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INTRODUCTION

Monmouth Parks - Your Best Backyard!

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The City of Monmouth developed this update to its 2008 Parks Master Plan to provide a blueprint for the growth, enhancement and management of its park and recreation system. The Plan considers the park and recreation needs of residents across the City. This Parks Master Plan was developed with the input and direction of local recreation leaders, stakeholders and residents, gathered through public meetings, interviews and a community survey.

The 2008 Plan outlined a framework for the improvement and growth of City recreation facilities, amenities and parks to address the specific needs of the community. This second Parks Master Plan establishes a path forward for enabling and enhancing high quality, community-driven parks, trails, open spaces and recreational opportunities. It updates the City’s policies, practices and projects and sets a long-range vision for the City with clear action items and strategies for implementation for the next 10 years. The recommendations in this Plan are based on community input, evaluations of the existing park system, and needs for acquisition, site development and operations. The Plan is intended to be updated periodically to
remain current with local interests and maintain eligibility for state-based grants.

PLANNING PROCESS

This Parks Master Plan represents the culmination of a year-long planning effort to define the community’s needs for parks, recreation facilities and programs, and trails over the next ten years.

The Parks Master Plan reflects the community’s interests and needs for park and recreational facilities, trails and programming. The planning process encouraged and enabled public engagement in the choices, priorities and future direction of the City’s park and recreation system. The Plan project team conducted a variety of public outreach activities. Community members expressed their interests through an online survey, open house meeting, stakeholder discussions, online engagement, and Parks and Recreation Board meetings.

In addition to community engagement, the actions identified in this Plan are based on:

- An inventory and assessment of the City’s existing park and recreation facilities to establish the current performance of the system and to identify needed maintenance and capital repair and replacement projects,
- A level of service and walkability assessment to quantify the system’s ability to serve both current and future residents.

The Plan's capital facilities plan and accompanying implementation and funding strategies are intended to move the City toward the community's park and recreation goals while recognizing operational realities.

OTHER RELATED PLANS

The Parks Master Plan is one of several documents that comprise Monmouth’s long-range planning and policy framework. The following past community plans provide policy direction and goals relevant to the City’s park, trail and recreation planning.

Monmouth Comprehensive Plan (1978-2007)

The Public Facilities element of Monmouth’s Comprehensive Plan, revised in 2007, includes a section encompassing Parks and Recreation
Facilities. The section summarizes the 1998 Parks and Recreation Master Plan as follows:

“The proposed parks system centers on the concept that a multi-use park (neighborhood park) should be located within convenient walking distance of most residents. This is accomplished by upgrading and/or expanding existing parks, converting or expanding several existing mini-parks and acquiring additional land within areas designated for residential development. This core system of parks will provide the basic passive and recreation opportunities within the neighborhoods. Supplementing these parks will be specialized recreation areas, natural open space and trail systems that serve the entire community. Main Street Park will continue to be the central focus of the parks system.”

The Parks and Recreation Facilities section also addresses open space, natural areas, and trails through the following statement:

“A major addition that does not now exist is a linear open space system formed by the various forks of Ash Creek. It is proposed that the riparian areas of these creek areas be preserved in their natural condition. Access to and within these areas will be provided by a series of paved and unpaved trails.”

Following the adoption of this Plan, the Parks and Recreation Facilities section of the Monmouth Comprehensive Plan may require revision to reflect updated information contained within this Plan.

Monmouth Parks Master Plan (2008)
The 2008 Parks Master Plan identifies existing park and recreation areas, makes recommendations for future park and recreation facilities, and identifies strategies and techniques for the acquisition, operation and development of parks. The plan identifies four prevailing features lacking in the park and recreation system in Monmouth, including: a shortage of larger “neighborhood parks”; an overall lack of sports fields; a shortage of indoor facilities; and a lack of off-street trails. The plan also provides an implementation strategy that prioritizes projects, identifies funding sources, and provides a capital facilities plan.

Ash Creek Trail Master Plan (2005)
Upon completion, the proposed Ash Creek Trail will link the cities of Monmouth and Independence along a four-mile trail adjacent to Ash Creek. The trail would extend from the Willamette River in Riverview Park (Independence) to the western edge of Monmouth at Western Oregon University. As these communities continue to grow, the Ash Creek Trail will serve as a major transportation connection between the cities, linking neighborhoods, schools and parks along the corridor, as well as provide additional recreation and open space preservation opportunities. The proposed Ash Creek Trail is a key recreation element of the Monmouth Parks System.

Monmouth Transportation System Plan (2009)
The Transportation System Plan (TSP) guides the management of all existing transportation facilities, as well as providing a planning framework to guide future transportation projects.
The Parks Plan relies on the TSP for existing and future on-street bike paths and pathways routes. Combined with trails, these facilities provide connectivity within the core system of parks. The future TSP update should consider the recommendations in the Parks Plan and make adjustments to planned bike paths and pathway routes, as needed.

**Housing and Residential Land Needs Assessment (2019)**

The analysis outlines a forecast of housing need within the City of Monmouth. It examines existing housing and household characteristics and outlines housing and land needs to 2039. The estimated city population for 2039 is 13,374 and estimates future housing demand by unit type, affordability and total numbers.

**Independence Parks Master Plan (2015)**

This plan provides information on Independence's parks system, amenities, facilities, and their relationship to Monmouth Parks.

**CONTENTS OF THE PLAN**

The remainder of this Parks Master Plan is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2: Community Profile – provides an overview of the City and its demographics.
- Chapter 3: Community Engagement – highlights the methods used to engage the community in the development of the Plan.
- Chapter 4: Inventory & Recreational Opportunities – describes the existing parks and recreation system in Monmouth.
- Chapters 5: Needs Assessment – discusses survey results and recreation trend data and provides context to the identification of potential system enhancements.
- Chapter 6: Goals & Objectives – provides a policy framework for the parks and recreation system grouped by major functional or program area.
- Chapter 7: Capital Planning – details a 10-year program for addressing park and recreation facility enhancement or expansion projects.
- Chapter 8: Action Strategies – describes a range of strategies to consider in the implementation of the Plan.
- Appendices: Provides technical or supporting information to the planning effort.
BENEFITS OF PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY BENEFITS

Residents in communities with increased access to parks, recreation, natural areas and trails have more opportunities for physical activity, both through recreation and active transportation. By participating in physical activity, residents can reduce their risk of being or becoming overweight or obese, decrease their likelihood of suffering from chronic diseases, such as heart disease and type-2 diabetes, and improve their levels of stress and anxiety. Nearby access to parks has been shown to increase levels of physical activity. According to studies cited in a 2010 report by the National Park and Recreation Association, the majority of people of all ages who visit parks are physically active during their visit. Also, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that greater access to parks leads to 25% more people exercising three or more days per week.

SOCIAL & COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Park and recreation facilities provide opportunities to engage with family, friends, and neighbors, thereby increasing social capital and community cohesion, which can improve residents’ mental health and overall well-being. People who feel that they are connected to their community and those who participate in recreational, community and other activities are more likely to have better mental and physical health and to live longer lives. Access to parks and recreational facilities has also been linked to reductions in crime, particularly juvenile delinquency.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

Parks and recreation facilities can bring positive economic impacts through increased property values, increased attractiveness for businesses and workers (quality of life), and through direct increases in employment opportunities.

In Oregon, outdoor recreation generates $16.4 billion in consumer spending, creates 172,000 direct jobs and results in $749 million in state and local tax revenue. According to the 2017 Outdoor Recreation Economy Report published by the Outdoor Industry Association, outdoor recreation can grow jobs and drive the economy through management and investment in parks, waters and trails as an interconnected system designed to sustain economic dividends for citizens.

A number of organizations and non-profits have documented the overall health and wellness benefits provided by parks, open space and trails. The Trust for Public Land published a report in 2005 called The Benefits of Parks: Why America Needs More City Parks and Open Space. This report makes the following observations about the health, economic, environmental and social benefits of parks and open space:

- Physical activity makes people healthier.
- Physical activity increases with access to parks.
- Contact with the natural world improves physical and physiological health.
- Value is added to community and economic development sustainability.
- Benefits of tourism are enhanced.
- Trees are effective in improving air quality and assisting with stormwater control.
- Recreational opportunities for all ages are provided.

- Value is added to community and economic development sustainability.
- Benefits of tourism are enhanced.
- Trees are effective in improving air quality and assisting with stormwater control.
- Recreational opportunities for all ages are provided.
The City of Monmouth, located in Oregon’s Willamette Valley, was founded in 1859 and has since grown to a community of nearly 10,000 residents. At just under 2.25 square miles, the city is located west of the Willamette River along a fork of Ash Creek and is bordered by rolling farmlands and the neighboring City of Independence. Monmouth is home to Western Oregon University, with a student body of nearly 6,000 students.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Monmouth is a small city of just under 10,000 residents located in the Willamette Valley southwest of Salem, Oregon. The city was incorporated in 1859, after being settled a few years earlier by Christian families who sought to establish a new community and college. Monmouth grew slowly through the first half of the twentieth century, then expanded as World War II soldiers from the nearby Camp Adair settled in the area. In recent decades, the city has grown further as Western Oregon University and the nearby City of Salem have grown. Monmouth is home to a large college-age population, as well families with children and older adults. The city’s residents are well educated, though they generally
have lower incomes than other state residents. While the city is predominately white, the population of communities of color has increased over the past decade.

Figure 1. Population Characteristics: Monmouth, Polk County and Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Monmouth</th>
<th>Polk County</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2017)</td>
<td>9,890</td>
<td>82,100</td>
<td>4,195,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2010)</td>
<td>9,534</td>
<td>75,403</td>
<td>3,831,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change (2000-16)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons w/ Disabilities (%)</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Household Characteristics (2013-17) |          |             |        |
| Households | 3,382 | 29,128 | 1,571,631 |
| Percent with children | 24.5% | 30.9% | 29.1% |
| Median HH Income = $36,748 | $36,748 | $56,032 | $56,119 |
| Average Household Size | 2.62 | 2.68 | 2.5 |
| Average Family Size | 3.4 | 3.18 | 3.05 |
| Owner Occupancy Rate | 45.3% | 64.6% | 61.7% |

| Age Groups (2017) |          |             |        |
| Median Age | 23.6 | 37.3 | 39.2 |
| Population < 5 years of age | 4.6% | 5.8% | 5.8% |
| Population < 18 years of age | 18.9% | 23.3% | 21.5% |
| Population 18 - 24 years of age | 34.9% | 12.8% | 9.0% |
| Population 25 - 64 years of age | 37.7% | 47.0% | 53.2% |
| Population > 65 years of age | 8.5% | 16.9% | 16.3% |


Population

The City of Monmouth has grown significantly over the past sixty years – from just under 2,000 people in 1960 to nearly 10,000 today (see Figure 1). The city is currently home to approximately 9,900 residents and its population is expected grow by approximately 30% over the next two decades.

Monmouth experienced strong growth in the 1960s and again between 1990 and 2010, when annual growth was approximately 2.3% per year. Growth has slowed in more recent decades, to less than 1% annually. Monmouth makes up about one-eighth (12%) of the population of Polk County and is projected to
contribute proportionally to the County's population growth over future decades.

Portland State University’s Population Research Center projects a 2020 population of 10,378 for areas within the Monmouth urban growth boundary, growing to 12,129 people by 2030.

Figure 2. Population Change – Actual and Projected: 1950 - 2040

Age Group Distribution

Monmouth has a youthful population, with a median age of 23.6, though a low percentage of families with children – due to the presence of Western Oregon University. This has important implications for park and recreation needs. Young adults between 15 to 24 years old make up the city’s largest 20-year population group, comprising 37.4% of the overall population (see Figure 3).

- Youth under 5 years of age make up 4.6% of Monmouth’s population. This group represents users of preschool and tot programs and facilities, and as trails and open space users, are often in strollers. These individuals are the future participants in youth activities.

- Children 5 to 14 years make up current youth program participants. Approximately 12% of the city’s population falls into this age range.

- Teens and young adults, age 15 to 24 years, are in transition from youth program to adult programs.
and participate in teen/young adult programs where available. Members of this age group are often seasonal employment seekers. About 37% percent of Monmouth’s residents are teens and young adults.

While approximately 54 percent of Monmouth residents are youth and young adults up to 24 years of age, 30% are 25 to 55 year olds, and 17% are 55 and older.

- Adults ages 25 to 34 years are users of adult programs. Approximately 14% of residents are in this age category. These residents may be entering long-term relationships and establishing families. One quarter of Monmouth’s households are families with children.

- Adults between 35 and 54 years of age represent users of a wide range of adult programs and park facilities. Their characteristics extend from having children using preschool and youth programs to becoming empty nesters. This age group makes up 15% of Monmouth’s population.

- Older adults, ages 55 years plus, make up approximately 17% of Monmouth’s population. This group represents users of adult and senior programs. These residents may be approaching retirement or already retired and may be spending time with grandchildren. This group also ranges from very healthy, active seniors to more physically inactive seniors.

The city’s median age (23.6) has remained relatively constant over the past two decades and is much lower than that of Polk County (37.3) and Oregon (39.1).

Figure 3. Age Group Distributions: 2010 & 2017

Sources: 2010 Census, 2017 American Community Survey
Race and Ethnicity

In 2010, Monmouth was 82.8% White, 3.3% Asian, 11% African American, 1.5% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 0.6% Pacific Islander, 6.6% other race, and 4.1% from two or more races, see Figure 3. Over 13% of people identified as Hispanic or Latino of any race. This represents an increase of 3.5% in the percentage of communities of color since 2000.

According to the 2017 American Community Survey, approximately 22% of Monmouth’s population speaks a language other than English at home. This is a higher percentage of people who speak a language other than English at home than in Oregon as a whole (6%).

The City should consider how it could best provide recreational opportunities, programs and information that are accessible to, and meet the needs of, all community members.

Household Characteristics

The 2017 average household size in Monmouth was 2.62 people, higher than the state (2.5) average. Average household size grew slightly since 2010 (2.52). The average family size in Monmouth is larger, at 3.05 people. Of the 3,382 households in the city, 48% were families, including 24% with children under 18, and 28% were individuals living alone.

Income & Poverty

A community’s level of household income can impact the types of recreational services prioritized by community members, as well as their willingness and ability to pay for recreational services. Perhaps more importantly, household income is also closely linked with levels of physical activity. Low-income households are three times more likely to live a sedentary lifestyle than middle and upper-income households, according to an analysis of national data by the Active Living by Design organization.

In 2017, the median household income in Monmouth was $36,748. This income level was over $19,000 (35%) less than the median income for Polk County and Oregon residents. At the lower end of the household income scale, approximately 35% percent of Monmouth households earn less than $25,000 annually, relatively more than households in Polk County (21%), the State of Oregon (21%), and across the United States (23%). In 2017, 11% of Monmouth’s families were living below the poverty level. The poverty threshold was an income of $24,600 for a family of four. This percentage is slightly higher than the countywide (9.5%) and statewide (9.8%) levels. Poverty affects 20% of youth under 18 and 8.5% of those 65 and older. The percentage of local families accessing food stamp or SNAP benefits (19%) is on par with the state average (18%).

Lower-income residents can face a number of barriers to physical activity including poor access to parks and recreational facilities, a lack of transportation options, a lack of time...
and poor health. Low-income residents may also be less financially able to afford recreational service fees or to pay for services, such as childcare, that can make physical activity possible.

Higher income households generally have an increased ability and willingness to pay for recreation and leisure services, and often face fewer barriers to participation. Approximately 9 percent of Monmouth households have household incomes in the higher income brackets ($100,000 and greater), lower than in the county (22%) and the state (24%).

Employment & Education

The 2017 work force population (16 years and over) of Monmouth is 8,312 (83%). Of this population, over half (59%) is in the labor force, 3.7% is unemployed, and 41% is not in the labor force. Monmouth’s economy centers on education, health and social services, which together employ more than four in ten workers. The largest employers include Western Oregon University, Partnerships in Community Living and the Ron Wilson Center. Retail trade and the arts, entertainment, recreation and hospitality sector also employ a large percentage of local workers and (13.4% and 12.7%, respectively) contribute significantly to the local economy.

According to the 2017 American Community Survey, approximately 4% of Monmouth residents have a Bachelor’s degree, while 85% have some college education. This level of education attainment is much higher than Polk County and the state (in which 65% and 56% of residents have some college or a bachelor’s degree, respectively). Additionally, 95% of city residents have a high school degree or higher, much higher than the statewide average.

Persons with Disabilities

The 2017 American Community Survey also reported 10.3% of Monmouth’s population (1,028 persons) 5 years and older as having a disability that interferes with life activities. This is lower than county and state averages (both 14%). Among residents 65 and older, the percentage rises to 37%, or 317 persons, which is par with percentages found in the general senior population of the State of Oregon (37%). It signals a potential need to design inclusive parks, recreational facilities and programs. Planning, designing and operating a park system that facilitates participation by residents of all abilities will also help ensure compliance with Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
HEALTH STATUS

Information on the health of Monmouth residents is not readily available. However, Polk County residents rank as some of the healthiest residents in Oregon (6th out of 36 counties), according to the County Health Rankings. However, approximately 35% of Polk County adults are overweight or obese, compared to 26% of Oregon adults.

Approximately 16% of Polk County adults age 20 and older report getting no leisure-time physical activity – on par with the statewide average of 15%. This relatively low rate may be due, in part, to the large number of places to participate in physical activity, including parks and public or private community centers, gyms or other recreational facilities. In Polk County, 92% of residents have access to adequate physical activity opportunities, which is slightly higher than the 88% average for all Oregon residents.

According to the County Health Rankings, Polk County also ranks in the top third compared to all Oregon counties for health outcomes, including length and quality of life, and health factors (such as health behaviors, clinical care, social and economic factors, and the physical environment).

From the winter 2015 issue of the National Association of Realtors (NAR) magazine, the direct link between how communities are built and grow is tied to health and quality of life. More walkable and bike-able environments with better access to nature and parks have become essential for personal well-being and needs to be integrated into community planning. The NAR articles identify walkable communities as a prescription for better health. Even the U.S. Surgeon General sounded a call to action challenging communities to become more walkable to allow more Americans to increase their physical activity through walking. The Center for Disease Control and its Healthy Community Design Initiative focuses on walkability and the need to better integrate into transportation planning.

The NAR magazine issue also reported on the value of bicycle-friendly communities and the direct tie to healthy and sustainable living. Access to healthy, locally-grown food choices is reported with the value of community gardens and urban food hubs for healthy diets, as well as connection to community engagement.

Realtors have long been aware that housing near a good system of parks and trails will hold strong appeal to buyers. The winter NAR issue illustrates the recognition that community design for healthy living goes beyond the single house location. People want choices, and these healthy community design traits of walking, biking, trails and parks all play an important role in housing prices, sales and re-sales.
Community engagement and feedback played an important role in establishing a clear planning framework that reflects current community priorities. A variety of public outreach methods were used, including:

- An online community survey
- Pop-up displays at four community events
- A community meeting
- Group and individual stakeholder discussions
- Website content & email blasts
- MindMixer online engagement
- Parks and Recreation Board sessions

Throughout this planning process, the public provided information and expressed opinions about their needs and priorities for parks, trails and recreation facilities and programs in the community. This feedback played a crucial role in updating policy statements and prioritizing the capital facilities project list contained within this Plan.
COMMUNITY SURVEY

The City of Monmouth contracted for the administration of a community survey to gather input to help determine park, trail and recreation priorities of the community. In all, 269 survey responses were received.

The 15-question online survey was posted to the City’s website on April 30, 2019. Information about the survey was provided on the City’s website homepage and on the Parks System Master Plan project page. It was promoted via multiple City Facebook posts and during the Community Health and Fitness Fair held in June 2019, which served as the initial outreach event for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan update. Community event attendees were encouraged to take the survey online and were provided handouts with the survey link and QR code. The survey was closed on June 29th, and preliminary data were compiled and reviewed.

Survey respondents were asked about:

- Performance and quality of programs and parks
- Usage of City parks and recreation facilities
- Overall satisfaction with the value of services being delivered by the City
- Opinions about the need for various park, recreation and trail improvements
- Priorities for future park and recreation services and facilities

Major survey findings are noted below, and a more detailed discussion of results can be found in the needs assessment (Chapter 5).

A complete summary of survey findings can be found in Appendix A.

Major Findings from Survey

Monmouth residents strongly value their parks and recreation facilities:

- Nearly all respondents (98%) think parks and recreation are important to quality of life in Monmouth.

Residents visit parks frequently:

- Nearly 85% of respondents visit parks or recreation facilities at least once a month.
- More than eight in ten respondents have visited Main Street Park, Madrona Park and Gentle Woods Park, while fewer have visited La Mesa and Whitesell Parks.
- The most popular activities are using playgrounds and participating in festivals or celebrations.

Residents are generally satisfied with existing parks and recreation facilities:

- A large majority of respondents (83%) are somewhat to very satisfied with the value they receive from the City of Monmouth for parks and recreation amenities.
- More than 90% of respondents rated the condition of Main Street Park and Madrona Park as excellent or good. La Mesa Park was rated less favorably and is also less frequently visited.
- However, over half of residents said they would visit parks more often if the City addressed maintenance,
Residents would like to see improvements made to the park and recreation system:

- A large majority of survey respondents think that Monmouth does not have enough neighborhood walking and biking trails (80%).
- Respondents were somewhat split on the adequacy of parks, picnic areas, and sports fields and courts, with pluralities feeling there are not enough sport fields and courts or picnic areas.
- Notably, a large majority of respondents (90% or more) were supportive of expanding and improving multi-use walking and biking trails, community events or festivals, ADA accessible playgrounds, and picnic areas or shelters for group gatherings.

PUBLIC EVENTS

The project team aimed to get feedback from local residents and program users at multiple community events and a public meeting during the course of the project. The City’s website, social media, and local news media were used to publicize the events and encourage participation. Summary responses from each of the meetings are provided in Appendix B.

Community Open House Meeting #1 (September 5, 2019)

Community members were invited to an open house on Thursday, September 5, 2019 from 6:30 - 8:00 p.m. at Volunteer Hall. As the first public session for the Plan update, the project team prepared informational displays covering major themes for parks and recreation, in addition to survey findings. These display stations included Project Overview, Survey Summary, Recreation Programming, Trails, Parks & Outdoor Recreation and Investment Priorities. Attendees were encouraged to talk with staff, record their comments and complete a written comment card. City staff, Board members and project team staff engaged with participants to explore current issues, needs and interests related to park, trail and recreation opportunities and needs.

Pop-Up Engagement at Events

City staff and members of the Park and Recreation Board coordinated for and attended four community events during the summer of 2019 to solicit feedback from the public. The events included the following:

- June 2019 - Community Health and Fitness Fair (June 1)
- Music in the Park Summer Concert Series (July 24)
- Music in the Park Summer Concert Series (July 31)
- Music in the Park Summer Concert Series (August 7)

Display materials offered attendees to learn about the project and provide feedback about their recreational interests and priorities.
STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSIONS

In May 2019, City staff and the project consultant met with representatives from multiple sports leagues, clubs, and programs to discuss existing challenges and future demands and needs for sports facilities and programming in Monmouth, including:

- Central School District
- Central Youth Sports
- Monmouth Senior Advisory Board
- Gate Youth Association
- Monmouth Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee
- Monmouth Planning Commission
- Partnerships in Community Living
- Western Oregon University
- YMCA

The group discussed each organization’s needs and perspectives regarding recreation facilities and programming. Stakeholder comments were often specific to the particular perspective or interest of the stakeholder group. Attendees offered a variety of suggestions on how to improve the City’s park and recreation system. Many recommended the addition or renovation of recreation facilities, such as playgrounds, sports fields and courts, trails, and skateparks. Attendees also encouraged greater coordination and collaboration with the City of Independence on regional park and trail improvements. Finally, many suggested ways to improve communication between the City and community members to bolster use and community ownership of the City’s park and recreation system. Specific recommendations are incorporated in the Needs Assessment chapter, and a full summary is provided in Appendix C.

PARK & RECREATION BOARD MEETINGS

The Park and Recreation Board provided feedback on the Plan during two regularly scheduled public sessions. The first session occurred on February 27th immediately after the plan update project was initiated. The Board discussed the update and provided their perspectives on a vision for the system, parks and programs, specific challenges, opportunities and potential community partnerships. A second session was held on July 10th to review the findings of the community survey, and a third session was help on November 7th to discuss the draft Plan and provide direction on proposed goals and capital improvements.

OTHER OUTREACH

In addition to the direct outreach opportunities noted above, the Monmouth community was informed about the project and opportunities to
participate and offer comments through the City’s website and social media.

A project webpage was posted on the City’s website to provide background information and meeting announcements. The page was updated periodically to keep residents informed of progress and alerted to opportunities for involvement during the process.

