Fields = maximum number of teams divided by average number of games allowable on a regulation field.
³ Maximum Demand = the total number of practices and games divided by the average number of games allowable on a regulation field.

The Keizer Soccer Club creates a total demand for adult regulation fields of 136 games/practices per week. In general, unlighted soccer fields can accommodate two games/practice per night Monday through Friday and six games on Saturday for a total of 22 game/practice slots per week.

Based on a supply and demand analysis, the current supply of eight adult regulation fields can accommodate 176 adult regulation games/practices a week. There is a surplus of 40 games/practices a week or the equivalent of two soccer fields.
C. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Field Use Guidelines:
The City should consider maintaining the current ratio soccer fields. There is currently a surplus of available facilities with only two regulation fields being utilized by the Keizer Soccer Club.

It should be noted that all of the available facilities are not equally maintained, but the city and schools have an adequate supply of land dedicated to this recreational activity.

If the surplus of two soccer fields is deducted from the existing inventory of eight fields and then divided into the current population, a suggested recommended standard of soccer fields per 34,735 people can be derived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Demand Guideline</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of fields</td>
<td>8 regulation fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minus surplus = field demand total</td>
<td>6 regulation fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current demand ratio</td>
<td>1 field per 5,789 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field use guideline of one regulation soccer field per 5,789 people is applied to the existing 2030 build-out population of 39,994 then there will be an eventual need for one more regulation soccer field. The future demand can be filled by the surplus two fields.

Site Specific Issues:
The demand for fields created by the Keizer Soccer Club currently only impacts the Whiteaker Middle School facility. The fields at this location were improved through a joint effort of the Keizer Rotary, Salem-Keizer School District, Keizer Junior Baseball and the City Keizer which improved the drainage, graded the fields, installed irrigation and seeded the field grass.

Claggett Creek Park has the only adult regulation size soccer facility available in the existing park system. This facility is currently in poor condition for game play and will need increased maintenance if the city is plans to provide a facility for regular soccer practices and games.

Participation in soccer has increased over the last decade. If this trend continues Keizer will need to adjust its field demand guideline. Once Keizer reaches its expected population projection or if a decision is made to expand the urban growth boundary, the Claggett Creek Park site can take the pressure off the Whiteaker MS facility.
It should be noted that lacrosse is a sport that utilizes soccer facilities. In Salem –Keizer, the Boys and Girls Club of America (BGC), serving Salem, Marion and Polk counties have 4th – 8th grade lacrosse teams averaging two practices and one game per week with a season running from March to June. BGC staff report that there is currently no Keizer team, but approximately eight percent of their lacrosse athletes are from Keizer. As lacrosse gains popularity and the league grows more facilities will be needed to serve this demand, which will impact the needs analysis for soccer fields.
3B.4 FOOTBALL FIELD NEEDS

Football Basic Elements:
Football fields must be 160’ x 360’ and have permanent goals. A football field occupies approximately 1.7 acres. Fields must be level without holes or mounds and have a good growth of turf.

A. EXISING CONDITIONS

Current Supply:
The City of Keizer has four football fields all located on school properties. The football fields can be found at:

- Clear Lake ES – 1 field
- Claggett Creek MS – 1 field
- Whiteaker MS – 1 field
- McNary HS – 1 field

Current Level of Service:
The football fields currently serve approximately ten football teams comprised of approximately 228 children. Games and practices are held at all four field locations

- Current Field Use:
  Each field accommodates an average of two practices per day Monday - Friday and an average of two games on Saturday.

- Team Participation:
The average number of games and practices per team one game and two practices a week.

B. ANALYSIS

Trends:
According to the NSGA, tackle football participation has increased 33.0% between 2000 and 2005 nationally\(^5\). Based on NSGA statistics, youth football participation has increased 20.1% from 1995 to 2005.

Input from Sponsoring Agencies:
The football programs operating in Keizer are sponsored by the Boys and Girls Club of America. A list of Boys & Girls Club teams is identified on the next page:

\(^5\) The NSGA does not currently maintain statistics on flag football.
Table 3B.4a: Football Organization & Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls Club of America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 1st – 2nd Grade Flag Football</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 3rd – 4th Grade Flag Football</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 4th – 5th Grade Tackle Football</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 5th, 6th, 7th Grade Tackle Football</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 6th – 7th Grade Tackle Football</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Supply and Demand:

The available football fields can accommodate one practice per day Monday – Friday and up to four games on Saturday. Each field has a capacity for nine games/practices per week. The four available fields create a total supply of 36 games/practices per week.