In addition to the City’s social media feeds via Facebook, the project team utilized the MindMixer platform as an ongoing forum for online community discussion. The tool allowed for community members to submit comments and ideas to a variety of prompts and was linked to the City’s social media accounts and website.

Figure 4. Sample screenshot of Facebook postings
Classifying parkland based on its characteristics and recreational offerings can help ensure the total park system meets a community’s recreational needs. The planned Monmouth 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 full range of community needs. Classifying parkland by function allows the City to evaluate its needs and plan for an efficient, cost effective and usable park system that minimizes conflicts between park users and adjacent uses.

As a small but growing city, the classifications are intended to provide a framework regarding the usage and utility of existing and future sites. Parks are categorized into the following park types, although Monmouth does not currently have properties that fall within each classification:

- Community Parks
- Neighborhood Parks
- Mini Parks
- Undeveloped Parks
- Special Use Areas
- Natural Areas
As Monmouth continues to grow, both in population and area, the existing parks system will need to adapt and expand to provide additional high-quality park and recreation amenities. Figure 5 displays a summary of existing parks and Map 1 illustrates the existing parks system.

Figure 5. Inventory of City Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>RESTROOM</th>
<th>SPLASH PAD / FOUNTAIN</th>
<th>AMPHITHEATER</th>
<th>HIKING TRAIL</th>
<th>PICNIC TABLE</th>
<th>PICNIC SHelter</th>
<th>BASEBALL FIELD</th>
<th>BASKETBALL</th>
<th>SOCCER</th>
<th>TENNIS COURT</th>
<th>DOG PARK</th>
<th>HORSESHOE PITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gentle Woods Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth Recreational Park</td>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marr Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesell Park</td>
<td>Mini Park</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winegar Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gentle Woods</td>
<td>Undeveloped Park</td>
<td>1.79</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ACRES** 28.08
Community Parks

Community parks provide a variety of structured, active and passive, and informal recreation opportunities for all age groups. Community parks are generally larger in size and serve a wide base of residents. They typically include facilities that attract people from the entire community, such as sports fields, pavilions and picnic shelters, water features, and require support facilities, such as parking and restrooms. These parks may also include natural areas, unique landscapes and trails. Community parks may range from 1 to 50 acres in size.

Main Street Park
120 Main St. E.

Main Street Park, at 2.05-acres, is located in downtown Monmouth is the crown jewel of the City's park system. The park encompasses nearly an entire city block and is bound on the north by Jackson Street, to the east by Knox Street, to the south by Main Street, and to the west by Warren Street. This park is home to an outdoor amphitheater often used for music and theater performances. The park's picnic tables and rentable gazebo are ideal for picnics and gatherings. The park also features multiple playground structures, a splash pad, bike repair station and restroom.

Monmouth Recreational Park
401 Hogan Rd. N.

Monmouth Recreational Park is a 6.21-acre community park bounded by Monmouth Elementary School to the west, residential housing to the south and northwest, and municipal wastewater
treatment ponds further to the north. Existing facilities include two baseball fields, two tennis courts, a large dog park, a skatepark, parking and restroom. The dog park is ADA-accessible and has separate fenced areas for large and small dogs. The Skate Park is 3,500 square feet of ramps, rails and platforms.

**Madrona Park**
1521 Madrona St. E.

Madrona Park is the city’s newest and largest community park. This community park, at 8.63-acres, includes a picnic shelter, playground, basketball court, ADA accessible paths, an arboretum, restroom and drinking fountain. There is also a spacious grassy area suitable for impromptu neighborhood baseball, football or soccer games. An ADA-accessible path extends along a perimeter surrounding the park.

**Gentle Woods Park**
600 Olive Way E.

This 2.54-acre park is located is along the middle fork of Ash Creek among a mature stand of oak and ash trees. The park is bordered by Highway 99W to the west, residential areas to the south and east, and undeveloped land to the north. It includes a large picnic pavilion that can be rented for group events as well as multiple picnic areas. Other park amenities include a playground, picnic tables, a horse shoe pit, benches, restroom and two drinking fountains.
Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks are located within walking and bicycling distance of most users. Neighborhood parks provide access to basic recreation activities for nearby residents of all ages, function as critical open space, and are often defining elements of a neighborhood. These parks are generally 1 to 5-acres in size and serve residents within ½-mile walking distance. Neighborhood parks typically include facilities such as playgrounds, basketball courts, tennis courts, lawn areas, picnic tables, and benches.

Cherry Lane Park
498 Ackerman St. W.

Cherry Lane Park is a 1.06-acre neighborhood park located at Cherry Lane, Ackerman Street W., and just off of Whitman Street S. Existing facilities and amenities include a playground, picnic table, benches. The park is comprised mostly of open lawn areas with perimeter landscaping.

Winegar Park
589 Ecols St. N.

Winegar Park, sometimes referred to as "Purple Park", is a 0.73-acre neighborhood park located in northwest Monmouth, at Ecols Street N. and Suzanna Avenue. It features a small creek, half-court basketball hoop, play structure, mature shade trees, a picnic table, bench, and open grassy area. The play structure mimics a boat, and includes a slide, climbing features and a balance beam.
Mini Parks

Mini parks are typically located on small parcels and provide passive or limited active recreation opportunities. They are generally less than 0.5 acres in size and provide modest recreational amenity to residents within a ¼-mile walking distance.

La Mesa Park
1059 Bentley St. E.

La Mesa Park is a secluded 0.57-acre mini park located in southeastern Monmouth, east of Heffley Street and south of Bentley Street. The park is located in the heart of a city block and is surrounded by residential development on all sides. This park has a half-court basketball hoop, picnic table, playground, bench as well as shade trees and lawn areas.

Marr Park
799 Jackson St. W.

Marr Park is a 0.37-acre mini park located at Jackson Street and Marr Court. The park is bordered by the City limits and agricultural land to the west, and residential development to the south and east. The park contains a playground, picnic table, bench, horseshoe pits, and an open lawn area.
Southgate Park  
501 Southgate Dr.

Southgate Park is a 0.66-acre mini park located at Southgate Drive and Josephine Street in southern Monmouth. It contains a half-court basketball hoop, picnic table, playground, bench as well as shade trees and an open grassy area.

Whitesell Park  
300 Catherine Ct.

Whitesell Park is a 0.49-acre mini park located just north of Western Oregon University on the western end of Catherine Court. It is also positioned on an informal walking route between predominantly WOU student housing and the WOU campus. The park contains a half-court basketball hoop, picnic table, bench, playground and open grassy area.

Undeveloped Parks

Undeveloped parks consist of property designated as parkland, but have little or no improvements and no specific park use as of yet. This classification is used to identify a site up until a site master plan is prepared and site improvements begin.

West Gentle Woods Park  
815 Catron St. N.

West Gentle Woods Park is a 1.79-acre undeveloped parcel located between Catron Street and Highway 99W in the northern portion of Monmouth. It is heavily vegetated with trees, shrubs, and grasses and is bisected by the Middle Fork of Ash Creek. Directly southeast of the parcel, across Highway 99W, is Gentle Woods Park. This property will be retained as a passive-use recreation site.
OTHER RECREATION PROVIDERS

School and University recreation facilities play an important role in the community and include amenities such as sports fields, tracks, playgrounds, indoor training and swimming pools.

Central School District

The Central School District operates two schools within the Monmouth city Limits, both of which have recreational facilities available for community use outside of school hours. Ash Creek Elementary School, located at 1360 16th Street N, has two playgrounds, a football/soccer field, a softball/baseball field and open grassy areas. The campus of Monmouth Elementary School, located at 958 E Church St., includes three playgrounds, two football/soccer fields, one softball/baseball field and open grassy areas. The campus of Monmouth Elementary School, located at 958 E Church St., includes three playgrounds, two football/soccer fields, one softball/baseball field and open grassy areas. The campus of Monmouth Elementary School, located at 958 E Church St., includes three playgrounds, two football/soccer fields, one softball/baseball field and open grassy areas.

Other City Assets

The City also maintains a 0.2-acre open space adjacent to City Hall, the Monmouth Library, the Monmouth Senior Center and a 1.45-mile bike path paralleling Hwy 99.

Natural Areas

Natural areas are undeveloped lands primarily left in a natural state with only modest improvements for recreation uses. These conserved open spaces are usually owned or managed by a governmental agency and may or may not have public access. Natural areas may provide trail corridors, and offer low-impact or passive activities, such as walking or nature observation, where appropriate.

Special Use Areas

Special use facilities include single-purpose recreational areas or stand-alone sites designed to support a specific, specialized use. This classification includes stand-alone sport field complexes and community centers.

Western Oregon University

Western Oregon University provides a number of recreation facilities for the use of its students and faculty. In general, facilities are only available for
public use during limited times, outside of academic/university function and school hours, and/or require additional memberships. Facilities include:

- Wolverton Memorial Swimming Pool
- McArthur Field (football/track stadium)
- indoor gymnasium for basketball and volleyball
- indoor climbing wall
- two racquetball courts, a weight room
- an indoor tennis court
- four outdoor tennis courts
- a frisbee golf course (9 holes)
- cross country course
- three softball fields
- four football/soccer fields

City of Independence

The City of Independence currently has nine parks in its inventory providing 114 acres of parklands for its residents. Riverview Park is the largest site and serves as a focal point for the community, with access to the Willamette River. The city also has a 5-acre dog park.

Independence has two off-street walking paths and running trails in town. The first is phase 1 of the Ash Creek Trail, a half-mile concrete path running along Ash Creek between 16th Street and Gun Club Road. The second is the Willamette River Trail, a 5k soft surface trail loop that runs from the Riverview Park Amphitheater to the North Riverfront Ballfield Complex.

City of Dallas

The City of Dallas provides a range of park and recreation options for its residents and serves as a recreation hub with its program offerings and the aquatic center. The city has 11 parks, provides a range of recreation programs and a variety of facilities, including disc golf, pickleball and trail segments along Rickreall Creek.

Private Homeowner Association Parks

In the southeastern section of Monmouth, the Edwards Addition subdivision provides two homeowner association parks for residents of this neo-traditional development. The two sites in total provide 0.63 acres of parkland for the community.
RECREATION TRENDS

The following summaries from recognized park and recreation resources provide background on national, state and local trends that may reflect potential recreational activities and facilities for future consideration in Monmouth’s park system. Examining current recreation trends can help inform potential park and recreation improvements and opportunities that may enhance the community and create a more vibrant parks system as it moves into the future. Additional recreation trend information is provided in Appendix D.

State of the Managed Recreation Industry Report

Recreation Management magazine’s 2018 State of the Managed Recreation Industry Report summarizes the opinions and information provided by a wide range of professionals working in the recreation, sports and fitness facilities. The 2018 report indicated that many (86.6%) recreation, sports and fitness facility owners form partnerships with other organizations, as a means of expanding their reach, offering additional
programming opportunities or as a way to share resources and increase funding. Local schools are shown as the most common partner (61.3%) for all facility types. Parks and recreation organizations (95.8%) were the most likely to report that they had partnered with outside organizations.

Park system professionals reported plans to add features at their facilities. The top 10 planned features for all facility types include:

1. Splash play areas (23.6%)
2. Synthetic turf sports fields (17%)
3. Fitness trails and/or outdoor fitness equipment (16.4%)
4. Fitness centers (16.3%)
5. Walking/hiking trails (15.5%)
6. Playgrounds (15.2%)
7. Park shelters (13.6%)
8. Dog parks (13.5%)
9. Exercise studios (12.9%)
10. Disc golf courses (12.9%)

Respondents from community centers, parks and health clubs were the most likely to report that they had plans to add programs at their facilities over the next few years. The 10 most commonly planned program additions in 2018 include:

1. Fitness programs (planned by 25.9% of those who will be adding programs)
2. Educational programs (25.7%)
3. Mind-body balance programs (23.3%)
4. Teen programs (22.7%)
5. Environmental education (20.7%)
6. Day camps and summer camps (20.3%)
7. Special needs programs (18.9%)
8. Adult sports teams (18.5%)
9. Holidays and other special events (18.3%)
10. Individual sports activities (17.5%)

Outdoor Participation Report

According to 2018 Outdoor Participation Report, published by the Outdoor Foundation in Boulder, Colorado, more than 146.1 million Americans (49%) participated in an outdoor activity at least once in 2017. These outdoor participants went on a total of 10.9 billion outdoor outings, a decrease from 11.0 billion in 2016. Participation in outdoor recreation, team sports and indoor fitness activities vary by an individual’s age. Recent trend highlights include the following:

- Twenty percent (20%) of outdoor enthusiasts participated in outdoor activities at least twice per week.
- Running, including jogging and trail running, was the most popular activity among Americans when measured by number of participants and by number of total annual outings.
- Nineteen percent (19%) outdoor participants lived in the South Atlantic region of the US, making its population the most active in outdoor activities.
- Walking for fitness was the most popular crossover activity where 45.8% of all outdoor participants also walked.
- Data shows that adults who were introduced to the outdoors as children were more likely to participate in...
outdoor activities during adulthood than those who were not exposed to the outdoors as children.

- The biggest motivator for outdoor participation was getting exercise.

Figure 6. 3-Year Change in Outdoor Recreation Participation of Youth (6-24)

Favorite activities and participation rates range with demographics. In 2017, the average participant had 15 years of experience enjoying outdoor recreation. The data shows, as would be expected, that the amount of experience increased as the participant aged. Those ages 45 and up averaged 25 years as outdoor participants.
Oregon State Outdoor Recreation Trends

The 2019-2023 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), entitled *Outdoor Recreation in Oregon: Responding to Demographic and Societal Change*, constitutes Oregon’s basic five-year plan for outdoor recreation. The plan addresses five important demographic and societal changes facing outdoor recreation providers in the coming years including:

1. An aging population;
2. An increasingly diverse population;
3. Lack of youth engagement in outdoor recreation;
4. An underserved low-income population; and
5. The health benefits of physical activity.

As part of developing the SCORP, the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) conducted a statewide survey of Oregon residents regarding their 2017 outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, as well as their opinions about park and recreation management. This data can help local park and recreation providers better understand public opinions and the preferences of outdoor recreation participants.

The top three activities with the largest annual user occasions include Walking on local streets / sidewalks (313 million), walking on local trails / paths (113 million), and dog walking / going to dog parks / off-leash areas (78 million).

The survey also asked about priorities for local community needs revealing the top six (6) local (close to home) needs as

- Cleaner restrooms.
- Soft surface walking trails.
- More restrooms.
- Playgrounds with natural materials (Natural Play Areas).
- Nature and wildlife viewing areas.
- Public access to waterways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local trails / paths</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing, hanging out, escaping heat / noise, etc.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking / going to dog parks / off-leash areas</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking your children or grandchildren to a playground</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing / driving or motorcycling for pleasure</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling on roads, streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / day hiking on non-local trails / paths</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling on paved trails</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Interests

Local recreation demands and needs were explored through a variety of public engagement to gather feedback on strengths and limitations of existing park and recreational resources available to Monmouth residents. Public outreach notification to generate interest in the master plan project included a two-month long online community survey, stakeholder discussions, an open house to review opportunities across the park system, and pop-up displays at several community events during the summer of 2019.

Community Outreach Events

The feedback and comments focused on trail connection for walking and biking and more active uses in parks. On display boards soliciting feedback about recreation investment priorities, participants were directed to select their top three priorities for future improvement in the park system. Trail connections ranked the highest priority with playgrounds and sports courts, respectively as the second and third priority park improvement.

Additional ideas were suggested as notes on various display boards and included:

- Trail connections
- Sport courts (e.g., pickleball)
- All-inclusive playgrounds
- Outdoor fitness
- Recreation program options
- Park maintenance

Parks for Health

Parks are an important destination for people engaging in outdoor physical activity. Physical activity is one of the most important behaviors that reduces chronic diseases and improves health incomes for all age groups. Numerous studies have demonstrated that public parks contribute to health even beyond physical activity. The NRPA report *Quantifying the Contribution of Public Parks to Physical Activity and Health* outlines several variables for parks’ role in improving both community and individual health. An important variable for promoting community health is the provision of parks which are accessible through safe walking routes and contain elements that create an attractive destination.
Stakeholder Feedback

Through a series of questions covering existing recreational activities and uses, concerns and future considerations and opportunities, the stakeholders provided their perspectives on how the park system could respond to current and future community needs. The stakeholders were all generally satisfied with what the City has been able to provide through the park and recreation system, but also noted that more park spaces and amenities would be beneficial to meet current and future recreation needs. The top priorities for potential park and recreation improvements included additional park spaces, better and safer biking connections, additional gathering places (picnic shelters), skatepark renovation/replacement, and sport courts for pickleball and volleyball.

Community Survey Results

A community online survey was conducted from late April 2019 thru late June 2018, accessed from the City’s website and promoted through Facebook, email blasts, an online engagement platform and during the Community Health and Fitness Fair in June. While the survey is not necessarily representative of all City residents since respondents were not selected through statistical sampling methods, the response provide some insight into local opinions and community preferences.

When asked about the value of public parks, recreation opportunities and open spaces nearly all respondents (98%) confirmed the relationship as important or essential to the quality of life. The majority of survey respondents (80%) agreed that the City of Monmouth does not have enough neighborhood walking and biking trails.

In rating their level of satisfaction with the overall value received from the City for parks and recreation, a large majority of respondents (83%) are somewhat to very satisfied with the value they receive from the City of Monmouth for parks and recreation amenities.

When asked which parks and recreation improvements they would like to see the City focus on, over half of residents gave top or high priority to maintaining existing parks, building trails and protecting natural areas.

Monmouth respondents visit local parks and recreation facilities for a variety of reasons. The most popular activities are using playgrounds (62%) and participating in festivals or celebrations (60%). Majorities of respondents also visit parks for relaxation (57%), family gatherings (55%), and trails (53%). Fewer visited to use a sport field (16%), tennis court (4%) or volleyball court (<1%). In addition, 12 respondents (4.6%) wrote in that they visit parks to walk or play with their dogs.

The survey also asked about residents’ support for park and recreational improvements. A majority of respondents were very or somewhat supportive of expanding or improving all facilities listed.

A large majority of respondents (90% or more) were supportive of expanding and improving multi-use walking and biking trails, community events or festivals,
ADA accessible playgrounds, and picnic areas or shelters for group gatherings. More than half of respondents were very or somewhat supportive of all other improvements listed.

Younger respondents were more supportive than older respondents of all active use activities listed, including sports courts and fields, splash pads, indoor fitness equipment, disc golf, and gymnasiums, with the exception of pickleball. Similarly, respondents with children in their home were more likely to support active-use improvements than those without children at home. Multi-use trails, wildlife viewing and community events areas appealed to respondents of all ages and family sizes.

Figure 8. Park Amenities of Interest from Survey
The condition of park infrastructure and amenities is a measure of park adequacy and a required assurance of public safety. General park infrastructure may include walkways, parking lots, park furniture, drainage and irrigation, lighting systems and vegetation. Deferred maintenance over a long period can result in unusable amenities when perceived as unsafe or undesirable by park patrons.

The existing conditions within parks were assessed to identify issues and concerns and opportunities for future improvements. The condition assessment matrix shown on the below summarizes the results of these assessments and can be used to help prioritize needed park improvements. The matrix uses a rating system that ranks the condition of the park element based on the following scale:

1 – Good Condition: In general, amenities in good condition offer full functionality and do not need repairs. Good facilities have playable sports surfaces and equipment, working fixtures, and fully intact safety features (railings, fences, etc.). Good facilities may have minor cosmetic defects. Good facilities encourage area residents to use the park.

2 – Fair: In general, amenities in fair condition are largely functional but need minor or moderate repairs. Fair facilities have play surfaces, equipment, fixtures, and safety features that are operational and allow play, but have deficiencies or time periods where they are unusable. Fair facilities remain important amenities for the neighborhood but may slightly discourage use of the park by residents.

3 – Poor: In general, amenities in poor condition are largely or completely unusable. They need major repairs to be functional. Poor facilities are park features that have deteriorated to the point where they are barely usable. Fields are too uneven for ball games, safety features are irreparably broken, buildings need structural retrofitting, etc. Poor facilities discourage residents from using the park.

Generally a feature with a rating of “3” should have higher priority for resolution through maintenance, capital repairs or as a new capital project. Park amenity conditions were also averaged across park elements to indicate which types of elements are in greater need for significant upgrades, renovations or overall improvements. Based on this assessment, the City’s tennis courts, baseball/softball fields, site furnishings, and natural area vegetation are in the greatest need of rehabilitation or repair.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Playgrounds</th>
<th>Paved Courts: Basketball</th>
<th>Paved Courts: Tennis</th>
<th>Soccer Fields</th>
<th>Baseball / Softball Fields</th>
<th>Pathways / Trails</th>
<th>Shade Trees / Sprays</th>
<th>Picnic Area</th>
<th>Restrooms</th>
<th>Amenity Area</th>
<th>Concession Building</th>
<th>Turf</th>
<th>Park Restrooms</th>
<th>Undeveloped Areas</th>
<th>Natural Areas</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Park</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</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>Gentle Woods Park</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Park</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona Park</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Park</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marni Park</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth Recreational Park</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Park</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gentle Woods</td>
<td>1.79</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>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesell Park</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winegar Park</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rating</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings: 1 = good; 2 = fair; 3 = poor

*Note: Does not constitute a comprehensive ADA assessment of every park element
Park & Facility Condition Assessment

### Parking Areas:

1. In good condition: paving and drainage do not need repair; pavement markings clear; pathway connection provided; facility proper layout.
2. In fair condition: paving needs patching or has some drainage problems; has wheel stops and curbs.
3. In poor condition: surfaces (gravel, asphalt, or concrete) needs repair; uneven grading; limited signage; no delineation for vehicles.

### Public Art:

1. In good condition: no vandalism; no signs of weathering.
2. In fair condition: minor signs of weathering or wear.
3. In poor condition: metal leaking/concrete efflorescence/paint peeling/wood chipped or carved/iron or warping/vandalized.

### Park Structures (Restrooms, Picnic Shelters, Concession Buildings):

1. In good condition: roof has no leaks; floor shows little sign of wear; finishes are fresh with no graffiti or vandalism; all elements are in working order.
2. In fair condition: roof shows signs of wear but is structurally sound; floor shows some wear; finishes show some wear with some marks or blemishes.
3. In poor condition: roof leaks or otherwise needs repair; floor shows significant wear and is difficult to maintain; finishes are dull or discolored, have graffiti, or are not easily maintained; some elements not working or in need of repair (e.g., non-functioning sink).

### Amphitheater/Stage:

1. In good condition: stage and stair materials have little to no cracking or peeling; vegetation that is present is healthy; seating and other furnishings show modest signs of wear; views to stage from all seating vantage points.
2. In fair condition: stage and stair materials have some cracking or peeling; vegetation that is present is healthy, but some soil compaction might be present; seating and other furnishings show signs of wear, but are still usable; stage orientation is not ideal for all viewers.
3. In poor condition: stage and stair materials have significant cracking or peeling; vegetation is unhealthy (pests, disease, topped trees), compacted soil; seating and other furnishings need repair or replacement; redesign of space is needed for proper viewing and access.

### Turf:

1. In good condition: lush and full; few weeds, no drainage problems.
2. In fair condition: some bare spots, some drainage problems.

### Park Trees:

1. In good condition: trees overall have good form and spacing; no topping; free of disease or pest infestation; no vandalism; no hazard trees.
2. In fair condition: some crowding may exist but overall health is good; less than 5% of trees show signs of topping, disease or pest infestation; vandalism has not impacted tree health (graffiti, not girdling).
3. In poor condition: Form or spacing issues may exist; evidence of disease or pests; vandalism affecting tree health; some hazard trees or trees in danger of becoming hazard trees.

### Landscaped Beds:

1. In good condition: few weeds; no bare or worn areas; plants appear healthy with no signs of pest or disease infestation.
2. In fair condition: some weeds present; some bare or worn spots; plants are still generally healthy.
3. In poor condition: many weeds present; large bare or worn areas; plants show signs of pests or disease; compacted soils.

### Natural Areas:

1. In good condition: barely noticeable invasives, high species diversity, healthy plants.
2. In fair condition: Noticeable invasives, fewer species but still healthy.
3. In poor condition: Invasives have taken over, low diversity, unhealthy plants.

### ADA Compliance:

1. Appears to comply with ADA standards.
2. Some items appear to not comply, but could be fixed by replacing with relative ease.
3. A number of park assets appear not to comply, including large-scale items like grading.
Playground Equipment

Monmouth public works/parks staff should conduct regular inspections to playground equipment with trained and certified play inspectors. The older steel play elements: slides, swings and jungle gyms, within neighborhood parks should be checked for worn parts and sharp edges. The need for replacement with new equipment offers the opportunity to bring new life and interest to the subject park. Play equipment has been continually evolving and can offer a variety of physical and recreational opportunities. Designers should keep in mind that the tradition of swings and slides continues to be appreciated by parents bringing their children to parks. Beyond that basic provision, lots of possibilities are available for park play renewal through new playgrounds.

Throughout the park system, the lack of ADA-compliant access into play areas was noted. While a few parks offer ADA access to playgrounds, most small neighborhood parks in the system need to address any barriers to persons with disabilities. In some cases, keeping the level of engineered wood chips up to the level of the firm ground may provide adequate access without the need for a ramp. Placement of new equipment with access platforms to the adjacent pavement could provide the barrier-free play access. Each playground should be assessed for the best method for providing ADA compliance and universal access to play.

Safety fall surfacing in the park system was either engineered wood chips or pea gravel. Playgrounds with pea gravel should have the stone removed and replaced with an adequate depth of engineered wood chips or other play fall safety material. The play pit area may need to be excavated to allow for adequate depths for fall safety materials beneath play equipment. Regular inspections should assure the adequate depth for engineered wood chips is continually maintained under all play equipment. Playgrounds may need annual or biannual reapplications of wood chip surfacing to maintain cushioning for safe fall zones.

Walking Paths

Smaller neighborhood parks lacked any paved pathway systems. Walking paths either connecting between two local streets or linking entrances through the park could enhance the park user experience by providing universal access and an all-weather walking surface. Connecting to park amenities such as play areas, benches and picnic tables can help unify the park user experience and meet ADA guidelines.

Madrona Park’s less formal pathway system in its naturalized area is located lower than the surrounding natural plantings areas. Water tends to collect and sit in the pathway making it unusable during and after rain or snow events. Better drainage design and raising the crushed stone surfacing along the pathway is recommended to alleviate this condition.
### Site Furnishings

Picnic tables and benches in most parks are located in open grass lawn areas without ADA-compliant connections to paved park pathways. As capital repair plans for aging site furnishings are phased throughout the park system, picnic tables and benches should be replaced with ADA-compliant styles and located along paved pathways within each park. Picnic shelters and gazebos with tables should provide for tables with wheelchair spaces. Gentle Woods Park, Madrona Park, and Main Street Park picnic structures should have tables that provide wheelchair seating for 50% of the tables to be compliance with ADA guidelines.

Bleachers for spectator viewing at ballfields did not include safety railing, a requirement of the International Building Code. All tiered seating is now required to have side and back safety rails to protect from accidental falls from bleachers.

### Grass & Irrigation

Most open grass lawns within parks were in good condition. Some areas with drainage challenges, as in Madrona Park, would benefit from directed drainage treatments. During this wintertime conditions assessment, turf management seemed adequate for general park uses, however, the outfield areas in Monmouth Recreational Park were notably uneven – creating some risk of ballplayer injury.

The existing irrigation system was not tested as part of this park conditions assessment. Keeping parts, pipes and controllers operational and up-to-date will contribute to effective turf grass management and park user satisfaction.

Ground-dwelling rodents have been tunneling in grass lawn areas in Gentle Woods Park and perhaps other parks as well. Some evaluation of risk for park users should be made to discern whether 'pest' controls are necessary to avoid injuries from tripping in the burrow holes.

### Sport Court Surfacing

Aging surfaces in tennis courts have developed cracks affecting play. Noted in the individual park conditions assessments, several courts have cracks that have widened from hairline threads to larger uneven edges that affect the quality of play. Resurfacing is needed on those tennis court surfaces (Monmouth Recreational Park) that have cracked enough to affect the quality of play. Spot treatments on basketball courts with hairline cracks may help extend those surfaces for a bit longer before complete resurfacing is necessary.

### Trees and Landscapes

Many parks had newer tree plantings showing evidence of careful planning and proactive management of the park system tree canopy. During this assessment in the wintertime, the need for new mulch applications at the base of park trees and in planting beds was noticed. While many landscape maintenance practices apply new mulch in the spring, some fall mulch applications could reduce soil erosion and muddy surfaces as well as extra root system protection during the winter months.
In Madrona Park, several shade trees are planted in small planting pits within the concrete plaza area. Due to the restricted root zone offered by the limited opening in concrete pavement, these trees should not be expected to live a long, healthy life span. In determining the highest and best use for the paved area, some consideration should be given to enlarging/expanding those tree planting pits to at least double their current size. An expanded planting area will offer more soil volume and greater root growth to support a longer life for the shade trees. Better shade coverage from the trees can create a more comfortable plaza area to support other park and recreation uses.

**Park Signs & Identification**

La Mesa Park (aka “Secret Park”) lacked the common larger park identification sign since it has no main entrance and very limited street frontage. Adding a smaller version of the standard Monmouth park identification sign can help park visitors get oriented and identify the parks department that provides the outdoor recreation facility.

**Compliance with American with Disabilities Act (ADA)**

Throughout the park system, the need to remove barriers and improve universal access is warranted. Many of the neighborhood parks lack any paved pathways connecting park amenities. Connecting park elements through paved walking paths could provide better access in parks without loop paths or paved trails. Accessible ramps into the playground safety surfacing areas are needed to overcome the barrier of elevation differences from pavement or curbing to the stable fall safety surface. Viewer seating for ballfields and sports courts should be connected to the park pathway system to provide for wheelchair seating for spectators.

To meet the ADA guidelines, at least one-half of picnic tables and benches should be designed for wheelchair seating space and/or companion seating space and located adjacent to paved or stable surfaces connected to pathways or in pavilions.

All restrooms should be signed with ADA-compliant signage displaying the universal symbols for restroom facilities. Existing restroom signs at Gentle Woods Park and Monmouth Recreational Park should be replaced with new ADA-compliance signs using universal symbols.

Handicapped parking requires signs that meet ADA guidelines in height, location and symbol. All designated handicapped spaces should have designated travel aisles (via painted strips) that lead directly to park or facility access pathways. Tactile warning strips should be in place where walkways intersect with vehicular use areas (parking, crossings, etc.).
CONCEPTUAL PARK DESIGNS

Gentle Woods, Monmouth Recreation, and Southgate Park represent major opportunities for the City to reinvest in its park system to better meet community needs and address existing renovation needs. The following conceptual park designs for these three parks offer a blueprint for the renovation and enhancement of these parks, based on site evaluations and community input. The Capital Facilities Plan includes projects necessary to realize the community’s vision for these parks.

Gentle Woods Park

Gentle Woods Park contains a mix of open sunny areas and woodlands comprising 9.2 acres along the west fork of Ash Creek. A small parking area located along Olive Street, provides access to the main park entry and pathway past the existing restrooms, over the footbridge and ending at the picnic shelter. The park is bordered by Pacific Highway on its west edge and High Street on a portion of the eastern edge.

In the proposed design (see Figure 10), a pathway system is proposed to connect through the park with an additional bridge crossing the creek to create a loop experience. Existing bridges are replaced and designed to match with new bridge for a complete trail/pathway loop experience. Paved pathways extend beyond just access to the picnic shelter by connecting to most of the existing and proposed park amenities and looping through the woods and crossing the creek several times.

The playground is upgraded with the addition of new play structures for each age category (2-5 years and 5-12 years). Both structures should provide slides. A zip line is added for older children. The existing climbing net and swing set are retained to provide diverse play experiences. The swing set should provide both strap and toddler seats. The play area has universal access through the paved path addition that connects the proposed small picnic shelter with the park path and playground. If warranted, a section of 40” high black-coated chain link fencing could be added to the eastern edge of the park where the
The playground is somewhat proximate to High Street.

The year-round, park restrooms are completely renovated or replaced to ensure full compliance with safety and ADA standards. Facility improvements should aim to retain a 'woodsy' aesthetic through the use of timber frame construction or through a design of comparable qualities.

New picnic tables and benches are provided along the new pathway to ensure ADA-compliant site furnishings and more opportunities for park enjoyment.

The park’s landscape is enhanced with additional native shade trees near the playground, new picnic tables and creek corridor, and the trees are maintained and managed toward sustaining a healthy, multi-aged stand that includes white oak and ash. Native shrub plantings are proposed along the stream bank to enhance aquatic habitat, limit carte-blanche creek access and stabilize the top of the stream bank. Additional shade trees are proposed along the Pacific Highway right-of-way to help add tree canopy coverage, beautification value and shade for the small stream tributary.
Figure 10: Gentle Woods Park Concept Plan
Monmouth Recreation Park

Accessed by Hogan Road along the curve of Monmouth Independence Road, Monmouth Recreation Park provides for active recreation through its two ballfields, skatepark and tennis courts. The off-leash dog area provides separate sections for small and large dogs. Restrooms and parking are centered in the park. The City’s Public Works facility shares the Hogan Road access and is conveniently adjacent to much of the park.

In the proposed design (see Figure 12), the park gets a thorough upgrade with a number of new amenities, a new skate park in a new location, gathering places (picnic shelters), and a loop paved pathway system that connects most of the recreational features and loops around the western park perimeter to add to longer walking/exercise options. The paved pathway also connects the backside of the northern ballfield to parking and off-leash areas.

The park restrooms are replaced and a kiosk added. The colors and materials for all new structures should be coordinated to provide a similar look and color palette.

In the location of the current (to be removed) skate park, two new petanque (or bocce ball) courts are added. Access is from the existing public sidewalk, and ADA pathways are provided. Two new benches provide rest for users and watchers.

Ballfields are renovated with grass field treatments and backstop and fencing upgrades, where needed. Bleachers should all have safety rails added or be replaced.

Playgrounds are added to the open area east of the tennis courts with a loop trail running between the two play areas and connecting to the tennis courts and beyond. The proposed playground areas are both ADA compliant and contain play elements designed for 2-5 year-olds and 5-12 year olds. The western play section includes universal access to a handicapped swing seat and a climbing structure with a slide using a poured rubberized surfacing to provide fully-inclusive access. A new picnic shelter with installed tables is located between the play areas for shade, rest, picnicking and gathering.

Tennis courts are converted to multiple sports courts (tennis, pickleball & basketball) when resurfacing to provide for a variety of sport activities. A small shelter is added next to the sport courts for shade, rest and as a waiting area for times when use is heavy.

Shade trees are added at strategic locations to provide visual definition to
the park spaces, provide shade to play and skate areas and enhance wildlife value and tree canopy throughout. Native plant species are recommended for all proposed plantings to ensure added environmental value and habitat.

In the northern section of the park, a proposed boardwalk interpretive trail leads into the city-owned wetland basin to an overlook shelter. The shelter provides visual access across the basin and to the adjacent treatment ponds where waterfowl can often be observed. This above-ground boardwalk access into the basin allows for wildlife observation and wetland interpretation. The boardwalk can also connect residents from Margaret Street East to the shelter and into the park.

Whether or not there is a neighborhood connection for the proposed boardwalk and gazebo, the interpretive trail should be designed to provide a loop experience that includes the observation gazebo. The trail should have two connections within the park along its proposed paved pathway and two approaches to the gazebo. The gazebo is intended to be elevated enough to allow views to the adjacent constructed ponds where waterfowl can often be seen. The existing wet basin would benefit from additional native tree plantings to improve wildlife habitat. Construction methods for the boardwalk should incorporate minimal disturbance best management techniques for maintaining wetland ecosystem integrity.
Proposed playground areas are both ADA compliant and contain play elements designed for 2-5 year-olds and 5-12 year olds. The western play section includes universal access to a handicapped swing seat and a climbing structure with a slide using a poured rubberized surfacing to provide fully-inclusive access.
Southgate Park

Located between the end of Southgate Drive and the corner High and Josephine Streets, this 0.67-acre neighborhood park contains play equipment area and basketball ½ court for active recreational activities. Shade trees, benches and open grass lawn space provide the green park setting. A short section of paved path leads to the play area. The play equipment is aging and does not meet current recommended play safety designs.

The proposed design for the park (see Figure 13) connects amenities for universal access using a paved path across the park, converts the basketball ½ court to a multi-purpose sports court and upgrades the playground equipment to provide safer and more diverse play experiences.

The play equipment provided has two main structures to provide for the two typical age categories for children’s play equipment. The existing swing set is retained with both strap and toddler seats.

Additional amenities including a small picnic shelter, permanent picnic tables and benches, support park users with places to gather, eat, rest and enjoy the park’s open space.

Additional shade trees help shape the spaces, shade the play area and add seasonal interest and comfortable microclimates within the park spaces. As much as feasible, all existing park trees should be retained during construction and installation of the proposed park design.

An area of open grass mown is maintained to allow for general recreational activities such as playing catch, throwing Frisbees, etc.

The park identification sign is moved forward along the Southgate Drive frontage and a smaller park identification sign is added at the corner of Josephine and High Streets to provide clear communication about the place name for the park.
New multi-sport court (Basketball, volleyball, and Pickleball)
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Proposed picnic table

Proposed pathway
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Proposed pathway

Proposed pathway

Proposed picnic table

Proposed pathway
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Proposed pathway

Proposed pathway
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Open Lawn

Playground shall have engineered wood chips as fall safety surface that allows ADA access.
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Monmouth residents are fortunate to have access to great parks; however, Monmouth’s projected growth will place further pressure on access to new recreational lands. Understanding the known gaps in the park system and evaluating the City’s existing levels of service for parks will provide a foundation for strategic planning to ensure that tomorrow’s residents have equitable access to a balanced distribution of parks, trails and recreation amenities to stay healthy and active.

To better understand where acquisition efforts should be directed, a gap analysis of the park system was conducted to examine and assess the current distribution of parks throughout the city. The analysis reviewed the locations and types of existing facilities, land use classifications, transportation/access barriers and other factors as a means to identify preliminary acquisition target areas. In reviewing parkland distribution and assessing opportunities to fill identified gaps, residentially zoned lands were isolated, since neighborhood and community parks primarily serve these areas. Additionally, walksheds were defined for neighborhood parks using a ¼-mile primary and ½-mile secondary service area with travel distances calculated along the road network starting from known and accessible access points at each park. Walksheds for community parks were derived using ¼-mile, ½-mile, and 1-mile travel distances to acknowledge that community parks serve a wider array of users and driving to such sites is typical.

Maps 2 through 5 illustrate the application of the distribution criteria from existing parks. Areas in white do not have a public park within reasonable walking distance of their home. The illustrated ‘walkshed’ for each existing Monmouth park highlights that certain areas within the city do not have the desired proximity to a local park.

Striving to provide a neighborhood or community park within a reasonable walking distance (e.g., ½-mile) may require acquiring new park properties in currently under-served locations, improving multi-modal transportation connections to allow local residents to safely and conveniently reach their local park, and evaluating the potential use of school sites as proxies for local neighborhood parks. As Monmouth develops and acquisition opportunities diminish, the City will need to be prepared to take advantage of acquisition opportunities in strategic locations to better serve City residents. In concert with the search for developable park land, the City should continue to coordinate with proposed residential land development projects to consider when and how a public park could be incorporated into the planning of new residential communities.

Resulting from this assessment, potential acquisition areas are identified for future parks (Map 6) and are noted in the Capital Improvements Plan section of this Plan. The mapping targeted four sites for future parks:
A site adjacent to the Central School District property near Ash Creek Elementary School to enable options for joint site development and to serve future residential lands in the northeast section of the city

A site west of Marr Park for future park expansion

A site near the South Fork of Ash Creek and Hemlick Road to serve future residential lands in the southern section of the city

A site near Riddell Road and the Middle Fork of Ash Creek to serve as a trailhead for the Ash Creek Trail and future residential lands in the northwest section of the city

An aggressive acquisition program should be actively pursued in Monmouth to capture opportunities that will be continually diminishing as residential growth continues to consume developable land.

While the targeted acquisition areas do not identify a specific parcel(s) for consideration, the area encompasses a broader region in which an acquisition would be ideally suited. These acquisition targets represent a long-term vision for improving parkland distribution across Monmouth. In addition, the City of Monmouth should coordinate with City of Independence to proactively plan for new neighborhood and community park sites in proximity to their city limits.
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LEVEL OF SERVICE ASSESSMENT

A level of service (LOS) review was conducted to further understand the distribution and acreage needs for parkland to assess how well the community can access and enjoy parks, recreation and open space. Traditionally, the application of numeric standards for the provision of parks has applied an acreage of parkland per thousand residents as a target measurement for adopted standards. Service standards are the adopted guidelines or benchmarks the City is trying to attain with their parks system; the level of service is a snapshot in time of how well the City is meeting its adopted standards. This assessment also provides the future direction for ensuring adequate provision of parks for the community based on current and potential future gaps in this community infrastructure.

Many communities are developing guidelines that are customized to their community and its unique and often changing park and recreation demands, rather than solely applying the historic National Recreation and Park Association’s (NRPA) published park standards that primarily focused on parkland acres per capita. The use and application of standards continues to evolve and develop diverse approaches. This Plan evaluates the City current park land level of service through a variety of characteristics and offers recommendations for the consideration of an adopted set of standards.

Parkland Acreage

Monmouth’s current level of service is examined using the population data and existing park acreage. The combined acreage for city-owned parks is 28.1 acres. The City is currently providing approximately 2.8 acres per 1,000 population in its park system relative to its adopted park standard of 4 acres per 1,000 people.

Monmouth’s current parks’ level of service (LOS) of 2.9 acres per 1,000 population is below the recommended guideline from the Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). The SCORP guidelines for total parkland ranged from 6.25 - 12.5 acres per thousand. While Monmouth currently provides slightly less park acreage based on existing recommended state-based levels, the Oregon SCORP recognizes that acreage alone does not necessarily provide for the outdoor recreation needs of the community.

Considering the future growth of Monmouth, additional park acreage may be needed to accommodate the estimated 2030 population of 12,129 residents (PSU Population Research Center forecast). If this current level of service for city-owned parks is maintained into the future, the resulting demand for additional park land will translate into the need for approximately 20.5 acres of parkland. The inclusion of private homeowner association (HOA) parks into the calculation upwardly adjusts the current level of service to
2.9 acres per 1,000 population. If this combined current level of service is held constant and applied to the projected population, the City would need to add approximately 19.8 acres of parkland to its system to maintain today’s service levels.

Figure 14. Current Level of Service & Project Acreage Need

The acreage-based discussion regarding levels of service represents a status quo approach to the City’s potential demand for parkland acreage relatable to today’s existing level of service. The assumption reflected in the chart (Figure __) and the plan content preceding the chart is that today’s level of service would be held constant and used as a guide post to estimate the future demand for parkland acres to accommodate population growth. This section does not suggest or assume a higher level of service than is provided for the City’s current population.

The City should utilize these metrics to develop and amend the parks capital improvements plan to put forward and execute on projects that aim to expand the capacity of the system and meet the needs from local growth.

Other Considerations

While this Plan uses total parkland acreage and parkland access as primary indicators of parkland need, the City could also consider other factors as its population grows, including:

- **Park pressure, or the potential user demand on a park:** Residents are most likely to use the park closest to their home. This measure uses GIS analysis to assign all households to their nearest respective park and calculates level of service (in acres of parkland per 1,000 residents) based on the acreage of the park and the number of residents in the ‘parkshed’. Areas with lower levels of service are more likely to be underserved by parkland, and to see higher degrees of use and wear and tear on park amenities.

- **Availability of park amenities:** Park systems should include an equitable distribution and quantity of the most common amenities like playgrounds, picnic shelters, sports courts, sports fields and trails to meet local needs and help distribute the potential usage of individual parks. Working to provide well-distributed basic park amenities, while also offering unique outdoor experiences, will result in a varied park system with a range of different recreational opportunities for residents.

- **Park condition:** The City should assess the condition of each park’s general infrastructure and amenities on a regular basis. The condition or quality of park amenities is a key measure of park adequacy and a required assurance of public safety. General park infrastructure may include walkways, parking lots, park furniture, drainage and irrigation, lighting systems and vegetation. Deferred maintenance over a long time period can result in unusable amenities when perceived as unsafe or undesirable by park patrons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Urban Parks Level of Service (LOS) Standard</td>
<td>4 acres per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Population (PSU)</td>
<td>9,980 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Population Forecast (PSU)</td>
<td>12,129 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkland Acreage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-owned &amp; maintained</td>
<td>28.1 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA Parks</td>
<td>0.63 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.73 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Level of Service based on total acreage (acres/1,000 residents)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net LOS to Standard (acres/1,000 residents)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance to Standard</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>(10.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monmouth residents desire to have connecting routes to local places that include home, work, school, shopping, play and access to nature. This need for healthy, recreational corridors requires a complete hierarchy of trails that range in scale from regional, multi-use paved trail to local park pathways and bike routes. The future target for Monmouth will be a connected recreational trail network that is integrated into the City’s active transportation system to provide seamless access throughout the community.

Current Trends & Perspectives

Recreational Trends
As was noted earlier in this chapter, walking and hiking continue to be the most popular recreational activities nationally and regionally, with approximately 70% participating in these activities based on statewide data. Furthermore, over the past ten years national recreation studies have consistently ranked hiking and walking as the most popular form of outdoor recreation. These studies include:

- Sports Participation Survey; National Sporting Goods Association
- Outdoor Recreation Participation Report; The Outdoor Foundation
- State of the Industry Report; Recreation Management Magazine
- Outdoor Recreation in America; The Recreation Roundtable

The Oregon SCORP points to a statewide public priority to ensure the continuing development of trail connections. Oregonians that participate in outdoor recreation activities identified that trail maintenance was among the top ten actions that park land managers can provide to help with user participation. The Oregon SCORP surveys identified the high public priority for dirt and other soft surfaced walking trails and paths and off-street bicycle trails and pathways. Additionally, close-to-home facility investments were recognized to maximize everyday use by local residents and encourage participation by current non-participants who identified lack of time as the primary reason for not participating in outdoor recreation. Recreation agencies were encouraged to provide easily accessible information about walking, running, dog walking, and bicycling opportunities in their jurisdictions to encourage use of existing recreational facilities. Additional recreational trends are noted in Appendix D.

Local Public Input
The citizens of Monmouth identified trails as a top priority in their park system. From the community survey conducted as part of this Plan update, using trails, jogging and/or running was one of the top five main reasons for visiting local parks in the last year. A large majority of survey respondents (80%) think that Monmouth does not have enough neighborhood walking and biking trails.
In looking at the sum of the top three priorities, another 78% gave a high priority to building a recreational trail network. Developing trails and open space protection was a higher priority in the SE area compared to other areas.

When asked about the desired increases in infrastructure, increased trails for walking and biking were rated with the highest level of importance. A substantial majority of survey respondents (96%) were supportive of expanding and improving multi-use walking and biking trails, and they ranked trails as the top amenity to be added to Monmouth’s parks system.

Additionally, the need to increase trail connectivity, safe routes to school and safety improvements for street crossings were identified by participants at community outreach events.

**Trail Inventory & Classifications**

Trails provide people with valuable links between neighborhoods, parks, schools, commercial centers and other regional non-motorized facilities.

As part of an active transportation plan, the recreational trail system can contribute by providing for alternative transportation modes of both walkability and cycling. A typical recreational trails system uses a trail hierarchy (opposite page) to create a series of interconnected linkages throughout the City and represents a trail framework based on the planned users volumes and intensity. A connected network with a hierarchy of trail types forms this community-wide system. Some regional trails can provide alternative transportation connections between communities, primarily utilized by biking commuters. To be effective in an active transportation plan, trails must connect across the network and provide access to target destinations. There are opportunities to create pleasant greenways and trails that stretch across the community and that connect residents to the wealth of parks, natural areas, recreation facilities and other amenities Monmouth has to offer.
The Monmouth recreational trail classification system is based on a tiered network and includes three primary trail categories: Regional, Connector and Park/Local trails. The differences between trail classifications are based on purpose, intensity of use and influence the trail width, material and recommended support facilities.

**Recommended Trail Network**

Monmouth should develop a system of multi-use, recreational trail linkages and, in conjunction with on-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities, seek to establish a comprehensive network of access linking major activity areas and destinations for recreational, as well as alternative transportation, purposes. Map 7 conceptualizes the recreational trail network, and the on-street linkages should relate to the non-motorized elements of the City’s Transportation Master Plan.

A regional trail loop linking the Middle Fork and South Fork of Ash Creek should encircle the city and link existing and planned trails for Independence. Park trails will provide recreation, relaxation and access to other outdoor activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Surfaces</th>
<th>Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Trail</td>
<td>Major connections through community and beyond</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>Pedestrians, cyclists, skaters. Equestrians (where feasible)</td>
<td>Asphalt, concrete, boardwalk.</td>
<td>12 - 18’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connector Trail</td>
<td>Connects parks, trails, neighborhoods and destinations</td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>Pedestrians, cyclists, skaters.</td>
<td>Asphalt, concrete, boardwalk. Gravel, possible.</td>
<td>8 - 12’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park / Local Trail</td>
<td>Interior loops or point-to-point routes in public spaces</td>
<td>Multi- or single use</td>
<td>Pedestrians, cyclists, skaters. Equestrians (where feasible)</td>
<td>Asphalt, concrete, boardwalk. Gravel, possible.</td>
<td>4 - 10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Path / Nature</td>
<td>Interior loops or connections in public spaces</td>
<td>Single use</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Firm soil</td>
<td>2 - 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and spaces within parks. Priority trail locations and connections include the following:

- Regional trail along the Middle Fork of Ash Creek in accordance with the Ash Creek Trail Master Plan
- Trail connection between the South Fork of Ash Creek and the Middle Fork of Ash Creek along the western extent of the Monmouth City limits
- Regional trail along the along a northern segment of the South Fork of Ash Creek
- Bike routes (bike lanes and/or sharrows) connecting east-west and north-south through the center of the city

It is recognized that significant challenges exist to bring these recreational trail connections to fruition, and coordination with the Public Works Department and the City of Independence will be crucial. Multiple ownerships along the Ash Creek corridors will challenge for securing an alignment, and there is a need for an aggressive program to secure public access easements along these creeks to accommodate future trails.