The ten teams average one game and two practices a week creating a demand of 30 games/practices a week on the four available fields.

Based on a supply and demand analysis, there is a surplus of six games/practice slots a week for football activities. The small surplus of six out of nine potential slots reflects the full use of the four football fields and the heavy schedules placed on these facilities. Based on feedback from BGC staff, these fields compete with other school sponsored activities and other sports leagues creating a shortage of available field space during peak season.

C. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Field Use Guidelines:

The City does not currently maintain any of the existing football fields. If the current school supply of four football fields is divided into the current population, a suggested recommended standard of football fields per 34,735 people can be derived.

Table 3B.4b: Football Field Demand Guideline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Demand Guideline</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of fields</td>
<td>4 fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- minus surplus = field demand total</td>
<td>4 fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current demand ratio</td>
<td>1 field per 8,684 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Demand Guideline</td>
<td>1 field per 8,684 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the field use guideline of one football field per 8,684 people is applied to the existing 2030 build-out population of 39,994 then there will be an eventual need for one more football field.

**Site Specific Issues:**
The City does not currently maintain any of the existing football fields. An adequate supply of fields is provided by the Salem-Keizer Public School District and there is no expected need for a field provided by the City’s park system.
3B.5  GYMNASIUM (INDOOR COURT SPACE) NEEDS

Gymnasium Basic Elements:
Indoor facilities can be used for a wide range of activities and in Keizer school gymnasiums are primarily scheduled by basketball and volleyball organizations. Gymnasiums must have appropriate dimensions for the sport with adequate dimensions outside the baseline for safe play. The playing surface should be resilient flooring for longevity of use and a variety of uses. The dimensions required for the basketball and volleyball are listed below:

**Basketball**
- Professional: 94’ x 50’
- College/High School: 84’ x 50’
- Junior High: 74’ x 42’.

**Volleyball**
- All Levels 94’ x 50’
- Outside Baseline: 9’ to 14’

A. EXISING CONDITIONS

Current Supply:
The City of Keizer has no indoor gymnasiums managed by the City. There are 15 indoor gymnasiums available through the use of school buildings, which are owned, maintained and scheduled by Salem-Keizer Public Schools. Courts included in this category are on average available from 5pm-9pm Monday-Friday and 9am-10pm Saturday. Keizer’s existing gymnasiums are located at:

- Clear Lake ES – 1 gym
- Cummings ES – 1 gym
- Forest Ridge ES – 1 gym
- Gubser ES – 1 gym
- Keizer ES – 1 gym
- Kennedy ES – 1 gym
- Weddle ES – 1 gym
- Claggett Creek MS – 2 gyms
- Whiteaker MS – 3 gyms
- McNary HS – 3 gyms

Due to the lack of facilities provided by the city and the coordinated scheduling by multiple agencies with the school district, a demand analysis of gymnasiums is not feasible for the parks master planning process. This section will review the schedule provided by the Salem-Keizer School District and the responses to the sports group survey regarding use the indoor gymnasiums.
**Current Level of Service:**
All schools with gymnasiums are scheduled by individual sports group organizations. The sports organizations listed in the facilities schedule for Keizer Public Schools are the Boys & Girls Club of America, Salem Keizer Youth Basketball and the Keizer Youth Basketball Association. It should be noted that the use of school facilities is not limited to sports organizations and scheduling is shared with the Department of Community Services, the Keizer Police, Girl and Boy Scouts, private groups and other various community organizations. Demand for these facilities is high with little few gaps in scheduling.

**B. ANALYSIS**

**Trends:**
According to the National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA), volleyball participation has increased 7.7% and basketball increased 10.4% between 2000 and 2005 nationally. However, the review of the NSGA statistics reflects a decrease in both volleyball and basketball participation over the ten year period from 1995 to 2005, with volleyball decreasing 26.5% and basketball 0.7%.

**Input from Sponsoring Agencies:**
The basketball programs operating in Keizer are sponsored by Salem Keizer Youth Basketball, Inc. (SKY), the Keizer Youth Basketball Association (KYBA) and the Boys & Girls Club of America (BGC). A list of organizations providing basketball and volleyball activities in Keizer is identified in Table 3B.5a on the next page.

Based on the information provided by the sports group respondents there are approximately 1,695 children participating in basketball programs. The SKY program has approximately 96 middle school age boy and girl teams averaging two games/practices a week. The KYBA program has approximately 78 elementary school boy and girl teams averaging two games/practices a week. And the BGC program provides service to 80 kindergarten through twelfth grade boy teams that average two games/practices a week.
Table 3B.5a: Basketball Organizations & Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salem Keizer Youth Basketball (SKY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 6th Grade</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 6th Grade</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 7th Grade</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 7th Grade</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 8th Grade</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 8th Grade</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keizer Youth Basketball Association (KYBA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 1st- 2nd Grade</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 1st- 2nd Grade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 3rd Grade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 3rd Grade</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 4th Grade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 4th Grade</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 5th Grade</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 5th Grade</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 6th – 8th Grade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Girls 6th – 8th Grade</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys &amp; Girls Club of America (BGC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 1st- 2nd Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 3rd – 4th Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 5th – 6th Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 7th – 8th Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Boys 9th – 12th Grade</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is one volleyball program operating in Keizer that is sponsored by the Boys & Girls Club of America.

Table 3B.5b: Volleyball Organization & Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Total Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys &amp; Girls Club of America (Fall)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 3rd – 4th Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 5th – 6th Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 6th - 7th Grade</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys &amp; Girls Club of America (Spring)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 1st- 2nd Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 3rd – 4th Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 5th – 6th Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 7th - 8th Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 9th - 12th Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The BGC programs run during the fall and spring seasons and serve approximately 72 kids during the fall season and 89 kids during the spring season with both seasons averaging three games/practices a week.

**C. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

The City does not currently maintain any of the existing indoor court spaces for basketball or volleyball. Demand is high for the existing indoor school facilities and the existing programs are maximizing use of the available facility schedules.

The future Kroc Center site may relieve some of the pressure on Keizer’s facilities, but with the existing demand for indoor facilities the City will need to take a measured look at the feasibility of a city funded recreation center or gym. A feasibility study would assess the capital and operational costs, assist in determining a model of operation that could work within Keizer’s budget, and could assess a cooperative financial strategy with Keizer’s existing sports organizations.

**Feedback provided through the sports survey:**
In general there are an insufficient amount of indoor facilities in comparison to the demand created by the existing sports leagues.

The existing gyms at Whiteaker MS and Claggett Creek MS are in good condition but the scheduling of Claggett Creek MS is difficult between games and practices.

The available elementary school facilities do not meet the current need for indoor basketball facilities. As enrollment increases gym availability has decreased. The conditions of the gyms are good overall but a number of the gyms need floor resurfacing.

**Future facilities:**
The Ray & Joan Kroc Corps Community Center is scheduled for completion in December of 2008. The facility plans include a two court gymnasium, aerobics room, climbing wall, fitness center, and swimming pools. The future facility is just southeast of Keizer’s city limits and will provide indoor recreation services to Keizer residents.
CITY OF KEIZER
KEIZER PARKS IMPROVEMENT
PARKS MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM

The City of Keizer, through its City of Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, endeavors to create opportunities to work with local citizens through a “Parks Matching Grant Program” to improve the quality of the parks system.

Each year, the Budget Committee and the City Council will consider the recommendation of the Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board with regard to the total amount to budget for the Parks Matching Grant Program for the upcoming fiscal year. The Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (hereinafter “Board”) will have authority to approve grants each fiscal year up to the amount budgeted. All requested projects must meet the requirements set forth herein.

Each year, the Board will solicit applications from citizens for projects that will benefit parks in Keizer. To be eligible, the project must qualify under one or more of the following categories:

1. Projects that are listed in the Keizer Parks Master Plan, or;
2. Projects that qualifies as a City of Keizer standard park amenity, or;
3. Projects that would improve a park or parks in Keizer.