**Trail Towns: Capturing Trail-based Tourism - A project of Allegheny Trail Alliance**

Trail towns are destinations along long-distance trails that can provide goods and services within easy access of trail users. A trail town encourages trail users to visit and welcomes them with warm hospitality. Trails users find their trail experiences are more enjoyable with the support services and local amenities that enhance their travels and add uniqueness to their experiences. Basic elements of a trail town strategy include:

- Enticing trail users to get off the trail and into your town
- Welcoming trail users to your town by making information about the community readily available at the trail
- Making a strong and safe connection between your town and the trail
- Educating local businesses on the economic benefits of meeting trail tourists’ needs
- Recruiting new businesses or expanding existing ones to fill gaps in the goods or services that trail users need
- Promoting the “trail-friendly” character of the town
- Working with neighboring communities to promote the entire trail corridor as a tourist destination
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Trail System Design Guidelines

Establishing and reinforcing a recreational trail classification enables a framework for trail design and facilitates the prioritization of proposed trail enhancements and development.

Access & Alignments

The future growth of the trail network will need to balance between alignments that are optimal from trail user, trail experience and connectivity perspectives and those that are practical from cost, regulatory and availability perspectives. Future consideration should be given toward finding alignment options that can accommodate different trail use types (i.e., commuter vs. recreational/destination oriented), as well as potentially interim solutions that rely on wider sidewalks to serve trail users or routing that utilizes existing or planned sewer lines or utility corridors. The proposed Recreational Trails System map (Map 7) indicates potential alignments that can vary depending upon landowner willingness, along with environmental constraints and design considerations.

Trail System Design

The primary purpose of recreation trails is to provide a recreational experience that allows for movement across the community as an additional objective. Whenever feasible, recreational trails should be located off-street; however, streets should be used in order to complete connections, wherever necessary. The following are sound tenets of recreational trail system design.

- Develop a high-quality system of multi-use trails that connect significant local landscapes, public facilities, neighborhoods and the downtown core.
- Create a network of interconnected, single- and multi-use trails for walking, running and cycling to promote connectivity between parks, neighborhoods and public amenities or destinations.
- Provide a comprehensive trail system that will interconnect the recreational trail systems and non-motorized transportation systems including sidewalks and bike lanes.
- Increase connectivity between parks and trails and prioritize the creation or completion of loops that provide a range of recreation options and experiences.
- Integrate the siting of proposed trail segments into the land development review process.
- Require development projects along designated trail routes to be designed to incorporate the trail as part of the project. Sensitive area buffers within proposed subdivisions and short-subdivisions shall be widened to accommodate additional open space and a public easement for future trails.
- Require the installation of safe, convenient and dedicated pedestrian paths by new development where minimizing travel distance has the potential for increasing pedestrian use.
- When possible, trails should be constructed prior to or concurrent with development or with the improvement of public facilities.
- Work with state, county and local agencies, utilities and private landholders to secure trail corridors and access to complete the recreational trail system through methods including land dedication, purchase, use of vacated rail lines and other rights-of-way, land donations, and public easements or use agreements.

Trailheads
Safe, convenient and formal entryways to the trail network expand access for users and are a necessary component of a strong, successful system. A trailhead typically includes parking, kiosks and signage and may include site furnishings such as trash receptacles, restrooms, seating and bicycle parking. Trailheads may be located on public park land and natural areas or provided via interagency agreements with partner organizations (i.e., Polk County, City of Independence, Central School District, etc.) to increase use and reduce duplication of support facilities. Specific trailhead design and layout should be created as part of planning and design development for individual projects and take into account the intended user groups and unique site conditions.

Trail Wayfinding
The City of Monmouth could benefit from enhanced wayfinding and signage in support of both City and community partners’ parks and facilities. As the trail system continues to grow in the future, the City should implement a comprehensive approach to directional and identification signage to park and trail facilities. Better signage and consistency in brand identification could increase awareness for residents and visitors of nearby recreational opportunities, such as City parks and recreation facilities, and county, state and partner facilities. Signage, in conjunction with publicly-available maps of parks and trails, can also improve the enjoyment and understanding of the parks system and encourage visitors to experience more sites within the City.

The proposed trail system will provide connections to key destinations and neighborhoods throughout the city. These trails and connections should be easy to access and convenient to use. This Plan recommends the implementation of detailed trail signage standards, route and wayfinding signage for trails and associated facilities and informational maps and materials identifying existing and planned trail facilities.

EVENTS & PROGRAMS

Special Events
Special events are the main recreation program area that is supported by the City of Monmouth. These events, which include the 4th of July Festival and Music in the Park series, are well-attended and enjoyed by the community. Many special events, such as Making Spirits Bright, History and Mystery in Monmouth, Halloween Spooktacular, are made possible through significant volunteer
Interest in the City providing recreation programs appears to be strong; however, the number and types of activities the City can offer is very limited due to the lack of staffing and indoor facility capacity. The City should consider incremental growth in recreation programs and initially focus on facilitating programs via contract vendors and/or focusing on those programs that are not currently offered by local or regional providers. The City should work with the school district, community partners, Senior Center, sports organizations and other recreation providers to plan for and consider how to offer both drop-in and structured programs in sports; art, music and dance; and educational and environmental activities for Monmouth youth.

Senior Center
The Monmouth Senior Center, started in 1974, serves the older adults in Monmouth and the surrounding area. The Center provides a place for local seniors to gather for classes, activities and trips, as well as receive services and resources to support the needs of older adults. Programs and classes range from tai chi and yoga to crafts and wellness to excursions to regional destinations. The Center also is a meal site Meals on Wheels. The Senior Center is available for community events on an hourly rental basis.

Recreation Programs & Activities
The City relies on other providers for most of its recreation services. The YMCA and Central Youth Sports are the primary providers of most programs that are associated with indoor recreation, fitness, athletics and youth services. Other recreation program providers include Central School District, Western Oregon University, the Gate Youth Foundation and other local sport leagues.
This chapter outlines the vision, goals and objectives that were created during the parks planning process. The vision for Monmouth's parks system and the set of goals and objectives for achieving the vision are intended to address the community’s needs.

- Goals represent the general end toward which an organizational effort is directed. They identify how a community intends to achieve its mission and establish a vision for the future.

- Objectives are measurable statements, which identify specific steps needed to achieve the stated goals.

The Capital Facilities Plan outlines more detailed recommendations - specific steps needed to achieve the Monmouth Parks Master Plan goals.

Vision

Monmouth residents desire a diverse parks system that provides a variety of services for its users. The following vision statement, developed during the 2008 Parks Master Plan process, articulates the hopes and desires of Monmouth residents for their parks system:

*We envision a parks system that promotes social and cultural activities and provides a natural environment for the enjoyment of the entire community.*
Parks and recreation areas will continue to flourish in Monmouth for the benefit of future generations, ensuring a healthy, dynamic and attractive place to live.

Goals

The goals and objectives described in the following section define the park and recreation services that the City of Monmouth aims to achieve based on its community’s needs. They are built on the foundation established in the previous Parks Master Plan, adopted in 2008, but have been updated to reflect feedback from the community, stakeholders and staff during this planning update process.

The Plan’s goals align with the National Recreation and Parks Association’s Three Pillars, which are foundational concepts adopted by the national organization in 2012. These core values (below) are crucial to improving the quality of life for all Americans by inspiring the protection of natural resources, increasing opportunities for physical activity and healthy eating, and empowering citizens to improve the livability of their communities.

- **Conservation** – Public parks are critical to preserving our communities’ natural resources and wildlife habitats, which offer significant social and economic benefits. Local park and recreation agencies are leaders in protecting our open space, connecting children to nature and providing education and programs that engage communities in conservation.

- **Health and Wellness** – Park and recreation departments lead the nation in improving the overall health and wellness of citizens, and fighting obesity. From fitness programs, to well-maintained, accessible, walking paths and trails, to nutrition programs for underserved youth and adults, our work is at the forefront of providing solutions to these challenges.

- **Social Equity** – We believe universal access to public parks and recreation is fundamental to all, not just a privilege for a few. Every day, our members work hard to ensure all people have access to resources and programs that connect citizens, and in turn, make our communities more livable and desirable.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION

Goal 1: Encourage and support meaningful community involvement and participation in Monmouth’s park and recreation system.

1.1 Support the Parks & Recreation Board as a City advisory body and the forum for public discussions of parks and recreation issues.

1.2 Involve residents and stakeholders in park and recreation planning, facility design, and recreation program development to gather community input, facilitate project understanding and support, and ensure facilities and programs meet community needs.

1.3 Develop and coordinate volunteer park improvement and stewardship projects to involve a variety of individuals, schools, service clubs, faith organizations and businesses in the development and maintenance of the City’s park and recreation system.

1.4 Provide easily accessible information about the City’s parks, trails, recreational opportunities, community events, educational programs, and volunteer activities to increase resident awareness.

1.5 Update the Parks Master Plan every five to ten years to ensure that it continues to reflect the needs and desires of the community.
PARKS & NATURAL AREAS

Goal 2. Parks: Provide a system of parks that meets current and future needs for active and passive recreation and enhance the community’s environment and livability.

2.1 Proactively acquire and develop parklands identified within this Plan, in both developed and undeveloped areas, to provide a high-quality, diverse system of parks to serve current and future residents.

2.2 Acquire and develop parklands necessary to provide a level of service standard of 4 acres of parks per 1000 residents and so all residents live within a one-half mile walk of a developed park.

2.3 Pursue long-term parkland acquisition within the UGB in identified parkland opportunity areas.

2.4 Evaluate opportunities to acquire lands declared surplus by other public agencies for park and recreation use.

2.5 Identify and prioritize lands for inclusion in the parks system based on their:
   - Contribution to desired level of service and park access
   - Adequacy of the site to accommodate the recreational needs of the intended service area.
   - Physical suitability of the site for recreational use.
   - Location of the site with respect to the intended service population.
   - Unique attributes of the site such as water features, natural vegetation and varied topography.

2.6 Ensure new parks are provided in concert with new development. Where approved, ensure park and recreation amenities within private developments meet the City’s minimum design and development standards prior to accepting dedicated properties into the City system.
2.7 Consider identified community needs and current recreation trends in the design and development of new parks and in the enhancement of existing parks.

2.8 Coordinate with Polk County, State of Oregon and other recreation organizations for the planning of nearby regional or state recreational areas that would benefit City residents.

Goal 3. Natural Areas: Preserve distinctive natural areas and features for their scenic and habitat value, as well as their contribution to passive recreational opportunities within Monmouth.

3.1 Work to preserve high resource value, significant or connected natural resource areas through partnerships with public agencies, acquisition or other protection (e.g., conservation easements) as they become available.

3.2 Coordinate with Polk County, the City of Independence, and private landowners to preserve and restore natural areas along Ash Creek for environmental and recreational use.

3.3 Pursue opportunities to provide or enhance appropriate public access (e.g., trails, viewpoints and wildlife viewing areas) within natural areas to support passive recreation and environmental education.

3.4 Develop partnerships with land trusts and private entities that have an interest providing recreation opportunities and/or natural resource protection and preservation.
RECREATION SERVICES

Goal 4. Community Events: Promote community events to encourage community interaction and enhance the quality of life of residents.

4.1 Provide and promote City-sponsored community events, such as the annual July 4th Festival, to enhance activity and civic pride.

4.2 Promote cultural activities and events that attract residents and visitors to the historic downtown area.

4.3 Explore opportunities to host special events, such as festivals, concerts or movies in the park, farmers markets, and historic or cultural activities that are organized by community groups, schools, or organizations.

4.4 Maintain and promote community event areas within Main Street Park, Madrona Park, and other community parks for community, cultural and recreational events.

Goal 5. Recreation Programs: Facilitate a variety of recreational services and programs that promote the health, well-being, and inclusion of residents of all ages and abilities.

5.1 Leverage City resources by forming and maintaining partnerships with other public, non-profit and private recreation providers to deliver recreation services and secure access to facilities for community recreation.

5.2 Partner and coordinate with Central School District, YMCA, Western Oregon University, community partners and sport organizations to offer drop-in and structured programs in sports; art, music and dance; and educational and environmental activities for youth and teens.
5.3 Explore options to expand the quantity and breadth of adult programs offered, in partnership with other recreation providers and organizations.

5.4 Continue to support the Monmouth Senior Center so that seniors engage in social, recreational, educational, nutritional and health programs.

5.5 Continue to support the Monmouth Library and the programs offered to all ages.

5.6 Consider evolving trends and changes in demographics to meet the needs of diverse users, including under-served residents who may have limited access to recreation.

Goal 6. Recreation Facilities: Maintain and enhance residents’ access to recreational opportunities, community services and opportunities to connect, learn and play.

6.1 Enhance partnerships with public, private and non-profit providers, such as the City of Independence, Polk County, and the Central School District, to expand community access to indoor and outdoor recreational facilities.

6.2 Partner with the Central School District for access to existing facilities (e.g. schools gymnasiums, tracks, fields) for community recreational use. Explore opportunities to co-develop facilities on school property or property adjacent to schools.

6.3 Establish and operate specialized recreational facilities (e.g. sport fields and courts, off leash dog areas, skateparks, community gardens) to respond to identified or emerging public needs, as appropriate.

6.4 Consider local needs, recreational trends, and availability of similar facilities within the City and region when planning for specialized recreational facilities.

6.5 Partner and coordinate with local user groups and organizations to plan for, develop, and manage specialized facilities.
TRAIL NETWORK

Goal 7. Trails: Engage multiple City agencies and local jurisdictions to develop a coordinated and connected pedestrian, bicycle, and off-street trail system.

7.1 Develop a network of shared-use trails for recreational, pedestrian and bicycle users, to connect parks, neighborhoods, schools and public amenities. Design and construct trails to serve a variety of users at varying skill levels.

7.2 Coordinate and partner with public agencies, local utilities and private landowners to secure trail easements and access to open space for trail connections.

7.3 Strive to provide safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to all new and existing park and open space areas.

7.4 Coordinate trail system planning and development with the City’s Transportation Plan and efforts to provide a comprehensive pedestrian and bicycle network. Support other City departments in the implementation of the City’s Transportation System Plan.

7.5 Coordinate with the Planning Department and integrate the siting of proposed trail segments and on-street improvements into the development review process. Require development projects along designated trail routes be designed to accommodate planned trail segments.

7.6 Work with the City of Independence and Western Oregon University to provide continuous walking and biking access between parks, schools, and other key destinations.
ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Goal 8 Administration: Effectively steward the community’s investment in parks and recreation resources.

8.1 Develop and manage a citywide system of parks, trails, and recreational facilities in a planned manner consistent with community goals and available resources.

8.2 Stay current with the progress of and advancements in parks, recreation, maintenance and operations best practices and applicable legal requirements.

8.3 Periodically update the City's General Plan, this comprehensive Parks Master Plan, and the City's Capital Facilities Plan to reflect the recreational needs and priorities of the community.

8.4 Assess the effectiveness of the organization on a regular basis and make structural changes and improvements as appropriate.

8.5 Assess staffing needs on a regular basis and hire adequate staff to manage the park and recreation system.

8.6 Use part-time, seasonal, and contract employees for select functions to meet peak demands and respond to specialized or urgent needs.
Goal 9. Maintenance and Operations: Develop a parks system that is efficient to maintain and operate, safe and attractive for community members, and that protects the City's capital investment.

9.1 Maintain an inventory of assets including their condition and expected useful life.

9.2 Establish park maintenance standards and regularly inspect, maintain, and repair or replace park facilities and infrastructure to ensure safe use, reduce unplanned reactive maintenance and protect public investment.

9.3 Upgrade and/or replace facilities or equipment that are in poor condition or are hazardous to users with new amenities that are safe, cost-effective to maintain, and provide desired recreational opportunities.

9.4 Plan for and finance deferred maintenance projects and upgrades to ensure a safe, secure and accessible park infrastructure.

9.5 Design and maintain parks and facilities to comply with ADA requirements and offer universal accessibility for residents of all physical capabilities, skill levels and ages.

9.6 Design parks and facilities to minimize ongoing maintenance costs, for example through standardization of park furnishings, use of native vegetation, and use of low-maintenance materials.

9.7 Provide sufficient staffing for maintenance and operations.
Goal 10. Funding: Use diverse funding sources to adequately and cost-effectively maintain and enhance the quality of the City’s park and recreation system.

10.1 Identify and secure appropriate funding sources, such as system development charges, user fees, bonds and levies, private donation, sponsorships, and state and federal grant sources, to adequately support the acquisition, development and maintenance of parks and facilities.

10.2 Review and adjust the Systems Development Charge rate on a regular basis to allow the City to expand and develop its parks system while meeting its park goals and objectives.

10.3 Consider adopting a Parks Utility Fee to provide a dedicated funding source for operations and maintenance.

10.4 Devote staff resources to the identification and procurement of parks, open space, trails, and recreation related grant funding.

10.5 Update rental fees on a periodic basis to reflect market rates.

10.6 Consider the maintenance and staffing costs necessitated by the acquisition, development or renovation of parks or open spaces, and pursue operational funding that adequately supports system expansion.

10.7 Promote volunteerism to involve individuals, groups, organizations and businesses in the planning, development and stewardship of the park and recreation system.

10.8 Utilize strategic capital investments in parks, trails, open spaces, recreation and art to encourage and support economic development and revitalization.
The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) presents the capital investment projects and strategic actions adopted by the City in chronological order to guide the implementation of this Plan. It assigns proposed sequencing and estimated costs for specific projects and groups them by project type. A summary of proposed project categories and scopes is described below.

The projects in the CFP implement long-standing plans for park and recreation improvements and work toward meeting the City’s goal to improve access and connections to its park and recreation system. The following table summarizes the aggregate capital estimates from the CFP by park types for the next ten years. A full CFP follows.

Figure 17. Capital Facilities Plan Expenditures Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Park Site</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026-2030</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Monmouth Recreational Park</td>
<td>New playgrounds</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added paved pathways</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport/tennis court shelter</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation boardwalk</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation gazebo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CD/Permitting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shade tree plantings</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restroom renovation (complete)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bleacher replacements (w/ safety rails)</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance sign, park kiosk, wayfinding signage</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive signs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petanque/Bocce courts</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis/sport court resurfacing/overlay</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Gentle Woods Park</td>
<td>Renovated playground</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added paved pathways</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New bridges</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovated restrooms</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic shelter (small)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shade tree plantings</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Madrona Park</td>
<td>Natural area pathway drainage improvements</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovated playground, all-inclusive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitness stations</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage swale planting (master plan)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Main Street Park</td>
<td>Shade tree replacement plantings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Cherry Lane Park</td>
<td>Added paved pathways</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add ADA bench &amp; picnic table</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>West Gentle Woods (undeveloped)</td>
<td>Park Master Plan Concept</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Winegar Park</td>
<td>Playground ramp</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Park Acquisition</td>
<td>Neighborhood park acquisition (A-1: 5-8 acres)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood park acquisition (A-2: 3-5 acres)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood park acquisition (A-3: 2-3 acres)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood park acquisition (A-4: 2-3 acres)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>La Mesa Park</td>
<td>Replace playground safety surfacing</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parks signs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Play equipment upgrade</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Park Site</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026-2030</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>Marr Park</td>
<td>Paved pathways - ADA access</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Play equipment upgrade</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>Southgate Park</td>
<td>Basketball/sport court expansion</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved pathways</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Playground replacement</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic shelter (small)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park signage</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>Whitesell Park</td>
<td>Play equipment upgrade</td>
<td>R/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved access paths</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace playground safety surfacing</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks-</td>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>ADA signage, parking striping, curb ramps,</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA picnic tables &amp; benches</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Ash Creek Trail (Middle</td>
<td>Trail Development (1.98 mi.)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fork)</td>
<td>Secure easements</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>NOTE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>This CIP identifies planning-level cost estimates and does not assume the value of volunteer or other non-City contributions. Detailed costing may be necessary for projects noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Planning/Permitting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Renovation/Repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $114,000 $509,500 $1,012,000 $2,387,500 $1,516,500 $1,238,500 $3,177,000 $9,955,000
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The City of Monmouth could use numerous strategies to improve park and recreation services for residents; however, the City must set clear priorities given limited municipal resources. A strong community will is necessary to bring many of the projects listed in this Plan to life, and the Monmouth community has demonstrated its support for parks and recreation efforts, facility maintenance and a high quality of life.

Carrying out this Plan’s recommendations for park and recreation services may require funding beyond current allocations for additional staffing, operations and maintenance responsibilities. Additional resources will be needed to leverage, supplement and support the implementation of proposed policies, programs and projects. The following implementation strategies are presented to offer near-term direction to realize these projects and as a means to continue dialogue between the City, its community partners and nearby cities.

Additionally, a review of potential implementation tools is attached as Appendix D and includes local financing, federal and state grant and conservation programs, acquisition methods and others.
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Local Funding
The City of Monmouth could explore a variety of local funding options for parks and recreation acquisition, development, operations and maintenance. The likelihood of success for local funding options depends on the community’s willingness and ability to pay additional property taxes or fees to support higher levels of parks and recreation services.

General Fund Revenues
General fund revenues consist chiefly of property taxes derived from the permanent tax rate and are subject to the combined limits on local government taxing agencies imposed by Measure #5 (1990). General fund revenues offer a source of funds for facility operations and maintenance, and may be available on a limited basis for ‘pay-as-you-go’ capital improvements. General revenues are the primary source of park and recreation funding in Monmouth. While the City’s general fund revenues are forecasted to be stable in the near term, unrestricted general fund revenues are limited and must also fund other City services.

System Development Charges
Park System Development Charges (SDCs) are fees paid by new development to meet the increased demand for parks resulting from the new growth. SDCs can only be used for parkland acquisition, planning and/or development. They cannot be used for operations and maintenance of parks and facilities.

The City of Monmouth currently assesses a Parks System Development Charges (SDC) on new residential development to assist with the cost of improvements needed to accommodate new growth. Significant new revenue is anticipated in these funds due to projected building activity. The City should prioritize the usage of Parks SDCs to secure new park properties and finance park or path/trail development consistent with the priorities within this Plan. The City should periodically update the methodology and rate structure, as appropriate, to be best positioned to obtain future acquisition and development financing from residential development.

Parks Utility Fee
A parks utility fee is an ongoing fee (often billed monthly) that provides revenue for the needs of the park system. When charged by a city, such a fee can be an additional line item on an existing utility bill. The revenue earned can be used for both operational and capital needs, and it can be pledged to the debt service of revenue bonds. Establishment of a parks utility fee in Oregon requires compliance with legal requirements at both state and local levels. Several jurisdictions across Oregon have implemented and utilized a parks utility fee as supplemental funding to maintain and enhance their park systems. Monmouth could consider enacting a parks utility fee for the purpose of providing for the operation and maintenance of parks and facilities.
within the City and to ensure adequate resources are available for the sound and timely maintenance of existing recreation amenities.

**General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds**

G.O. Bonds are debt instruments which may be sold by the City to fund new parks and recreation facilities, or to make improvements to existing facilities. Bonds are repaid with property tax revenue generated by a special levy that is outside the limits imposed by ballot Measures #5 (1990) and #50 (1997). Voters must approve G.O. Bond sales either in a General Election, or in another election in which a minimum of 50% of registered voters participate. G.O. Bond revenues may not be used for operations, maintenance or repairs; but may be used for renovations to existing facilities.

**Local Option Levies**

Local option levies are separate property tax levies that can be assessed to fund capital improvements or operations and maintenance activities. Such levies are outside of the City’s permanent tax rate limit, subject to the combined rate limit imposed under Measure #5. Local option levies require voter approval and are subject to the double majority (50% voter turnout and 50% approval) requirement of Measure #5. If used to fund capital improvements, revenues can be used to secure bonds or complete one or more projects on a pay-as-you-go basis, over a period of up to 10 years. Operations and maintenance levies are limited to a period of five years.