Applications must be received two (2) weeks prior to the next Board meeting in order to be considered at that meeting. Applications can be submitted via electronic submission, or a hard copy can be hand delivered or mailed, but must be received by the deadline set to be considered at the next Board meeting. Applications shall be submitted on a city-approved form. All applications must be addressed to Deputy City Recorder.

Completed applications received by the deadline will be considered at the next Board meeting. Applicants (or an authorized representative) must attend to be eligible, unless the Board votes to waive such appearance. A Board member cannot be an applicant.

The Public Works Director or designee shall work with the applicant to make the applications and proposed budgets complete prior to the application being considered by the Board. Projects must meet all local, state, and federal laws for parks and recreation facilities to be considered.

The Board will review each proposal and make a determination on the proposal based on the following criteria:

1. Projects that benefit the greatest number of Keizer residents and provide the "best bang for the buck";
2. Identified need for the project;
3. Likelihood the project can be accomplished on time and on budget;
4. Other projects that have been considered and deferred (see below);
5. Whether the proposed project is identified in the Parks Master Plan;
6. Any other criteria the Board believes are appropriate to consider.

The Board shall give more weight to projects that are identified in the Parks Master Plan.

The Board may approve or deny the proposal, or they may approve it with conditions. The Board may also defer decision on the proposal due to timing of the season or concern that other proposed or deferred projects would not be able to be funded. In such case, the Board may consider the deferred project in the same or next fiscal year. The maximum total grant awards cannot exceed the amount budgeted by the Keizer City Council each fiscal year.

Once an application has been approved, a meeting shall be set up between the Project Director and the Public Works Director or designee to explain the process for making donations and submitting funds toward the project, as well as to report progress being made. Prior to beginning the project, the Public Works Director must approve an itemized list of materials.

These are strictly reimbursement grants. Applicant will need to complete the project, have the project accepted by the City, and provide appropriate copies of receipts for materials and other costs associated with the project to receive reimbursement. The project is subject to city audit and receipts must be approved by the Finance Director.
## KEIZER PARKS IMPROVEMENT
### MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM APPLICATION

All areas must be filled in and signed before submission.

Please deliver to City Hall at 930 Chemawa Road, Keizer
Attention: Debbie Lockhart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization or Individual</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Director</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Proposed Park Site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the project identified in the current Parks Master Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example: vegetative buffer along River Road at Meadows Park)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated project start date:</th>
<th>Estimated project completion date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget: Parks Board Matching Grant</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Cash/Materials Donations</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sponsorship</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor (estimated value)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will a recognition sign be required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Project:** (check all that apply)

- [ ] New Park Feature(s)
- [ ] Replacement of Existing Park Feature
- [ ] Park Rehabilitation
- [ ] Other

**Project Description:** Describe the project for which the matching grant funds are requested including a description of labor and materials needed for completion of the project, a cost estimate for project completion if available, impact on the community, involvement of the organization itself and its volunteers. Attach additional pages if necessary.

---

*Successful applicants will be expected to follow all applicable city/state requirements/laws. *Grants will be withdrawn and recipients will be required to reapply for funds if the project is not completed thirty (30) days after the estimated completion date noted above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications must be received by the first Tuesday of the month in order to be considered at the next Parks Board meeting (second Tuesday of each month).
KEIZER PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD
GRANT PROGRAM

The City of Keizer Parks and Recreation Advisory Board endeavors to create public/private partnerships with local citizens through a “Parks Matching Grant Program” to improve the quality of the parks system. The Board wants to engage motivated residents to get the best ‘bang for the buck’ with the limited resources available.”

- Award of the grants will be by “weight” with projects on the Master Plan receiving more weight than those not included in the Master Plan.
- Testimony will be received from applicants with the Board evaluating each application according to the “best bang for the buck” and the benefit to the greatest number of Keizer residents.
- There will be no minimum or maximum amount (aside from the total available)
- Firm start and completion dates must be provided by the applicant
- Funding must be complete by June 30 of the budget year
- Applications will not be limited to one project
- Applicants may apply for more than one grant
- Grants are reimbursement grants. Applicant will need to complete the project, have it accepted by the City, and provide copies of receipts for materials and other costs associated with the project to receive reimbursement.