**Grants & Appropriations**

Several state, federal and private grant programs are available on a competitive basis, including those offered by the Oregon State Parks & Recreation Department (such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund). Pursuing grants is not a panacea for park system funding, since grants are both competitive and often require a significant percentage of local funds to match the request to the granting agency, which depending on the grant program can be as much as 50% of the total project budget. Monmouth should continue to leverage its local resources to the greatest extent by pursuing grants independently and in cooperation with other local partners. Appropriations from state or federal sources, though rare, can supplement projects with partial funding. State and federal funding allocations are particularly relevant on regional transportation projects, and the likelihood for appropriations could be increased if multiple partners are collaborating on projects.

**User Fees and Rents**

User fees and rents are direct charges to individuals and groups who use specific programs, facilities and services. These rents and fees usually help pay only a portion of the costs of providing programs and services. User fees generally are set at levels sufficient to cover only a portion of program and maintenance costs, and are rarely used to fund capital projects. The City currently charges user fees for the park and picnic shelter rentals.
Public-Private Partnerships

Public-private partnerships are increasingly necessary for local agencies to leverage their limited resources in providing park and recreation services to the community. Corporate sponsorships, health organization grants, conservation stewardship programs and non-profit organizations are just a few examples of partnerships where collaboration provides value to both partners. The City has existing partners and should continue to explore additional and expanded partnerships to help implement these Plan recommendations.

Parkland Donations & Dedications

Parkland donations from private individuals or conservation organizations could occur to complement the acquisition of park and open space lands in Monmouth. Gift deeds or bequests from philanthropic-minded landowners could allow for lands to come into City ownership upon the death of the owner or as a tax-deductible charitable donation. Parkland dedication by a developer could occur in exchange for Park SDCs or as part of a planned development where public open space is a key design for the layout and marketing of a new residential project. Any potential dedication must be vetted by the City to ensure that such land is located in an area of need or can expand an existing City property and can be developed with site amenities listed in Appendix D.

Volunteer & Community-based Action

Successful volunteer efforts – through volunteer groups, students, neighborhood groups, or sport and service organizations – can result in significant site improvements and can allow community members to gain a sense of ownership in the parks and recreation system. Volunteers and community groups already contribute to a variety of community programs and events, such as at the Monmouth Library, Senior Center, and special events like the 4th of July Festival, through the City’s Community Development Department. The City could engage volunteers in additional park and recreation projects like tree plantings, recreational programs, trail maintenance, park clean-ups, and other small works or volunteer-appropriate projects. Monmouth could prepare and update a revolving list of potential volunteer-appropriate projects that could be advertised on the website, through the community newsletter, and via partnerships with Western Oregon University and the Central School District. While supporting organized groups and community-minded individuals can add value to the Monmouth park system, volunteer coordination requires staff time, and additional resources would be necessary to support a volunteer coordination to take advantage of the community’s willingness to support park efforts.
APPENDIX A

Community Survey Summary
To: Suzanne Dufner, Community Development Director  
From: Steve Duh, Conservation Technix, Inc.  
Date: July 1, 2019  
Re: City of Monmouth Parks Master Plan Update  
Community Survey Summary Results

Conservation Technix is pleased to present the results of a survey of the general population of the City of Monmouth that assesses residents’ recreational needs, preferences and priorities.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY
In close collaboration with City staff and the Monmouth Parks Board, Conservation Technix developed the 15-question survey that was estimated to take approximately ten minutes to complete.

The online survey was posted to the City’s website on April 30, 2019. Information about the survey was provided on the City’s website home page and on the Parks System Master Plan project page. It was promoted via multiple City Facebook posts and during a community event held on June 1, 2019 that served as the initial outreach event for the Parks System Master Plan. Community event attendees were encouraged to take the survey online and were provided handouts with the survey link and QR code. The survey was closed on June 29th, and preliminary data were compiled and reviewed. In all, 269 survey responses were received.

This report includes findings on general community opinions. Since the survey was open to the general public and respondents were not selected through statistical sampling methods, the results are not necessarily representative of all City residents.

Percentages in the report may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
KEY FINDINGS

Monmouth residents strongly value their parks and recreation facilities.

Nearly all respondents (98%) think parks and recreation are important to quality of life in Monmouth.

Residents visit parks frequently.

Nearly 85% of respondents visit parks or recreation facilities at least once a month. More than eight in ten respondents have visited Main Street Park, Madrona Park and Gentle Woods Park, while fewer have visited La Mesa and Whitesell Parks. The most popular activities are using playgrounds and participating in festivals or celebrations.

Residents are generally satisfied with existing parks and recreation facilities.

A large majority of respondents (83%) are somewhat to very satisfied with the value they receive from the City of Monmouth for parks and recreation amenities. More than 90% of respondents rated the condition of Main Street Park and Madrona Park as excellent or good. La Mesa Park was rated less favorably and is also less frequently visited. However, over half of residents said they would visit parks more often if the City addressed maintenance, accessibility or safety issues or provided desired facilities, programs, or equipment.

Residents would like to see improvements made to the parks & recreation system.

A large majority of survey respondents think that Monmouth does not have enough neighborhood walking and biking trails (80%). Respondents were somewhat split on the adequacy of parks, picnic areas, and sports fields and courts, with pluralities feeling there are not enough sport fields and courts or picnic areas. Notably, a large majority of respondents (90% or more) were supportive of expanding and improving multi-use walking and biking trails, community events or festivals, ADA accessible playgrounds, and picnic areas or shelters for group gatherings.
Differences by Demographic Groups

The table below summarizes key differences between respondents of different demographic groups.

Note: The survey did not include a representative sample of residents. Results are for informational purposes only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>20 to 45</th>
<th>Over 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most frequent users of parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>• Tend to be less frequent users of parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More likely to have children in the home</td>
<td>• Tend to be more satisfied with the value provided by Monmouth’s parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tend to be less satisfied with the value provided by Monmouth’s parks</td>
<td>• More likely than younger residents to prioritize pickleball and tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More likely than older residents to prioritize developing new parks</td>
<td>• Stronger preference for newspapers as a communication method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More supportive of adding the active use activities listed, such as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sports courts/fields, splash pads, skate parks, indoor fitness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment, disc golf, and gyms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Household</th>
<th>0 kids</th>
<th>1 – 3 kids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More likely to be older adults</td>
<td>• More likely to be frequent visitors of parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More likely than those with children to cite not knowing what is</td>
<td>• More likely to cite crowding, maintenance issues, or lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offered as a reason why they do not use parks more often</td>
<td>desired programs or equipment as reasons why they do not visit more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less frequent users of parks</td>
<td>often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater interest in trails and fitness as reasons to visit parks</td>
<td>• Most likely to visit parks to use playgrounds and sport fields or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attend family gatherings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>West of Hwy 99W</th>
<th>East of Hwy 99W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NW: Placed a higher priority on community gardens and wildlife viewing</td>
<td>• NE: More likely to feel that there are not enough sport fields and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SW: More likely to cite being too busy to go to parks</td>
<td>courts or recreation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SW: Placed a higher priority on acquisitions for future parklands</td>
<td>• SE: Placed a higher priority on trails and protecting open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SE: Tend to be more satisfied with the value provided by Monmouth’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FULL RESULTS

How much do residents value parks and recreation?

Nearly all respondents (98%) feel that local parks, recreation options and open space opportunities are important or essential to the quality of life in Monmouth. More than eight in ten feel that they are essential; while an additional 15% believe that they are important to quality of life, but not essential. Less than 2% of respondents believe parks are “more of a luxury that we don’t need”.

Respondents under 45 are more likely than older age groups to use parks and recreation facilities on a regular basis and to feel that they are essential to the quality of life in Monmouth.

Are residents satisfied with the value they receive from the City of Monmouth?

A large majority of respondents (83%) are somewhat to very satisfied with the value they receive from the City of Monmouth for parks and recreation amenities. However, a small share of respondents (14%) are either somewhat or very dissatisfied.

Respondents between 45 and 54 tend to be less satisfied with the value provided by Monmouth’s parks than older residents.

How often do residents use Monmouth’s parks & recreation facilities?

Respondents were asked how often they, or members of their household, visited a park and recreation facility in Monmouth over the past year. Respondents tend to visit frequently, with 84% visiting a park at least once per month. Approximately 40% visit at least once a week and another 24% visit one to three times per month. About one in seven visit just a few times per year.

As compared to other age groups, adults under 45 are the most frequent users of Monmouth’s parks. Respondents without children tend to be less frequent users of parks.

1. When you think about the things that contribute to the quality of life in Monmouth, would you say that public parks and recreation opportunities are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential to the quality of life here</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important, but not really necessary</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More of a luxury that we don’t need</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please rate your satisfaction with the overall value your household receives from the City of Monmouth for parks and recreation amenities.

4. How many times over the past year have you or members of your household visited a public park or recreation facility in Monmouth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a week</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times over the year</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not visit a public park</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which parks & recreation facilities do residents visit?

The City asked respondents which developed parks and recreation facilities they, or members of their household, have visited. More than nine in ten respondents have visited Main Street Park, approximately 80% have visited the Gentle Woods Park and Madrona Park. Smaller neighborhood parks were visited less often.

How would residents rate the condition of parks and facilities they have visited?

Of the respondents who have visited city parks, more than nine in ten gave a condition rating of excellent or good for Main Street Park (94%) and Madrona Park (90%). Respondents rated the conditions of Southgate, Marr and La Mesa Parks less favorably, with only about half rating these parks as being in excellent or good condition.
Why do residents visit parks?

Monmouth respondents visit local parks and recreation facilities for a variety of reasons. The most popular activities are using playgrounds (62%) and participating in festivals or celebrations (60%). Majorities of respondents also visit parks for relaxation (57%), family gatherings (55%), and trails (53%). Fewer visited to use a sport field (16%), tennis court (4%) or volleyball court (<1%). In addition, 12 respondents (4.6%) wrote in that they visit parks to walk or play with their dogs.

Respondents aged 20 to 44, who were also the most likely to have children in their household, were the most likely to visit for playgrounds, family gatherings, and sport fields.

Why don’t residents visit more often?

When asked why they do not visit Monmouth’s parks and recreation facilities more often, many respondents responded that they do visit (30%), parks lack the right equipment (25%), are too busy (24%) or have other reasons (19%, write-in) suggesting that further improvements would not increase their use of parks.

However, over half of respondents selected a reason that could be addressed by the City, including lack of desired equipment (25%), crowding (10%), maintenance issues (7%), safety concerns (5%), and accessibility issues (6%).

Respondents also cited transportation-related issues, either that existing parks are too far from their home (7%) or that there are limited, safe biking routes to parks. Other respondents stated that they either use other facilities (19%) or do not know what is offered in Monmouth (17%).

Respondents with children at home were more likely to cite that parks and facilities are too crowded or do not offer desired equipment as reasons why they do not visit more often. Respondents without children at home were more likely than those with children to cite being too busy as a reason why they do not use parks more often. In addition, 37% of respondents who live west of Hwy 99W and south of Hwy 51 (SW area) responded that parks lack the desired equipment, as compared to 20% to 25% from other areas of Monmouth.

6. What would you say are the main reasons you visited Monmouth parks and open spaces in the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals / celebrations</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family gatherings / picnics</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails (walk / run / bike)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport fields</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized program or activity</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife viewing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking dogs (write-in only)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Write-in “Other” responses which fit clearly into defined answer categories were included in those categories.

7. Please CHECK ALL the reasons why your household does not use City of Monmouth parks or recreation facilities more often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (I/We use them)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks do not have the right equipment</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy to go to parks and facilities</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use parks or facilities provided by another city or organization</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know what is offered</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and sports courts are too crowded</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and facilities are too far from my home</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and facilities are not well-maintained</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible for my physical abilities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not feel safe in the park or facility</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Write-in “Other” responses which fit clearly into defined answer categories were included in those categories.
Do residents think Monmouth needs more parks and recreation opportunities?

A large majority of survey respondents think that Monmouth does not have enough neighborhood walking and biking trails (80%). Respondents were somewhat split on the adequacy of parks, picnic areas, and sports fields and courts, with pluralities feeling there are not enough sport fields and courts or picnic areas. A majority (58%) responded that there are not enough recreation programs.

Respondents with two or more children are more likely than others to think there are not enough sport fields or recreation programs. Respondents who live in the NW area were more likely than others to think there are not enough recreation programs, and those living in the NE area think there are not enough picnic areas.

What park and facility improvements would residents prioritize?

When asked which park and recreation improvements they would like to see the City focus on, seven in eight respondents identified maintaining existing parks as one of their top three priorities, with over 40% saying it should be the highest priority. In looking at the sum of the top three priorities, another 78% gave a high priority to building a recreational trail network. Developing trails and open space protection was a higher priority in the SE area compared to other areas.

There was no significant difference in responses based on age, and respondents with no children or only one child were more likely than the others to place a higher priority on building a recreational trail network.

8. For the following list, indicate how you would rank the priority for each (1st priority is highest and 5th priority is lowest).
The survey also asked about residents’ support for park and recreational improvements. A majority of respondents were very or somewhat supportive of expanding or improving all facilities listed.

A large majority of respondents (90% or more) were supportive of expanding and improving multi-use walking and biking trails, community events or festivals, ADA accessible playgrounds, and picnic areas or shelters for group gatherings. More than half of respondents were very or somewhat supportive of all other improvements listed.

Younger respondents were more supportive than older respondents of all active use activities listed, including sports courts and fields, splash pads, indoor fitness equipment, disc golf, and gymnasiuems, with the exception of pickleball. Similarly, respondents with children in their home were more likely to support active-use improvements than those without children at home. Multi-use trails, wildlife viewing and community events areas appealed to respondents of all ages and family sizes.

9. The following list includes park amenities that the City of Monmouth could consider adding to the park system. Please indicate for each whether you would be very supportive, somewhat supportive, not sure, or not supportive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events and festivals</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA accessible playground equipment</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas &amp; shelters for group gatherings</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pad / water spray features</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / wildlife watching opportunities</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to indoor fitness &amp; health equipment</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiuems for indoor sports, like basketball or...</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball and softball fields</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog opportunities</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis and pickleball courts</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor volleyball</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf course</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer / football / lacrosse fields</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding or BMX parks</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked which of a set of improvements would best meet the needs of their household, a plurality (39%) of respondents prioritized developing an extended trail system for walking and cycling, and an almost equal number (36%) prioritized building a larger community park. Fewer (18%) felt a smaller neighborhood park near their home would best meet their needs. Only 7% of respondents felt undeveloped and natural open spaces would best meet the needs of their household.

Households with two or more children were more supportive of a larger community park, and a larger community park and an extended trail system were strongly supported by all age groups. Respondents from the northeast were slightly more supportive of a larger community park, and respondents from the southeast and northwest were more supportive of an extended trail system.

How do residents want to hear about the City’s recreational facilities, programs and events?

Majorities of respondents prefer to hear about City parks, facilities and events through online channels such as social media (75%) and the City’s website (74%).

Posted signs or information, such as community event signs, flyers at City facilities or schools, or the newspaper, are also a popular source. School flyers and social media announcements are much more popular source of information among respondents under 54 years of age and among households with children at home.

Approximately 8% of respondents also wrote-in that they would like to hear about park and recreation opportunities through other means, such as direct mail to their home via the utility billing.
Demographics

Age
The largest age group who responded to the survey were between 35 and 44 (34%). Respondents roughly split between respondents over age 65 (22%), respondents between 45 and 64 years of age (21%), and respondents under 35 years of age (23%). Only one survey respondent was under the age of 20.

Location of Residence
Roughly two-fifths of survey respondents (42%) live in the southeast area of Monmouth, east of Hwy 99W and south of Hwy 51. Approximately 29% live in the northwestern portion of the city (east of Hwy 99W, north of Hwy 51). Another 16% live in the northwest, and approximately 14% live in the southwest. Less than five percent of respondents do not live in Monmouth.

Number of Children in Household
Nearly half of respondents (49%) have no children in their household. These households tended to include older adults (over age 55). The remaining 51% of households have one (11%), two (27%), or three (13%) children in the home.
Community Survey on Park, Recreation & Open Space Preferences

Dear Monmouth Community Member:

The City of Monmouth is conducting a short survey to assess the recreational needs of community members to update its citywide Parks Master Plan. The new Plan will establish a path forward for providing high quality, community-driven parks and recreation amenities throughout the city. The Plan will establish goals and recommend specific projects for the city’s park facilities for the next 5-10 years. Final review of the Plan tentatively is targeted for late fall 2019.

Your participation is crucial to the success of this project. The survey consists of 15 questions regarding current use of facilities, preferred activities and support for future improvements. It takes on average about 5 minutes to complete, and residents of all ages are encouraged to participate.

Take the survey now online at www.ci.monmouth.or.us

Thank you in advance for participating!

1. When you think about the things that contribute to the quality of life in Monmouth, would you say that public parks and recreation opportunities are... (check one option)
   - Essential to the quality of life here
   - Important, but not really essential
   - More of a luxury that we don’t need
   - Don’t Know

2. When it comes to meeting the needs for parks, trails and recreation facilities, would you say there are... (Check only one box in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Neighborhood Walking / Biking Trails</th>
<th>Sport Fields &amp; Sport Courts</th>
<th>Picnic Areas &amp; Shelters</th>
<th>Recreation Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than Enough</td>
<td>About the Right Amount</td>
<td>Not Enough</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please rate your satisfaction with the overall value your household receives from the City of Monmouth for parks and outdoor recreation amenities.
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Don’t Know

4. How many times over the past year have you or members of your household visited a public park or recreation facility in Monmouth?
   - At least once a week
   - Two or three times a month
   - About once a month
   - Two or three times over the year
   - Did not visit a public park
   - Don’t Know
5. Please indicate if YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD has used any of the following parks and recreation facilities listed below. If YES, please indicate how you would rate the condition of the park or recreation facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Have you visited in the past year?</th>
<th>If YES, how would you rate the condition of the park?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gentle Woods Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth Recreational Park (dog park &amp; skate park)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Lane Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesell Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Park</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What would you say are the main reasons you visited Monmouth parks and open spaces in the LAST YEAR? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.
- Fitness
- Playgrounds
- Sport fields
- Tennis court
- Volleyball
- Skate park
- Trails (walk / run / bike)
- Family gatherings / picnics
- Festivals / celebrations / music concerts
- Relaxation
- Wildlife viewing
- Organized program or activity, such as club, camp or league activity
- Other: ________________________

7. Please CHECK ALL the reasons why your household DOES NOT USE City of Monmouth parks or recreation facilities more often.
- Parks do not have the right equipment
- Parks and facilities are not well maintained
- Do not feel safe in park or facility
- Inaccessible for my physical abilities
- Parks and sport courts are too crowded
- Parks and facilities are too far from my home
- Use parks or facilities provided by another city or organization (such as private fitness clubs)
- I do not know what is offered
- None / I regularly use local parks or recreation facilities
- Other: ________________________

8. For the following list, indicate how you would rank the priority for each (1st priority is highest and 5th priority is lowest). Circle each ranking number only once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining existing parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new active use parks that include sport fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a recreational trails network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring land for future parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting open space and natural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The following list includes park amenities that the City of Monmouth could consider adding to the park system. Please indicate for each whether you would be very supportive, somewhat supportive, not sure or not supportive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball and softball fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer / football / lacrosse fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport courts, such as tennis, pickleball, basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis and pickleball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pad / water spray features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas &amp; shelter for group gatherings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding or BMX parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature / wildlife watching opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA accessible playground equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community events and festivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums for indoor sports, like basketball or volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to indoor fitness &amp; health equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Which ONE of the following best fits your needs? (Check one)

- [ ] A smaller, ½ - 2 acre neighborhood park with basic amenities such as play equipment, picnic tables and benches, within a short walk from your home
- [ ] A larger, 10-20 acre community park suitable for wide use including sports fields, picnic areas and pathways, within a short drive from your home
- [ ] An extended trail system for walking and cycling
- [ ] Undeveloped and natural open spaces with limited or no improvements
11. Please check ALL the ways you would prefer to learn about Monmouth’s parks, recreation facilities, programs and special events.
- City website
- Social media (Facebook, Instagram)
- NextDoor
- Internet/Search Engine
- Newspaper
- Flyers at City facilities
- School flyers/newsletters
- Community event signs
- Other: ____________
- None

12. Do you have other comments or suggestions for Monmouth’s parks?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

These last questions help us understand whether we have a cross section of the community. It’s important that you provide a response to each question. Your answers are confidential.

13. How many children under age 18 live in your household?
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

14. What is your age?
- Younger than 20
- 20 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 and older

15. Using the map, in which section of Monmouth do you live?
- ( NE ) Northeast
- ( NW ) Northwest
- ( SE ) Southeast
- ( SW ) Southwest
- Don’t live in Monmouth

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!
Your input and insights will be used to help guide the development of the Monmouth Parks Master Plan.
Take this survey online:
www.ci.monmouth.or.us
Check the City's website for more information about the citywide Parks Master Plan.
ATTACHMENT 2. OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESPONSES

Q7: Open-ended – The main reasons you visited Monmouth parks and open spaces?

- Dog park for my dog!!
- Go to park(s) as part of my job working with children
- I LIVE ACROSS THE STREET FROM GENTLE WOODS PARK. MY ENJOYMENT IS THE VIEW AND THE WILD LIFE
- Splash pad
- Dog park
- Gentle house activities
- Dog exercise where she can free roam and play with other dogs
- Dog walking
- Be outside on nice grass/lawn.
- People watching
- Dog walking
- Exercise the dog (at the dog park)
- Independence parks are close by and used also
- Water fountain
- Hanging out with other college friends when it’s sunny out
- Dog park
- I'm not aware of any public tennis courts.
- Outdoor play space for my child
- Dog exercise
- just to see them
- Spaces to walk my dog off the pavement.
- Bday parties
- We would use the park system more if they were easily connected by bike paths
- To experience the beauty and a sense of peace
- 4th of July
- exercise dog
- Play
- Walking the dog
- Dog walking
- Dogs
- I just moved here in January, so I haven’t had much opportunity to visit the parks due to weather and pregnancy.
Q8: Open-ended - The reasons why your household does not use City of Monmouth parks or recreation facilities more often.

- No Parking spots
- thank you city for new tennis court nets. However, court surface needs major repair/replacement.
- I wish we had a few more covers areas to sit close to the playground locations.
- use them occasionally, if I had kids I would use them all the time
- Inaccessible for a child I work with and her needs. She uses a wheelchair to get around and has specific physical needs when using park facilities
- I live next to the park and enjoy the scenery & wildlife
- Some parks do not have bathrooms or the bathrooms are closed for much longer than necessary. It would be nice if there were more than two benches in Monmouth main st park through the rainy season when benches are needed! Also, the fact that there is no soap at most parks in the bathrooms is unsanitary.
- They are very tiny
- Pregnant and can't go out much
- Mainly to let our puppy explore, free roam, train and light walks for ourselves.
- Do not have children
- No softball complex
- We do daily walks and either walk in or by other parks for the view and beauty of them
- We want to use Gentle Woods more but it is in need of updates.
- the facilities at most parks are very minimal and dated (playgrounds) and rarely open (bathrooms); even the new playground equipment is very uninspired
- Not enough walking/hiking opportunities especially trails for enjoyment without concrete
- Only Madrona had a "trail". It would be great to have somewhere that had longer trails to walk.
- Bathrooms are not available year round for all parks
- No pickleball courts
- The play equipment in Monmouth Parks is not ADA accessible. There is nothing available in our neighborhood park (Gentlewoods) for my child who needs a wheel chair. I would like to see swings, and other accessible equipment.
- Some of the parks do not offer much shade in the summer and are too hot to play on.
- Lack of baseball fields
- Poor drainage at Madrona Park in wet weather and playground for very young children only
- Gentle Woods Park equipment needs painting/maintenance, Skate park gets too crowded for safety
- Playground equipment is minimal and outdated in many parks and we could use more trail networks in/around town. But we use the parks all the time regardless of these issues.
- Main Street Park gets very busy. Madrona Park's path is too short.
- I wish we had a better bike/run/walk system that connected parks to neighborhoods. Additionally some neighborhoods have sidewalks only on one side and no crosswalks to parks.
- Bathrooms aren't great at times
The parks are very well maintained (so pretty). Some just have better equipment etc. so it depends on the purpose of our visit.

We live closest to La Mesa and Southgate Parks. Entire play areas have water log/drainage issues, and too muddy much of the time. La Mesa Park is has been irregularly maintained, grassy too high, trash, etc.

No Pickleball courts !!!!!!!!

Dog park is not regulated at all; I have stopped going.

Lack of nature trails/hiking or pool

I am more interested in serious walking, like at Independence’s growing Riverfront Park. Monmouth has nothing like this. The Ash Creek trail is too short. A walking/bike path around the city would be lovely.

A bike or pedestrian trail would be used by our household 4-5 times per week.

Toddler equipment not always available

Bathrooms are often closed seasonally.

Bathrooms closed, very inconvenience

Again, we love to bike and would like to see more bike path.

Typically visit parks in Independence

I would use them more if I had a family in the area. Not something I generally do alone.

Would be nice to have a brochure that describes all the parks in the city

Winegar park is littered with dog poop. Main Street Park, for being a centerpiece of the town has poor equipment options. There is ample space to add more equipment especially given the amount of usage. More swings are needed along with a better and updated climbing structure. The Dallas City Park has amazing equipment options in comparison. The corner pocket park off Stadium Drive sometimes has sketchy people there during the day, so I no longer take my kids there.

inadequate seating and shade

Bathrooms not open for winter and past of fall and spring

Never enough tables, garbage cans, bathrooms

The lower grounds at Madrona Park are often too soft.

Q10: Open-ended – Park amenities that the City could consider adding to the park system.

- racquetball
- Fenced toddler playground
- Racquetball Courts
- parks where dogs are not allowed off leash! Madrona Park often has dogs off leash and prevents older people like me from enjoying walking and relaxing there. Have enclosed off leash areas if dog-rules can’t be enforced!
- Love more off leash opportunities! or scheduled play to boost dog park attendance :-)
- Patague court and pickle ball courts
• The key word is "adding"...
• parks and rec summer camps for kids (all day options like YMCA)
• ADA accessibility is a #1 priority! Families should not have to drive to Salem to swing and play!
• We need an ADA accessible playground. Please start with at least 1 accessible swing in each park. That is a doable goal.
• Monmouth could really use more gymnasium space and baseball fields so kids don't have to practice so late in the evening. There is ZERO ADA equipment in our parks.
• complete sidewalks and bike lanes between parks and neighborhoods
• Covered/indoor playground equipment
• First priority - maintain what we have to best standards possible. Then recreation paths, picnic areas, splash pads, community events. Don't support massive indoor building plans.
• Pickleball Pickleball Pickleball and more Pickleball COURTS !!!
• Play structures that encourage creativity & adult fitness structures nearby. Benches for seniors
• having unpaved trails would be great
• Bike paths should be a priority
• Outdoor exercise equipment for adults - Similar to what they have in Waluga Park West in Lake Oswego
• need more comfortable benches; not metal or stone; should have backrests and smooth seating area
• Improved equipment at current parks, specifically the Main Street Park.

Q13: Open-ended - Do you have other comments or suggestions for Monmouth’s parks?
• We truly NEED more ADA accessible parks for our children in this city. We are excluding a huge number of our children and hindering their chance to participating in normal everyday activities. We can do better than this, we are better than this. Let's give these kids priority.
• Maintain current parks before adding new land/facilities.
• A bigger splash pad would benefit the community and bring more visitors to town
• More off leash dog opportunities!
• I love the emphasis on our parks, particularly Main Street Park, over the last few years. I am not fond of the idea of overnight camping in any of our parks because it raises safety concerns for our kids. Anything that gives us safe, community gathering space sounds great! And local activities are fun for all ages.
• Indoor recreational space - for all ages - would be great. Not a pool (WOU, Dallas & Independence have pools). Indoor basketball, racquetball, volleyball, exercise classes, other activities with childcare would be great. A place to
• Our community lacks accessible play equipment for children with special needs. I feel this is currently the biggest gap in our park system. All children need to be able to play outdoors, and all children should be able to access public parks to play.
• ADA accessible play equipment for children should be available at the parks! This should be a priority for the city first and foremost!
• Madrona Park is right behind my back garden. So too are the sounds of people there after 10pm. Also dogs off-leash there. Neither are permitted but these laws/rules are not enforced or obeyed. I have found things from balls to drones in my garden from park 'activities' even been hit by a ball. What to do??
• Splash pad
• I commented earlier about the bathrooms, benches, and soap. Also, Monmouth Main St park restrooms don't get cleaned thoroughly very often. The sink area is clean, but the stalls and walls are streaky, greasy, and sometimes you can see fecal matter that takes weeks to be properly cleaned.
• Except when considering combined needs of both communities, don't try to duplicate/compete with what is available in Independence.
• I would add sidewalks where missing along Madrona street and Heffley street so pedestrians can be safe first.
• Parks are very clean and feel safe. Just would like to see more and with more events
• Maybe smaller off leash dog areas in some of the main parks where they can roam but within walking distance. EX 50ftx50ft fenced area at Madrona or Monmouth city park.
• Inter-connectivity is key, with walking trails, wildlife, picnic areas. Using wetlands or constrained land for this would be great.
• We would love to Gentle Woods updated as it is one of the first sights visitors see as they drive into Monmouth...with the Gentle Woods neighborhood growing and younger families moving in, there is a huge need to add more age appropriate and ADA accessible equipment and ideally a barrier separating the highway from the park...the space is there and is great but it could be greatly improved upon!
• I would like to see measures taken to improve Monmouth's walkability. More marked crosswalks, more sidewalks, designed and marked walking routes, and speed zones marked and enforced on neighborhood streets.
• The number of parks is pretty decent for the size of our town and I feel that the city does a good job of maintaining what is already in place. It would be really nice to see some new or at least more inventive playground equipment added to some of the older parks (e.g. Gentle Woods) and also some nature trails/paths throughout town.
• "Maybe two cities could work together to create a multi use trail system to benefit residents who consider both cities important to the community"
• Section 9 is not working properly. I wanted to answer 1 to both questions 1 and 2 and it wouldn't let me. It took the answer for question 1, but then deleted it when I answered question 2. Clicking on the dots to the left, answered all the questions in sequential order but not my order so ignore responses on section 9.
• We really need more gym space for kids sports. Having practices for elementary school kids until 9pm at night has been very difficult.
• ADA, ADA, ADA!
• "We have a significant community need for ADA accessible play equipment in our community. Many kids are left out because the equipment is not even close to accessible.
• Also, we love to bike with our young kids between Monmouth and Independence, but the path options along Main St are dangerous. The bike lanes are highly insufficient and not suited for most people, especially kids. In an ideal world, a bike and walk path between the two cities would promote a great connection and easy way to explore the towns. 
• I think we could definitely use more ADA accessible park features at all existing parks. And they should be mandatory in any future park plans.
• "Strongly suggest that pickleball courts be install in an exciting park in the City.
• The game is very popular and is an activity that people of all ages and skill levels can participate. 
• Our top priority is having an ADA accessible playground.
• We are in desperate need for more sports facilities. I am a coach for many youth sports teams and we never have enough courts or fields to use for practices and games. We travel to similar size communities and play in large tournaments that make a good amount of money. Many tournaments split costs with the programs and the cities. They take in a lot of revenue between the costs of the tournaments and the concessions.
• Make a splash pad at Main street park or Madrona, gives the kids more things to do, then just play under the fountain.
• Maintain what’s already there and put an emphasis on baseball. Look at what Dallas and many other communities have done with their youth baseball complex’s. Monmouth’s youth baseball facilities are somewhat embarrassing and not well maintained. Seems like an after thought for funding.
• We have a huge need for a multi-use indoor sports facility... something like the boys and girls club facility in Albany... to provide accessible and equitable youth sports programming for kids in our area.
• I love that Monmouth has lots of little parks tucked away here and there. So fun to walk/ride bikes to a different one each week. Gentle Woods equipment really needs some maintenance. Another splash/water park would be lovely! Expanding the skate park would be great too. Both get overcrowded to the point that safety can be a concern for the younger kids.
• Our parks are great considering the size of our town. I would enthusiastically promote an extended trail system for walking and biking (this would hugely improve our town). I would also encourage updating playground equipment when possible, and offering more fitness opportunities for kids/teens during all months of the year. Thank you for your work!
• The tennis court near the dog park needs improvement. Also, making it pickle ball friendly would be great!
• Definitely ADA accessible parks as well as more areas for dogs!!
• No community rec center, competes with local business owners
• The parks we have are great! The only issue is the sports facilities. The town (along with Indy) is very limited to space for sports games and practices. It would be great to see a multi-functional recreation building, as well as more baseball/softball fields. Thank you for asking these questions and getting input from the residents!
• Our kids really need somewhere safe to be. A sports complex will bring revenue and also split this sex biased funding
• It would be nice to have more play structures at cherry lane park
I do think the parks Monmouth offers are great, beautiful and well maintained. Monmouth does a fantastic job with their parks. I just think there are lots of RECREATIONAL opportunities being missed out on and activities that are missing from our parks to make them more user friendly and meet the needs of a wider audience.

I love the idea of creating new opportunities for kids and families to be active in our community but I don’t think it would be smart, or business friendly for the city to get involved in “fitness” type equipment that would compete with local businesses. It would be great to partner with local fitness clubs to promote healthy living but not create fitness centers.

I REALLY enjoy our parks!! I do believe there could be more done to maintain the lawns (mowing, reseeding, water drainage). Also ensure the playground equipment is well maintained (replaced and repaired when necessary). esp. Southgate and La Mesa Parks ;-) 

Pickleball is the fastest growing sport and is not a passing fad. Dallas has 4 great courts, used a LOT by all ages. Might add 2 more. Tournaments bring $$$$$$. Research it please!!!

I appreciate this survey, but I am not optimistic that this city has the will to make a serious walking/bicycling trail. I’ve been to many cities that have a wonderful network - often Rails to Trails - avidly supported by residents and city staff alike. This city seems intent on selling to the first bidder for the promise of more property taxes. It grows without consideration for what people want. Hwy 99 is a commercial embarrassment. Residents will need educating as so many have a NIMBY mentality.

Independence has the nice waterfront area, so I’m sure Monmouth folks go there quite a bit. I’m not sure we can compete with that. It would be nice, though to create a walk all along ash creek over to Independence.

Connect cycling routes, not just trails but designated public streets with signage, to Ind and Dallas.

Monmouth does a great job maintaining parks. Bathrooms would be my only suggestion for improvements. Thank you for working on this. We love hiking and playing outdoors!

Multi-use trails have been shown to be a health and economic benefit to communities. Monmouth residents shouldn’t have to drive to Corvallis or Salem to have pleasant, family-friendly opportunities to walk and bike. A 5-mile trail alone either branch of Ash Creek would be a huge benefit to our community.

I have young children and I feel like some of the equipment is more suited for older kids at many of the parks. At Gentle Woods, for example, the slide is dangerous for small children, but my 2-year-old loves to slide and is so disappointed that he can’t go on that one. He also loves to climb and many of the climbing options (spider webs, structures with monkey bars instead of bridges to get from one side or the other) are not appropriate for his age. I love it when parks have climbing structures that are appropriate for toddlers/preschoolers AND structures for bigger kids. I wish we had more things for smaller children. We also love to hike/walk/bike and miss the trail systems we had when we lived in other areas.

So great that we’re getting the ball rolling!

"Having some unpaved trail options for walking/running would be great.

What if a park, or series of parks, had a workout circuit: chin up bars, over/under bars, stretching stations, etc.? Independence has a park like that, and I’ve seen the concept implemented internationally even.
• More parks featuring they hydrology of the area would be an attraction. Are there any local ponds or streams that might become incorporated into a park? All I can think of right now is Gentle Woods Park. If there were a way to highlight the watershed, it could very easily tie into programs around water management, habitat restoration/maintenance, and opportunities for wildlife observation.

• One of my favorite parks in town is La Mesa Park because it’s so incorporated into the neighborhood. Instead of being right next to the road, it's buffered by houses. It gives the park a more ""hidden treasure"" feeling as well as encourages people living around its perimeter to use it more often. More little parks like that as Monmouth grows would make parks in Monmouth stand out a little more."

• Thank you to the staff of Monmouth Public Works! They do a great job of maintaining the parks and managing everything else they do to make this such a great community.

• Would be nice to see all of the parks linked by a trail system

• We see more and more bicycle use on the roads around Monmouth. In many cases it is dangerous to pass the cyclists and dangerous for them to be sharing the road with cars.

• Really appreciate the survey and the thoughtful questions.

• Without Central School District letting us use their field, we could not run the CYS baseball program for youth now. There are so many teams. The district has after school programs that use the fields and practices overlap with school and CYS. I think we need more baseball/softball fields and areas to practice and play.

• We usually go to parks for playground equipment and walking/running trails. Usually our kids play at ACES playground on the weekends. We often walk and run at Riverview in Independence. I would love to see more trails for running and biking. Madrona’s updates are nice for short walks and kids' bike rides.

• So glad to have them

• Thanks for your hard work to make this city a great place for families while also meeting the needs of the college.

• It would be so nice to have an area to walk and enjoy nature and views of the countryside. Outside of the city and not along a busy highway.

• Included in the monthly Community Notes

• make sure the park(s) have many trees.

• I would like to see improved maintenance of the water splash pad at Main Street Park. The algae builds up too fast and becomes quite slippery for kids. Maybe signs posted about not smoking in public parks, as that often occurs in the shelter areas and trickles over to where kids are playing. Add play structures to the Main Street Park.

• I have enjoyed walking at Madrona Park and would love to see more parks similar to madrona park. Thank you

• Please remember wherever you place them that the existing home owners are VERY affected by the noise and activity generated at a facility.

• More ADA accessible walking paths

• Park restrooms should be open year round or at least when weather permits. We should also have the option to reserve covered areas and have use of restrooms in October and March/April if temperatures
permit. Having restrooms closed limits how often I can bring my family to the park. Restrooms should be stocked with hand soap.

- Bicycling/walking corridors would be safer for cyclists and pedestrians who now sometimes risk their lives when using our streets.

- Overall we are pleased with the parks we visit and enjoy them. We like to see more walking trails/paths. And would love to have a local family fitness center with indoor pool for swimming like Dallas has.

- I HIGHLY recommend an all abilities playground as well as a splash pad. The water feature at Main Street Park is not nearly big enough for the amount of children who want to play on the water during the summer. Not to mention that children are constantly slipping and falling onto the cement whereas other splash pads have a bouncy rubber bottom for children.
APPENDIX B

Community Outreach Notes
Community members were invited to the first open house for the Monmouth Parks & Recreation Master Plan on Thursday, September 5, 2019 from 6:30 - 8:00 p.m. at Volunteer Hall. The project team prepared informational displays covering the major themes of the Master Plan. These displays included Project Overview, Parks & Outdoor Recreation, Trails & Connections, and Maps.

Attendees were encouraged to talk to project team members, record their comments and complete a written comment card. City staff and project team staff engaged with participants to identify general needs and interests for park and recreation in Monmouth. Approximately 15 people attended the meeting to review materials and provide comment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following represents a summary of the comments received during the evening meeting.

Responses on Recreation Opportunities (What’s missing or in short supply?)

- 4 – Put new parks in “gap” areas for future
- 3 – Install bike lanes on local streets
- 2 – Install new skatepark at Recreational Park
- 2 – Schedule more community events and festivals
- 1 – Install walking paths at large parks
- 1 – Renovate and expand sport courts to include pickleball

Comments from Trail Display Board

- Add paths to/from MES
- Can the Southgate Trail be separated from streets?
- Traffic devices every time a path crosses a major street
- Add mile markers along the paths at Madrona
- Flashing solar light for pedestrians at 99 and Madrona
- Add pedestrian activated crosswalk light at 99 and Powell for WOU and MES students
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General Comments
- Make parks and play areas accessible
- Bike parking structures at all parks
- Softball fields for women, kids? (There are none for women in town)
- Geocode passport
- More amenities at Cherry Lane Park (soccer field?) and add path to playground
- Need parks in new developments

Comments on Gentle Woods Park Concept
- Keep the natural feel & place for wildlife
- Love the proposed pathway here… gets very muddy after stairs in rainy season
- Nature or farm-themed play equipment
- Lots of family reunions, picnic, weddings here
- Some kind of “barrier” between playground and steep bank down to creek
- Plantings (native), picnic tables, etc. along Hwy 99 south of park
- The bocce ball court might not be a good fit given the flooding in this area of the park - Probably best to keep it in Monmouth Recreation Area.

Comments on Southgate Park Concept
- Pickleball
- Benches – multi-generational amenities
- Can you get to the park from the south?

Comments on Monmouth Recreational Park Concept
- Love the pathway
- Signage from “S” curve so you know it’s there
- Skatepark, teen activities

Every effort has been made to accurately record this meeting. If any errors or omissions are noted, please provide written response within five days of receipt.

cc: Suzanne Dufner
File
APPENDIX C
Stakeholder Discussion Notes
STAKEHOLDER GROUP DISCUSSION NOTES

Project Name: Monmouth Parks Master Plan Update  
Project No.: Proj-19-117PLN  
Location: Volunteer Hall  
Interview Date: May 7, 2019  
Time: 1:30 pm  
Notes by: Steve Duh, Conservation Technix  
Suzanne Dufner, Monmouth Community Development Manager  
Stakeholder: Central School District  
Monmouth Bicycle / Pedestrian Committee  
Partnerships in Community Living  
Monmouth Senior Center  
Monmouth Planning Commission  
YMCA  
Gate Youth Association  
Central Youth Sports  
Western Oregon University  
Subject: Park and Recreation Opportunities

PURPOSE

To discuss existing challenges and future demands and needs for sports facilities and programming in Monmouth with representatives from a variety of sports leagues, clubs and programs. This meeting took place on May 7, 2019 at Volunteer Hall from 1:30 – 3:00 pm.

DISCUSSION

The discussion began with a brief introduction of participants and an overview of the City’s plan update process and master plan expectations and the need for community input regarding specific elements of the park and recreation system. A set of questions were used to initiate a discussion of each organization’s perspective and to consider their current and future status regarding facilities and programming.

- Ryan O’Malley, Athletic Director Central High School, church pastor – The school district provides athletic facilities, some of which open/available to public at certain times. The high school has 1000+ kids and sport facilities throughout the district. The only athletic facility in Monmouth is at the S-curve. School facilities are heavily programmed, and 2nd and 3rd graders sometime have to play until 9p for indoor sports because of the scheduling. The school district has tentative plans for a 5 field complex on the north side of Monmouth along 16th Street and near Ash Creek Elementary. The district works closely with Central Youth Sports (CYS).
- Kyle Jansson, Monmouth Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, former Parks and Rec Board member – helps organize bike rodeo event at summer concert series, wrote a grant to place bike repair stations, provides feedback to city on priority sidewalk locations. There is a lack of walking paths in city parks with the exception of Madrona Park. He does not have numbers for participants/activists.
Interview Notes (continued)

- Jennifer Bisek, Activities Coordinator with Partnerships in Community Living – work with people with disabilities and there are about 100+ participants in program, interested in how to make activities/facilities more accessible.
- Stephen Howard, Monmouth Planning Commission Chair, father of young kids in Monmouth – would like to see implementation of a 5-minute walk to greenspaces approach, and providing safe bicycle and pedestrian access to parks.
- Andrea VanHeeswyk, YMCA - works on a variety of special recreation and fitness programs in Polk County (e.g. After School Fitness Program as MES/Ash Creek). YMCA provides a range of health and community programs, including summer programs, youth sports, training, fitness after school. They are currently rebuilding the Salem Y, which will likely be done in 2021 and take much of the existing bandwidth and funding for facilities.
- Joyce Wahl, Gate Youth Association – provides academics and social recreation for middle school and high school aged teens (200+). Programs include archery and games. Use the church next door for facility space. In the process of building new center to support programs and are looking for opportunities to expand offerings.
- Gerry Blankenheim, Dallas Senior Advisory Board, President Pickleball Club – 350+ seniors engaged in programs. 45 adults from Monmouth are involved in pickleball games and play in Dallas, probably increase to 60 pp if had a facility in Monmouth. Should use the opportunity to resurface the Monmouth Recreation Area tennis courts to provide a pickleball court. Madrona Park could be a site for future pickleball courts. If enough courts are built, it could provide an option for tournaments.
- Christal Sperling, Central Youth Sports, Curves – Work with 450+ kids active in the sport programs; baseball, basketball, softball. Share/use school facilities for most programs, and CYS only has access to school facilities after 6p. The only baseball field is at the S-curve. There are no sport facilities in Monmouth for female sports (softball). CYS maintains baseball fields at MRA. Their programs growing, but they are running out of space, with challenges for indoor basketball space.
- Rip Horsey, Western Oregon University Campus Recreation Program, father of young kids in Monmouth – 5,000 students at WOU, university runs athletic program, club sports, in addition to campus recreation programs. Current facilities are heavily use and programmed for students. Some programs at set for NCAA rules. Recreational use and club sport use involves almost as many students as the athletic programs. The pool and climbing wall are open for community use during specific hours. There are 3 basketball courts (rentable), with first priority to students, and they are exploring the possibility of indoor pickleball courts. The University would like to be more open to the community, and summers are the most flexible.

What is the current state of parks and recreation affairs in Monmouth?

- Common theme – sports facilities shortage, no place in Monmouth for girls softball.
- There is a need for an even distribution of parks for unorganized activities as well as organized sports. Are pocket parks really usable (e.g. La Mesa)?
- Can we utilize existing parks to put in more sports fields? (e.g. soccer in Riverview Park Independence, Madrona Park)
- There are no adult recreation/socialization programs in Monmouth.
- There is a Monmouth-Independence running group organized by Ramone in Independence.
- What is relationship with Independence? Need two cities to work together to have a real impact on the development of parks and rec facilities. Two cities working together on new skate park now. Additional opportunities for coordination to avoid duplication of services.
Interview Notes (continued)

- What are the possibilities of creating a parks and rec district in Monmouth and Independence? Voters turned down bond for new gym, ball fields in past. Bond was sent to voters after another school bond, right after recession hit.
- Need to consider how various populations use the parks (e.g. Hispanic families use parks for family gatherings)

What would you like to see happen in 5 years?
- Trail from Monmouth to Independence (off-street and bike path)
- Every front door within 3-5 minute walk of park or open space
- Repair/replace playgrounds
- Skatepark renovation/replacement
- Pickleball complex
- Shared platform for communications
- Greater volunteer leadership/involvement
- Must have cooperative arrangements with Independence
- Need more trails and walking areas
- More outdoor volleyball
- Need more park land

Recreational Facilities
- The area north of Gentle Woods Park (east side) might be an option (see old parks plan); a conservation easement might preclude future development.
- Monmouth Elementary School does not have a gym; it has a combined cafeteria and PE space. The past school bond failed at the ballot, and that would have been one of the improvement projects
- The LDS church has a gym. It accommodates indoor pickleball, cheerleading and CYS basketball
- Look across the community at existing church land for opportunities for sport field development

Communications
- Citywide event and program calendar should be set up to share information with residents about what is available and who offers what. There have been past challenges with people using/administering.
- The City should host programs just for the community; the Arts and Culture Commission could help with volunteers
- Need better promotions
- Used to have reader board signs on 99 to advertise events.
- Need better communication between groups; Creating a platform for the community to get excited about what’s available and what’s possible may help generate future funding support for larger projects. Need better usage of what we have now to help identify/emphasis what additional facilities needed. All parties in parks and rec need united front.
Interview Notes (continued)

Other Comments & Interests
- YMCA – new facility, maybe on a site that straddles the two cities
- Need to grow the roster of volunteer coaches and provide additional training for retention
- Softball complex for tournaments and draw tourism
- School District – turf baseball/softball fields with lights; football field turf needs replacement in 5 years; need to do a lot of work on Ash Creek fields
- Senior Center – interest in space to do Tai Chai outdoors
- The WOU Strategic Plan outlines the university’s capital projects, e.g. renovate old PE bldg.
- There seem to be a fair amount of options for organized sports and activities, but there are few options or facilities available for unorganized, pick-up games and activities
- Need more drop-in opportunities
- Dallas has Kids Inc, which is a tremendous way to bring kids into programs

-- End of Notes --
STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSION NOTES

Project Name: Monmouth Parks Master Plan Update
Project No.: Proj-# 19-117PLN
Location: Phone Discussion
Interview Date: June 18, 2019
Time: 3:00 pm
Notes by: Jean Akers, Conservation Technix

Stakeholder: Shawn Irvine, City of Independence
Subject: Park and Recreation Opportunities

PURPOSE

To discuss existing challenges and future demands and needs for sports facilities and programming in Monmouth with a representative from the City of Independence and explore the potential for collaboration and coordination across the provision of park and recreation services. This phone discussion took place on June 18, 2019 at 3:00 pm.

DISCUSSION

The discussion began with a brief overview of the City of Monmouth’s parks master plan update process and master plan expectations and the need for community input regarding specific elements of the park and recreation system. Questions were used to initiate discussion of current and future city park and recreation services and opportunities for potential cooperation with Monmouth.

From the City of Independence perspective, what are your thoughts on Monmouth’s future of parks and recreation facilities and programming?

Relative to parks infrastructure, the City of Independence (and other communities) tend to be more geographically focused, i.e. within city limits.

What opportunities should be pursued to ensure enriching the future provision of parks and recreation?

In recreational programming, there are lots of opportunities. Thus far, it’s the YMCA and some specific sports organizations that offer recreational programming. It would be a good place for collaboration between the two cities and the school district to expand and enhance recreation programs being offered.

Are there unmet recreation needs?

The City of Independence library has existing programs for educational enrichment. Programs that offer after-school, adult education and other forms of enrichment could be coordinated with recreational programming to cover a wider range of community opportunities.
Interview Notes (continued)

Is the City of Independence currently (or in the near future) planning any significant recreational program or facility additions?
Independence has soccer fields where shared programming/use and maintenance could be initiated with the school district. Because the fields are built in a flood plain they cannot always be available for use during Oregon’s rainy season. If the school district could collaborate with these fields and perhaps with their all-weather turf field at the high school, more sports field facilities would be available for the community at large. In the long term future, a public all-weather turf field complex would be a valuable addition. An indoor soccer field would be awesome. Maybe that’s where a public/private partnership could create the facility and operational resources. Currently, existing teams travel to Corvallis. WOU students could use the indoor facility. A project of this scale that fills a community recreational gap would be a good collaboration with the University, school district and both cities.

What role could the City of Independence offer in partnering with the City of Monmouth in the provision of facilities, programming or funding?
The future replacement of the Monmouth Recreation Area skate park is a strong cross-community recreation facility. The skate park fills a gap in parks infrastructure and would provide value for both communities. With private collaboration and both cities’ involvement, a new skate park could fill a big gap in park amenities.

What projects or programming are being planned in the City of Independence that could benefit from a collaboration with Monmouth?
The City encourages bike tourism and puts forth the image of a great small town. They are actively promoting ‘walkable’ and ‘bikeable’ characteristics. Their 2015 parks master plan cited its 1st priority as better biking & walking connections. This element has regional value and benefits from collaboration & coordination. The Ash Creek Trail project was mentioned (despite some local landowner resistance) as a project that could be moving along with collaborative planning.

What could create better synergy (enhanced results) between Independence and Monmouth in providing parks and recreation?
The City of Independence tends to be able to move faster than surrounding local governments (perhaps more resources allow for this). Starting with city managers and examining for unneeded duplication, exploration of potential collaboration to fill unmet recreational facility needs could move forward. First, as an informal discussion, meeting several times a year to explore opportunities, then perhaps, moving forward in a more formal organizational process.

-- End of Notes --
APPENDIX D

Recreation Trends
The following summaries from recognized park and recreation resources provide background on national, state and local trends that may reflect potential recreational activities and facilities for future consideration in Monmouth's park system. Examining current recreation trends can help inform potential park and recreation improvements and opportunities that may enhance the community and create a more vibrant parks system as it moves into the future.

**National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) PRORAGIS**

In 2013, the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) issued its first report using PRORAGIS, a geographic information system, to establish industry trends. The 2013 report gathered data from 383 park and recreation agencies across the country and compared changes over the last three years. According to the report, park and recreation agencies typically provide management of park and open space lands and operate recreational facilities and programs. Within these areas of responsibility, some growth occurred from 2010 to 2012 among the agencies participating in the survey, including conducting major special events, maintaining public jurisdiction areas and administering community gardens.

The NRPA report indicated that public park and recreation service providers continue to suffer from reduced funding levels. Agencies receiving higher funding levels generally experienced greater reductions, while smaller agencies (in smaller communities) were more stable over the last three years. Recreation programming experienced a significant drop in attendance from 2010 to 2011. While a slight rebound had begun in 2012, the NRPA 2013 report indicates that program offerings have declined in every major category since 2010.

**The State of the Industry Report**

Recreation Management magazine’s 2017 State of the Industry Report summarizes the opinions and information Recreation Management magazine’s 2018 State of the Managed Recreation Industry report summarizes the opinions and information provided by a wide range of professionals (with an average 21.3 years of experience) working in the recreation, sports and fitness facilities. The 2018 report indicated that many (86.6%) recreation, sports and fitness facility owners form partnerships with other organizations, as a means of expanding their reach, offering additional programming opportunities or as a way to share resources and increase funding. Local schools are shown as the most common partner (61.3%) for all
facilities. Parks and recreation organizations (95.8%) were the most likely to report that they had partnered with outside organizations.

Survey respondents from urban communities are more optimistic about positive changes to revenues, while rural respondents are not. In 2018, 41 percent of respondents said that revenues increased from 2016 to 2017, while 11.1% reported a decrease. Looking forward from 2018 to 2019, 50 percent of urban respondents expect revenues to increase, and just 4.3 percent project a decrease.

In last year’s report, parks respondents had reported increases in their average operating expenditures with operating costs that grew by 58% between fiscal 2013 and fiscal 2016. After a significant increase in operating expenditures in fiscal 2016, costs have fallen again in 2017, and are expected to rise more steadily over the next two years, though not to the high reported last year. From 2017 to 2018, respondents said they expect their operating expenses to increase by 1.7 percent, followed by a further increase of 4.9 percent projected in fiscal 2019. The greatest decrease (16.8%) in average operating costs from 2016 to 2017 was reported by parks and recreation respondents.

Relative to costs and revenues, few facilities covered by the survey reported that they cover more than 90 percent of their operating costs via revenue. The percentage recovered varied with type of organization with the average percentage of costs recovered for all respondents hovering near 50%. For parks, the cost recovery rate increased from 43.4 % to 43.9 % from 2017 to 2018.

Over the past decades, public parks and recreation departments and districts have faced a growing expectation that facilities can be run like businesses. Many local facilities are expected to recover much of their operating costs via revenues. While this is the business model for for-profit facilities like health clubs, it’s a relatively recent development for publicly owned facilities, which have typically been subsidized via tax dollars and other funding sources. Most recreation providers (80.5%) have been taking actions to reduce expenditures. Cost recovery actions typically involve reduction in expenses with improving energy efficiency as the most common action (48.3% of respondents). Increased fees and staffing cost reductions and putting off construction or renovation plans were reported as other common methods for reducing operating costs.

Utilization of recreation facilities has shown steady increases by the majority of respondents. Looking forward, more than half of respondents expect to see further increases in the number of people using their facilities. The expectation is that this trend will continue in the next two years.

This year saw a fairly significant drop in the average number of people employed at the organizations covered by the survey. After several years of steady growth, to a high of 147.6 employees in 2017, the average number of employees dropped by 21.7% in the past year. On average, this year’s survey respondents employ 28.2 full-time workers, 39.8 part-time employees, 44.8 seasonal workers, 43.2 volunteers, and 9.1 employees of some other designation. In 2018, more than three-quarters (77.7%) of respondents said they plan to maintain existing staff levels, up from 57% in 2017.

A majority of respondents (83.2%) require certifications for some of their staff members to help measure and verify specific types of professional knowledge and skill. Of those respondents that require certification, the most common types of certification required included CPR/AED/First Aid (required by
90.3% of those who said they require some staff members to be certified), background checks (83.4%), and lifeguard certification (56.3%).

Over the past five years, the percentage of respondents who indicate that they have plans for construction, whether new facilities or additions or renovations to their existing facilities, has grown steadily, from 62.7 percent in 2013 to 69.5 percent in 2018. Construction plans of all kinds are most common among camps and parks. For camp respondents, 47.1 percent are planning new facilities, 45.9 percent are planning additions, and 60 percent are planning renovations. They were followed by parks, 33.9 percent of whom have plans for new construction, 32.6 percent for additions, and 57.7 percent for renovations.

Parks saw modest increases to their construction budgets from 2016 to 2018, with respondents expecting to see increases of 13.5%. Public organizations saw the sharpest increase to their construction budgets from 2016 to 2018, with an increase of 28.7 percent, from $3,877,000 in 2016 to $4,990,000 in 2018.

Parks respondents were more likely than other facility types to include: playgrounds (86.7% of parks respondents had playgrounds); park shelters (80%); park restroom structures (75.6%); outdoor sports courts (74.4%); community and multipurpose centers (58.4%); bike trails (46.4%); skate parks (41.1%); dog parks (38.8%); community gardens (33.7%); disc golf courses (32.9%); fitness trails and outdoor fitness equipment (32.6%); splash play areas (30.7%); golf courses (19.9%); ice rinks (17.6%); waterparks (16.8%); and bike/BMX parks (11.4%).

Park respondents (56.2%) reported plans to add features at their facilities. The top 10 planned features for all facility types include:

1. Splash play areas (23.6%)
2. Synthetic turf sports fields (17%)
3. Fitness trails and/or outdoor fitness equipment (16.4%)
4. Fitness centers (16.3%)
5. Walking/hiking trails (15.5%)
6. Playgrounds (15.2%)
7. Park shelters (13.6%)
8. Dog parks (13.5%)
9. Exercise studios (12.9%)
10. Disc golf courses (12.9%)

Respondents from community centers, parks and health clubs were the most likely to report that they had plans to add programs at their facilities over the next few years. The 10 most commonly planned program additions in 2018 include:

1. Fitness programs (planned by 25.9% of those who will be adding programs)
2. Educational programs (25.7%)
3. Mind-body balance programs (23.3%)
4. Teen programs (22.7%)
5. Environmental education (20.7%)
6. Day camps and summer camps (20.3%)
7. Special needs programs (18.9%)
8. Adult sports teams (18.5%)
9. Holidays and other special events (18.3%)
10. Individual sports activities (17.5%)

While in general, overall budgets are the top concern for most respondents, equipment and facility maintenance lead the issues of budgetary challenges with staffing as the second most common concern. Marketing, safety/risk management, and creating new and innovative programming are continuing challenges for facility managers. Current concerns on the rise in 2018 include older adult fitness and wellness, legislative issues, environmental and conservation issues and social equity and access.

The Outdoor Participation Report

According to 2018 Outdoor Participation Report, published by the Outdoor Foundation in Boulder, Colorado, more than 146.1 million Americans (49%) participated in an outdoor activity at least once in 2017. These outdoor participants went on a total of 10.9 billion outdoor outings, a decrease from 11.0 billion in 2016. Participation in outdoor recreation, team sports and indoor fitness activities vary by an individual’s age. Recent trend highlights include the following:

- Twenty percent (20%) of outdoor enthusiasts participated in outdoor activities at least twice per week.
- Running, including jogging and trail running, was the most popular activity among Americans when measured by number of participants and by number of total annual outings.
- Nineteen percent (19%) outdoor participants lived in the South Atlantic region of the US, making its population the most active in outdoor activities.
- Walking for fitness was the most popular crossover activity where 45.8% of all outdoor participants also walked.
- Data shows that adults who were introduced to the outdoors as children were more likely to participate in outdoor activities during adulthood than those who were not exposed to the outdoors as children.
- The biggest motivator for outdoor participation was getting exercise.
Favorite activities and participation rates range with demographics. In 2017, the average participant had 15 years of experience enjoying outdoor recreation. The data shows, as would be expected, that the amount of experience increased as the participant aged. Those ages 45 and up averaged 25 years as outdoor participants.

Sports, Fitness & Leisure Activities Topline Participation Report

Prepared by a partnership of the Sports and Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) and the Physical Activity Council (PAC), this 2018 participation report establishes levels of activity and identifies key trends in sports, fitness, and recreation in the US. The largest focus of activities continues to be toward fitness sports. Winter sports gained the most of all categories, increasing 2% over the last year. The interest in activities has started moving toward outdoor recreation. The top aspirational activity for all age segments was outside, ranging from camping to biking to birdwatching.

Fitness sports/activities continues to have the highest participation rates; having 64% of the US population ages 6 and over engaging in activities like running/jogging, high intensity/impact training, row machines, and swimming. Outdoor activities remained second but was flat from 2016; seeing a increase in day hiking and backpacking, but lost participants in canoeing and adventure racing.
While age clearly affects how often someone participates, what they do can also be age dependent. Young kids, ages 6 to 17, who tend to be more active overall, focus on team sports and outdoor activities. While Boomers prefer fitness activities, especially low impact such as aquatic exercise, cycling, and walking. Millennials are more likely than the other generations to participate in water sports, such as stand up paddling, boardsailing, and surfing.

Inactivity rates remain higher than 10 years ago despite the promotion of the benefits of an active lifestyle. Over a quarter of the US population (ages 6 and over) did not participate in even the lowest caloric activity in 2017. Trends continue to show how income affects inactivity. Generally, the affluent are getting more active while the less affluent are becoming more inactive.

Despite aspirations to become more active, the biggest influence on engaging more participants is having a friend or family member to take part in the physical activity. First time participation depends on who you are doing it with more than if you have the time.

**National Survey on Recreation and the Environment**

The National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE) is a comprehensive survey that has been collecting data and producing reports about the recreation activities, environmental attitudes and natural resource values of Americans since the 1980s. The NSRE core focus is on outdoor activity participation and personal demographics. The most recent 2012 NSRE reports the total number of people participating in outdoor activities between 2000 and 2007 grew by 4.4% while the number of days of participation increased by approximately 25 percent. Walking for pleasure grew by 14% and continues to lead as the top favorite outdoor activity.

Nature-based activities, those associated with wildlife and natural settings, showed a discernible growth in the number of people (an increase in 31% participation rate) and the number of days of participation. American’s participation in nature-based outdoor recreation is increasing with viewing, photographing, or otherwise observing nature clearly measured as the fastest growing type of nature-based recreation activity.

**Americans Engagement with Parks Survey (from NRPA)**

The vast offerings of the local park and recreation agency improve the lives of people throughout our nation. From the fact that Americans on average visit their local park and recreation facilities approximately 29 times a year to the majority of Americans identifying parks and recreation as an important service provided by their local government, the general public is an untapped advocate to spread the public park and recreation story.
This annual study probes Americans’ usage of parks, the key reasons that drive their use and the greatest challenges preventing greater usage. Each year, the study probes the importance of public parks in Americans’ lives, including how parks compare to other services and offerings of local governments. The survey of 1,000 American adults looks at frequency and drivers of parks/recreation facilities visits and the barriers to that prevent greater enjoyment. Survey respondents also indicate the importance of park and recreation plays in their decisions at the voting booth and their level of support for greater funding.

Key Findings:
- Americans on average visit their local park and recreation facilities approximately 29 times a year, with 3 in 5 saying their most recent visit was within the past month.
- Three in four Americans agree that the NRPA Three Pillars of Conservation, Health and Wellness, and Social Equity represent what they see as the priorities for their local park and recreation agency.
- Nine in 10 Americans agree that parks and recreation are important services delivered by their local government.
- Seven in 10 Americans say they are more likely to vote for local politicians who make park and recreation funding a priority.
- Three-quarters of Americans support increased local government spending for park and recreation agencies with solid support for a nearly 30 percent increase in funding for local park and recreation agencies.

**Oregon State Outdoor Recreation Trends**

The 2019-2023 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), entitled *Outdoor Recreation in Oregon: Responding to Demographic and Societal Change*, constitutes Oregon’s basic five-year plan for outdoor recreation. The plan addresses five important demographic and societal changes facing outdoor recreation providers in the coming years including:

1. An aging population;
2. An increasingly diverse population;
3. Lack of youth engagement in outdoor recreation;
4. An underserved low-income population; and
5. The health benefits of physical activity.

As part of developing the SCORP, the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) conducted a statewide survey of Oregon residents regarding their 2017 outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, as well as their opinions about park and recreation management. This data can help local park and recreation providers better understand public opinions and the preferences of outdoor recreation participants.
Fifty six (56) recreation activities were identified as important recreation activity types. These activities were grouped into eight (8) categories including Non-motorized Trail or Related Activities, Motorized Activities, Non-motorized Snow Activities, Outdoor Leisure and Sporting Activities, Nature Study Activities, Vehicle-based Camping Activities, Hunting and Fishing Activities, and Non-motorized Water-based and Beach Activities. The top three activities with the largest annual user occasions include Walking on local streets / sidewalks (313 million); Walking on local trails / paths (113 million); and Dog walking / going to dog parks / off-leash areas (78 million).

**Figure D-2. User Occasions for Oregon Residents in Outdoor Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local trails / paths</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing, hanging out, escaping heat / noise, etc.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking / going to dog parks / off-leash areas</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking your children or grandchildren to a playground</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing / driving or motorcycling for pleasure</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling on roads, streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / day hiking on non-local trails / paths</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling on paved trails</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure D-3. Participation Rates for Oregon Residents in Outdoor Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local trails / paths</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing / driving or motorcycling for pleasure</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing, hanging out, escaping heat / noise, etc.</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach activities – ocean</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / day hiking on non-local trails / paths</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending outdoor concerts, fairs, festivals</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting historic sites / history-themed parks</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach activities - lakes, reservoirs, rivers</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure D-4. Frequency per Household for Oregon Residents in Outdoor Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Times / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking on local trails / paths</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing, hanging out, escaping heat / noise, etc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking / going to dog parks / off-leash areas</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking your children or grandchildren to a playground</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing / driving or motorcycling for pleasure</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bycycling on roads, streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking / day hiking on non-local trails / paths</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging / running on streets / sidewalks</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling on paved trails</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also asked about priorities for local community needs revealing the top six (6) local (close to home) needs as
- Cleaner restrooms.
- Soft surface walking trails.
- More restrooms.
- Playgrounds with natural materials (Natural Play Areas).
- Nature and wildlife viewing areas.
- Public access to waterways.

When asked about recreation priorities for dispersed recreation opportunities, survey respondents indicated their top priorities as
- Cleaner restrooms.
- Soft surface walking trails.
- Nature and wildlife viewing areas.
- More restrooms.
- Public access to waterways.
- More places and benches to observe nature and others.
- Picnic areas and shelters for small visitor groups.

Outdoor recreation participants were asked what their local parks and recreation agency could do to improve/increase participation and value. Across the state, providing more free-of-charge recreation opportunities was the most important action, with ensuring clean and well-maintained parks and facilities, and developing walking / hiking trails closer to home also high in importance.
OPRD also conducted a statewide survey of Oregon public recreation providers to determine outdoor recreation funding priorities for OPRD grant programs and identify top management issues and challenges faced by public recreation providers. The survey showed that across the state within urban growth boundaries, the most important funding need was for community trail systems; restrooms; children's playgrounds and play areas built with manufactured structures like swing sets, slides, and climbing apparatuses; picnic areas and shelters for small visitor groups; trails connected to public lands; and picnicking/day use and facilities. In rural areas across the state, the most important funding need was for restrooms; RV/ trailer campgrounds and facilities, day-use hiking trails, connecting trails into large trail systems, interpretive displays, and tent campgrounds and facilities (car camping). Creating new park and recreation facilities was the greatest maintenance/management challenge for urban and urban growth areas. Other pressing issues were maintaining existing local parks in the community, addressing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) issues, and providing safe walking and biking routes to parks and trails. More rural, dispersed setting park providers faced challenges maintaining existing park and recreation facilities. Adequate funding was lacking by most park and recreation providers for renovation, rehabilitation; updating facilities for universal access (ADA compliance); growing homeless population pressures, responding to new recreation trends and technology. In many cases, park and recreation providers were concerned that inadequate funding would increase safety and security issues associated with public use of park and recreation facilities and services.
APPENDIX E

Funding & Implementation Tools
The City of Monmouth possesses a range of local funding tools that could be accessed for the benefit of growing, developing and maintaining its parks and recreation system. The sources listed below represent likely potential sources, but some also may be dedicated for other local purposes which limit applicability and usage. Therefore, discussions with city leadership is critical to assess the political landscape to modify or expand the use of existing city revenue sources in favor of parks and recreation programs.

**LOCAL FUNDING OPTIONS**

**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 construction and improvements, but not for maintenance. This property tax is levied for a specified period of time (usually 15-20 years). Passage requires a simple majority in November and May elections, unless during a special election, in which case a double majority (a majority of registered voters must vote and a majority of those voting must approve the measure) is required.

**Park Utility Fee**

A park utility fee provides dedicated funds to help offset the cost of park maintenance and could free up general fund dollars for other capital project uses. 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. Monmouth does not assess a park utility fee.
System Development Charges

Monmouth currently assesses a parks system development charge (SDC). SDCs are charged for new residential development to help finance the demand for park facilities created by the new growth.

Fuel Tax

Oregon gas taxes are collected as a fixed amount per gallon of gasoline purchased. The Oregon Highway Trust Fund collects fuel taxes, and a portion is paid to cities annually on a per-capita basis. By statute, revenues can be used for any road-related purpose, which may include sidewalk repairs, ADA upgrades, bike routes and other transportation-oriented park and trail enhancements.

FEDERAL / STATE GRANTS & CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program - National Park Service

The Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, also known as the Rivers & Trails Program or RTCA, is a community resource administered by the National Park Service and federal government agencies so they can conserve rivers, preserve open space and develop trails and greenways. The RTCA program implements the natural resource conservation and outdoor recreation mission of NPS in communities across America.

Urban and Community Forestry Small Projects and Scholarship Fund - Oregon Department of Forestry

The purpose of the Oregon Department of Forestry's Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program's Small Projects and Scholarship Fund (UCF-SPSF) is to cover the small, yet sometimes prohibitive, administrative and material expenses directly related to community forestry projects encountered by smaller volunteer groups and cities across Oregon. Applications must be received by the end of each quarter for consideration.

The North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989 provides matching grants to organizations and individuals who have developed partnerships to carry out wetland conservation projects in the United States, Canada, and Mexico for the benefit of wetlands-associated migratory birds and other wildlife. Both are Two competitive grants programs exist (Standard and a Small Grants Program) and require that grant requests be matched by partner contributions at no less than a 1-to-1 ratio. Funds from U.S. Federal sources may contribute towards a project, but are not eligible as match.

The Standard Grants Program supports projects in Canada, the United States, and Mexico that involve long-term protection, restoration, and/or enhancement of wetlands and associated uplands habitats. In Mexico, partners may also conduct projects involving technical training, environmental education and outreach, organizational infrastructure development, and sustainable-use studies.

The Small Grants Program operates only in the United States; it supports the same type of projects and adheres to the same selection criteria and administrative guidelines as the U.S. Standard Grants Program. However, project activities are usually smaller in scope and involve fewer project dollars. Grant requests may not exceed $75,000, and funding priority is given to grantees or partners new to the Act's Grants Program.

Local Government Grant - Oregon Parks and Recreation

Local government agencies who are obligated by state law to provide public recreation facilities are eligible for OPR's Local Government Grants, and these are limited to public outdoor park and recreation areas and facilities. Eligible projects involve land acquisition, development and major rehabilitation projects that are consistent with the outdoor recreation goals and objectives contained in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan.

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Grant - Oregon Parks and Recreation

LWCF grants are available through OPR to either acquire land for public outdoor recreation or to develop basic outdoor recreation facilities. Projects must be consistent with the outdoor recreation goals and objectives stated in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan and elements of local comprehensive land use plans and park master plans. A 50% match is required from all successful applicants of non-federal funds, in-kind services and/or materials.
Recreational Trails Program Grant - Oregon Parks and Recreation

Recreational Trails Grants are national grants administered by OPRD for recreational trail-related projects, such as hiking, running, bicycling, off-road motorcycling, and all-terrain vehicle riding. Yearly grants are awarded based on available federal funding. RTP funding is primarily for recreational trail projects, rather than utilitarian transportation-based projects. Funding is divided into 30% motorized trail use, 30% non-motorized trail use and 40% diverse trail use. A 20% minimum project match is required.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Grants - Oregon Department of Transportation

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Grant Program is a competitive grant program that provides approximately $5 million dollars every two years to Oregon cities, counties and ODOT regional and district offices for design and construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Proposed facilities must be within public rights-of-way. Grants are awarded by the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Project types include sidewalk infill, ADA upgrades, street crossings, intersection improvements, minor widening for bike lanes.

Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) - Oregon Department of Transportation

The FAST Act, which replaced Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) in 2015, provides long-term funding certainty for surface transportation projects, meaning states and local governments can move forward with critical transportation projects with the confidence that they will have a Federal partner over the long term (at least five years). The law makes changes and reforms to many Federal transportation programs, including streamlining the approval processes for new transportation projects and providing new safety tools.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Grant

The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board focuses on projects that approach natural resources management from a whole-watershed perspective. OWEB encourages projects that foster interagency cooperation, include other sources of funding, provide for local stakeholder involvement, include youth and volunteers and promote learning about watershed concepts. There are five general categories of projects eligible for OWEB funding: watershed management (restoration and acquisition), resource monitoring and assessment, watershed education and outreach, Watershed council support and technical assistance.
OTHER METHODS & FUNDING SOURCES

Private Grants, Donations & Gifts

Many trusts and private foundations provide funding for park, recreation and open space projects. Grants from these sources are typically allocated through a competitive application process and vary dramatically in size based on the financial resources and funding criteria of the organization. Philanthropic giving is another source of project funding. Efforts in this area may involve cash gifts and include donations through other mechanisms such as wills or insurance policies. Community fund raising efforts can also support park, recreation or open space facilities and projects.

Business Sponsorships/Donations

Business sponsorships for programs may be available throughout the year. In-kind contributions are often received, including food, door prizes and equipment/material.

Meyer Memorial Trust

The Meyer Memorial Trust seeks opportunities to make program-related investments in Oregon and Clark County, WA. General Purpose Grants support projects related to arts and humanities, education, health, social welfare, and a variety of other activities. Proposals may be submitted at any time under this program, and there is no limitation on the size or duration of these grants.

Wells Fargo: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF): Environmental Grant Program

This program builds partnerships with local environmental nonprofits that have projects that focus on strengthening the resiliency of our communities. This includes efforts focused on climate mitigation and adaptation, sustainable agriculture and forestry, water quality, land conservation, and support for building healthy urban ecosystems. The programs operate as a closed RFP, invitation-only process where Wells Fargo engages specific organizations whose work aligns with their giving priorities.
REI in the Community - Non-Profit Partnerships and Grants

Partnerships begin with store teams who may connect with nonprofits by promoting or partnering for events and service projects, raising visibility with REI customers, offering product donations, and inviting and selecting organizations for an REI grant.

Kaiser Permanente Healthy Environments - Community Benefit Programs

These programs work with community-based organizations, public agencies, businesses and residents to translate their vision for healthy communities into visible, concrete changes — and ultimately healthier neighborhoods. Kaiser has several assistance programs that encompass support for Environmental Stewardship, Community Health Initiatives, Every Body Walk!, and Physical Activity Guiding Principles.

Interagency Agreements

State law provides for interagency cooperative efforts between units of government. Joint acquisition, development and/or use of park and open space facilities may be provided between parks, school districts, other municipalities and utility providers.

ACQUISITION TOOLS & METHODS

Direct Purchase Methods

Market Value Purchase

Through a written purchase and sale agreement, the city purchases land at the present market value based on an independent appraisal. Timing, payment of real estate taxes and other contingencies are negotiable.

Partial Value Purchase (or Bargain Sale)

In a bargain sale, the landowner agrees to sell for less than the property’s fair market value. A landowner’s decision to proceed with a bargain sale is unique and personal; landowners with a strong sense of civic pride, long community history or concerns...
about capital gains are possible candidates for this approach. In addition to cash proceeds upon closing, the landowner may be entitled to a charitable income tax deduction based on the difference between the land’s fair market value and its sale price.

**Life Estates & Bequests**

In the event a landowner wishes to remain on the property for a long period of time or until death, several variations on a sale agreement exist. In a life estate agreement, the landowner may continue to live on the land by donating a remainder interest and retaining a “reserved life estate.” Specifically, the landowner donates or sells the property to the city, but reserves the right for the seller or any other named person to continue to live on and use the property. When the owner or other specified person dies or releases his/her life interest, full title and control over the property will be transferred to the city. By donating a remainder interest, the landowner may be eligible for a tax deduction when the gift is made. In a bequest, the landowner designates in a will or trust document that the property is to be transferred to the city upon death. While a life estate offers the city some degree of title control during the life of the landowner, a bequest does not. Unless the intent to bequest is disclosed to and known by the city in advance, no guarantees exist with regard to the condition of the property upon transfer or to any liabilities that may exist.

**Option to Purchase Agreement**

This is a binding contract between a landowner and the city that would only apply according to the conditions of the option and limits the seller’s power to revoke an offer. Once in place and signed, the Option Agreement may be triggered at a future, specified date or upon the completion of designated conditions. Option Agreements can be made for any time duration and can include all of the language pertinent to closing a property sale.

**Right of First Refusal**

In this agreement, the landowner grants the city the first chance to purchase the property once the landowner wishes to sell. The agreement does not establish the sale price for the property, and the landowner is free to refuse to sell it for the price offered by the city. This is the weakest form of agreement between an owner and a prospective buyer.

**Conservation Easements**

Through a conservation easement, a landowner voluntarily agrees to sell or donate certain rights associated with his or her property—often the right to subdivide or develop—and a private organization or public agency agrees to hold the right to enforce the landowner’s promise not to exercise those rights. In essence, the rights are forfeited and no longer exist. This is a legal agreement between the landowner and the city (or private organization) that permanently limits uses of the land in order to
conserve a portion of the property for public use or protection. Typically, this approach is used to provide trail corridors where only a small portion of the land is needed or for the strategic protection of natural resources and habitat. The landowner still owns the property, but the use of the land is restricted. Conservation easements may result in an income tax deduction and reduced property taxes and estate taxes. The preservation and protection of habitat or resources lands may best be coordinated with the local land trust or conservancy, since that organization will likely have staff resources, a systematic planning approach and access to non-governmental funds to facilitate aggressive or large scale transactions.

Landowner Incentive Measures

Density Bonuses
Density bonuses are a planning tool used to encourage a variety of public land use objectives, usually in urban areas. They offer the incentive of being able to develop at densities beyond current regulations in one area, in return for concessions in another. Density bonuses are applied to a single parcel or development. An example is allowing developers of multi-family units to build at higher densities if they provide a certain number of low-income units or public open space. For density bonuses to work, market forces must support densities at a higher level than current regulations.

Transfer of Development Rights
The transfer of development rights (TDR) is an incentive-based planning tool that allows land owners to trade the right to develop property to its fullest extent in one area for the right to develop beyond existing regulations in another area. Local governments may establish the specific areas in which development may be limited or restricted and the areas in which development beyond regulation may be allowed. Usually, but not always, the "sending" and "receiving" property are under common ownership. Some programs allow for different ownership, which, in effect, establishes a market for development rights to be bought and sold.

IRC 1031 Exchange
If the landowner owns business or investment property, an IRC Section 1031 Exchange can facilitate the exchange of like-kind property solely for business or investment purposes. No capital gain or loss is recognized under Internal Revenue Code Section 1031 (see www.irc.gov for more details).
Other Land Protection Options

Land Trusts & Conservancies

Land trusts are private non-profit organizations that acquire and protect special open spaces and are traditionally not associated with any government agency. The Greenbelt Land Trust is the local land trust serving the Monmouth area. Other national organizations with local representation include the Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land and the Wetlands Conservancy.
APPENDIX F

Site Acquisition & Development Guidelines
ACQUISITION GUIDELINES

Planning and land acquisition for future parks is a recognized component in land use and urban growth management, since the provision of parks and open space is considered essential to the livability of urban areas. For the recreation resource planner, the land acquisition process is an important task for ensuring the availability of future recreation resources for the majority of the community. The established planning goals for a community’s comprehensive plan recognize the development of parks and retention of open space with conservation values as a tool for managing the effects of increased density and fostering livability.

Distribution Equity (location/gaps)

Equitable distribution of public park facilities is a community goal (articulated in the Park System Master Plan). GIS mapping and analysis documented and tracked the existing public park inventory and areas where public parks are lacking in search for park land acquisition targets. Park acquisition should be prioritized in underserved areas where households are more than ½-mile from a developed park.

Specific Site Suitability for Developed/Active Parks

According to the 2017 Parks Master Plan, the minimum size for a typical neighborhood park is 3 acres to allow for the accommodation of the desired range of recreational amenities. While existing neighborhood parks may range from 1.5 to 10 acres in size, some basic location and land characteristics influence how accessible, “developable” and convenient a potential site might be for a future public park. Evaluating a potential land parcel should include consideration of the following property features:

- Access and visibility to the property. An adequate amount of public right-of-way is needed to allow for creating bike/pedestrian pathways, at a minimum, and either on-street parking or a parking lot for park visitors who must drive a vehicle.
- Existing publicly owned lands, easements and right-of-way. Are there existing lands under public ownership that could be converted to public park use? What other public amenities are proximate and complementary to a future park development (e.g., schools, police stations, etc.)?
- Connectivity to trails, schools, parks, neighborhoods and connectivity of the trail links. Connections to and from related land uses can add value to a potential park location.
- Environmental constraints, field assessment (does not include Environmental Assessment level detail), regulatory and permitting requirements and GIS data for critical areas. Sensitive environmental lands should
be protected, but often they are not the best sites for development of recreational amenities for public parks. Protected and conserved lands can provide complementary value to public parks, while the public park land can create a buffer for the conserved land.

- Topography. Existing landforms, whether flat or hilly, will influence the park’s design and best fit for provision of recreational facilities.
- Technical analysis of park standards and development costs should be evaluated to help provide realistic site development costs. For example, existing road improvements within the public right-of-way or lack of public water and sewer may trigger additional park development costs.

Within identified neighborhoods that may lack or have limited access to public parks, potential properties should be evaluated for suitable site conditions for the development of future recreational amenities and/or access to natural resources and water.

**Neighborhood/Community Park Site Suitability Criteria:**

- Access / visibility
- Parcel size / configuration
- Contiguous public land / connectivity
- Extent of sensitive areas
- Cost factors (acquisition, development & maintenance.)
- Compatibility with surrounding uses
- Vacant land preference

**Trail Site Suitability Criteria:**

- Development feasibility
- Continuity / connectivity ("safe routes")
- Natural, cultural, historic value
- Public ROW access
- Land costs / value

**Urban Natural Areas Site Suitability Criteria:**

- Ecological, cultural, historic value
- Continuity / connectivity
- Public right of way access
- Development pressure (threat of conversion)
- Acquisition costs, donations, grants, third-party support (i.e., land trusts), etc.
Site-Specific Concerns

Once a targeted park land acquisition has been identified and evaluated with consideration to its potential suitability as a future public park, more specific assessments should be conducted to ensure a measure of known development variables for future park use.

A boundary survey and review of the title is important to identify any existing encroachments, encumbrances or entitlements that need to be addressed or corrected prior to closing.

Environmental constraints, such as wetlands, waterways, other sensitive habitats and any associated buffers, should be identified to determine their impact on developable park spaces.

An environmental site assessment should be conducted to identify environmental conditions that could have resulted from a past release of hazardous substances and determine any potential mitigation requirements to protect public health. Additionally, environmental law typically leaves the burden of responsibility on the property owner, so conducting an environmental site assessment is important to protect the City’s liability.

An archeological assessment to review potential cultural resources may also help bring to light future park development costs and variables.

Any underground tanks, wells, septic systems and existing structures should be evaluated for the need to remove, decommission, or demolish after closing of land sale.

Design Standards for Environmental Site Assessment

Considering a current use of a property is typically not sufficient for evaluating potential environmental concerns. For example, a vacant lot may previously have been used for agricultural purposes and may contain pesticide residues in the soil, or a current retail building formerly may have housed an auto repair business with underground tanks. Additionally, properties that are considered low-risk, such as a residence, could have a leaking underground heating oil tank or other concerns. Therefore, conducting an environmental site assessment is an important step in purchasing and managing property.

Prior to purchasing or accepting ownership of a property, the City should conduct an environmental site assessment to determine if contaminated soil, sediment or groundwater could be present. This process typically begins with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) per ASTM E1527-13 to identify environmental conditions or other business risk issues that could impact site development, pose a liability to the City, or present a risk to human health or the environment. Depending on the results of the Phase I ESA, a subsequent Phase II ESA may be warranted to sample and test soil, sediment or groundwater for the presence of contamination.

For property currently owned by the City, conducting an ESA prior to redevelopment can help to identify issues that could affect building design or result in construction delays.

For property that will be leased by the City, conducting a baseline environmental assessment may be warranted to establish initial conditions prior to the City occupying the site.
**PRESERVING FUNDING ELIGIBILITY**

Public outdoor park and recreation areas and facilities are eligible for funding assistance through the Oregon Local Government Grant Program (LGGP). Land acquisition projects must be consistent with the outdoor recreation goals and objectives contained in the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) or the recreation elements of local comprehensive plans and local master plans. Acquisition of land and waters for public outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including new areas or additions to existing parks, forests, wildlife areas, open spaces and other similar areas dedicated to outdoor recreation are eligible for assistance through the LGGP. To be eligible in the LGGP, the acquisition procedures set forth by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) should be closely followed. The grant funding program requires a percent match based on the population size of the eligible jurisdiction.

**DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES**

With planned park upgrades and the potential for development of park acquisitions, Monmouth would benefit from park design and facility standards that help unify the system's amenities, operations and maintenance going into the future. Standards can begin with the adoption of typical bench details and expand to incorporate graphic sign styles, materials, colors and specific site furnishings. With the desire for Monmouth to create a unifying identity and enhance park maintenance efficiencies, guidelines for park standards should be planned, endorsed and implemented.

If the City should annex its urban reserve area, the acquisition and development of additional parks will be necessary. There may be opportunities to partner with residential development projects for providing new parks to be dedicated to the City upon completion. The establishment of park design and development standards with predetermined requirements for consistency and quality of site amenities would ensure that new parks could readily fit within on-going park operations and maintenance.

All newly developed parks and trails shall adhere to the Final Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas as set forth by the United States Access Board.

**Design Standards for Parks**

Public park space should be clearly identifiable and provide a safe and secure environment for outdoor recreation and enjoyment. To help communicate the identity, amenities and uses within the park, some unified design standards should be applied. These standards are intended to help with public access, communication of safety and appropriate behaviors, and efficiency in operations and maintenance without creating a park system of identical “cloned” urban parks. Standardizing the designs for park signage, benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, lighting, bollards, irrigation systems and fencing can
allow for easier and less expensive procurement, installation, maintenance and replacement. The visual character of unified park amenities can quickly convey to the park visitor that the space is part of an overall system of public spaces where they are welcome.

While sharing standard site furnishings and signage styles helps unify the system identity, each individual park should have its own unique character. The shape and size of the land, the layout of circulation and location of key features, the styles, types and colors of play equipment, the architecture of restrooms, picnic and other park structures should be specific to that park. Even though each park contains some standardized site furnishings, each park site master plan design should strive to create a sense of place that highlights the character of that park in its local context and for its primary purpose (such as passive park with natural area or active sports-oriented facility).

The following tables highlight the range and considerations of various amenities that may be provided within urban parks (community, neighborhood and mini parks) and can provide guidance for negotiating facility development opportunities in situations when private entities propose park development in-lieu of payment or for other, alternative arrangements, such as density bonuses.

Figure F1. Minimum Site Design Considerations for Mini Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Considerations - where feasible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>• Minimum 2,000 sq.ft. play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Play equipment should be age-specific targeting pre-school and elementary school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Playground should be ADA-compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Access</td>
<td>• ADA compliant surfacing for barrier-free access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>• Use standard ADA compliant picnic table style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>• Provide ADA-compliant standard fixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>• Use standard ADA compliant bench style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Area</td>
<td>• Open play space with sun exposure; 800-1,000 sq.ft. minimum size; irrigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>• Provide shade for portion of playground area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide tree canopy for &gt;40% of park space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Racks</td>
<td>• Accommodate 2-bike minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Receptacles &amp; Dog Waste Disposal Stations</td>
<td>• Minimum of 1 located at entry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure F2. Minimum Site Design Considerations for Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Considerations - where feasible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Playground          | - Minimum of 4,000 sq.ft. play area  
                      | - Equipment should be suitable for and developmentally-appropriate for toddlers and elementary school-aged children  
                      | - Playground should be ADA Accessible and play equipment should be ADA Compliant                                                                                     |
| Loop Walking Path   | - Minimum 8' wide  
                      | - ADA-compliant surface to accessible elements (benches, tables, play area)  
                      | - Pathway slope not to exceed 5% grade or no more than 8% for more than 30 lineal feet without switchbacks or railings |
| Picnic Tables       | - Minimum of 2, Use standard ADA compliant picnic table style                                                                                                   |
| Drinking Fountain   | - Provide ADA-compliant standard fixture                                                                                                                      |
| Benches             | - Minimum of 2, Use standard ADA compliant bench style                                                                                                          |
| Open Turf Area      | - Provide at least 15% of total lawn area with irrigation, preferably adjacent to the play area                                                                |
| Trees & Landscaping | - Provide shade for portion of playground area  
                      | - New trees and shrubs should be irrigated for a minimum of 2 years until established                                                                             |
| Bicycle Racks       | - Minimum of 2, with capacity to serve 4 bikes                                                                                                                 |
| Trash Receptacles & Dog Waste Disposal Stations | - Minimum of 1  

For community parks, any or all of the following outdoor recreation features should be considered in addition to the same amenities provided in neighborhood parks.

### Figure F3. Minimum Site Design Considerations for Community Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Considerations - where feasible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parking             | - Based on types of amenities and their parking quantity requirements  
                      | - Include requisite number of handicapped parking stalls at appropriate locations  
                      | - Consider need for parking provision at multiple access points, where appropriate                                                                               |
| Loop Walking Path   | - Provide a perimeter trail in addition to pathways accessing all major park amenities                                                                 |
| Multiple Access Points | - Provide connectivity to neighborhoods and public rights-of-way                                                                                             |
| Restrooms           | - Provide ADA-compliant standardized design facilities                                                                                                                                                                |
| Picnic Shelter      | - Provide minimum of 1 group picnic shelter                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Sports fields       | - Type and quantity dependent on available space and current public demand for each sport facility                                                                                                                    |
| Sports courts       | - Type and quantity dependent on available space and current public demand for each sport facility                                                                                                                     |
| Tree Canopy         | - Target a 25-45% tree canopy dependent on other park amenities and feasibility                                                                               |
| Open Grass Area     | - Open play area with sun exposure  
                      | - Minimum target of 1 acre                                                                                                                                 |
| Natural Areas       | - Based on existing and restored environmental characteristics                                                                                               |
| Off-leash Dog Area  | - Minimum target of 1 acre  
                      | - Fenced enclosure with double-gate access  
                      | - Provide doggy waste dispenser and trash receptacle at entrance                                                                                                 |
Design Considerations for Other Park Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelter</td>
<td>Minimum of 400 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport field</td>
<td>Practice level for youth soccer, T-ball, baseball and/or softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport court</td>
<td>½ court basketball court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative recreation court</td>
<td>Such as bocce ball, pickleball, horseshoes, lawn bowling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate spot</td>
<td>600 to 1,200 sq.ft. with small ramps, bowls or features for beginners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf course</td>
<td>Minimum 9 baskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprayground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water feature</td>
<td>Such as a passive water-based amenity that provides a visual focal point, i.e. fountains, ponds, or waterfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking fountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Automatic Irrigation, Electricity, Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Standards for Open Space and Natural Areas

Open space and natural areas are primarily intended to conserve places with ecological sensitivity or natural landscape value. Most natural areas have some space where low-impact recreational uses and trails can be accommodated without reducing the environmental integrity of the land or water resource. Since the open space can range from wetlands and riparian corridors to fields and forests, design standards are not applied uniformly across the site. Each natural landscape is treated according to its level of sensitivity, need for conservation/restoration and tolerance for outdoor recreational use. However, where passive recreation opportunities such as trails can be provided, the standardized designs for park benches, picnic tables, signs and other site amenities should be applied.

Design Standards for Special Use Facilities

Consideration should be given in the design and renovation of any special use facility as to how and how much the site and its amenities should be identifiable within the park system through the application of standardized park signage and site furnishings. For example, a future sport field complex could accommodate some of the standardized park benches, picnic tables and signage, but it would also require its own specialized features, such as bleachers, backstops, field lighting, score boards and other equipment, that are unique to the facility. Each master plan design for new facilities should give careful consideration as to how a unique sense of place and identity is conveyed while still communicating that the facility is part of a system of outdoor recreation accommodation provided by the City of Monmouth.
Design Standards for Trails

A successful trail system is integrated with other transportation alternatives to include a range of trail, sidewalk, bike path and connection opportunities designed to the human scale. The typical recreational trail hierarchy is aligned from regional shared-use trails to local neighborhood paths and park trails. Trail systems can also incorporate specially designated trails for single track mountain biking, primitive hiking and equestrian uses.

Designing the actual physical trail starts with overall purpose of the trail, connecting travelers from one location to another (point A to point B) or through a particular environment (loop trail through a park). With a clear purpose for the trail, an appropriate alignment can then be determined to help provide the desired outdoor recreation experience or transportation value. For example, regional multi-use shared trails should be designed to a minimum width of 10 feet. In expanding urban centers, providing a 16-foot trail width can help accommodate significant bike and pedestrian use as the community grows and linkages to public transit enable increased trail usage. The most heavily used urban trails benefit from the installation of permanent pavement to withstand heavy traffic in a variety of weather conditions.

It should be noted that changes in transportation engineering and trail construction methods may warrant the need to update trail design standards over time, which are currently part of Monmouth's Engineering Design Manual. Trail widths and surfacing types will vary across the trail hierarchy. Site furnishings along the trail are one method for standardizing trails as part of the outdoor recreation system provided by Monmouth. The same benches, picnic tables, bollards and other site furnishings used throughout Monmouth’s park system could be installed along its trails to help unify the sense of place, reduce procurement costs and simplify maintenance.

The unifying standard for Monmouth’s trail system can be visually expressed through a designed wayfinding plan. Linked with the graphic character for Dry Canyon and park system wayfinding, the trail signage should provide identification, direction, destination, travel information and safety messaging, while clearly reinforcing Monmouth’s sense of place.

Trails should be constructed according to City specifications. It is recommended that trail layout and surfacing materials be approved by the City and meet the following general requirements:

- Trail width should be a minimum of 8 feet wide
- Surfacing should be appropriate to the location; paved asphalt or concrete is recommended for upland areas, and wood chip, crusher waste or boardwalks are appropriate in lowland, wet or sensitive areas (City codes shall apply)
- Hard-surfaced trails should comply with ADAAG guidelines for slope and cross-slope; soft-surfaced trails should include properly placed and designed water bars or other surface water management techniques to minimize run-off and erosion.
- Entry signage should be provided at trailheads or access points, and boundary signage should be placed, as appropriate, to demarcate sensitive edges or private property boundaries.
- Trash receptacles should be provided at trailheads.
CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (CPTED)

The inventory assessment highlighted an opportunity to consider incorporating crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles to enhance park and trail safety and facilitate the monitoring of park uses and behaviors. CPTED applies four principles that are used to deter criminal behavior in outdoor environments:

- Natural surveillance
- Natural access control
- Territorial reinforcement
- Maintenance

CPTED natural surveillance ("see and be seen") asserts that sight lines for better visibility can deter undesirable behavior and increase the perceptions of safety and comfort by park patrons. Lowering understory vegetation or raising lower tree branches through intentional vegetation management can provide more clear lines of sight in and around trails and other areas of use. Providing clear visibility and reducing blind corners can also improve safety by limiting conflicts between different users (e.g. runners, cyclists, dog walkers), where unanticipated encounters may result in crashes or entanglements.

Natural access control in park design is often very subtle. Controlling where vehicles enter and exit park facilities through designed barriers, bollards, boulders, and post and cable fencing can protect park users and minimize park property damage from misguided vehicular traffic. Walkways, lighting, fencing and landscaping provide explicit direction for park users. The flow of users through a park will help decrease the opportunity for crime and improve clarity for the intended park behaviors.

Territorial reinforcement comes through clear demarcation of boundaries. For public parks, those boundaries between public and private lands, safe and unsafe areas, and special use, limited access or reserved sites can be delineated with the appropriate placement of fencing, signs, landscaping or other physical or visual design techniques.

Finally, clearly visible, high-quality maintenance is an important element of CPTED, as well as general public safety. CPTED recognizes the “broken window” theory where neglected and poorly maintained amenities are more attractive targets for vandalism or other criminal activity. Deferred maintenance can also result in park amenities that put users at risk. Broken pavement, worn decking, uneven playing fields and missing play safety surfacing can create injuries. Overall attention to CPTED principles can help ensure safer public park environments.
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS STANDARDS

General Standards

Grounds
- Grounds are mowed and trimmed.
- Park is free of litter, debris and hazards.

Walkways & Paths
- Walkways have a uniform surface and are level with the ground and free of trip hazards.
- Walkways are free of litter and debris.
- Walkways have unobstructed accessibility, i.e. free from low and protruding limbs, guide wires, etc.
- Walkways are neatly edged.
- Walkways are clear of weeds and grass growth in cracks and expansion joints.

Signage
- Park identification signs are secure and properly installed in a noticeable location.
- Handicap parking signs (as applicable) are secure, visible and to city and state standards.
- Signs are clean, painted and free of protrusions.

Ornamental Plants & Landscaping
- Plants are healthy.
- Plant beds are free of litter, debris, and weeds.
- Plant selection is appropriate for season and area usage.

Playgrounds

Play Equipment
- Play equipment and surrounding play areas meet ASTM and National Playground Safety Institute standards.
- Play equipment and hardware is intact, and safety inspections are conducted regularly.
- Play equipment is free of graffiti.
- Age appropriateness for the play equipment is noted with proper signage.
- Shade structure is secure and free from tears, if applicable.

Surfacing
- Fall surface is clean, level and free of litter and debris.
- Fall surface meets ASTM and National Playground Safety Institute standards.
- Fall surface is well drained.
Rubber cushion surfaces are free of holes and tears.
Rubber cushion surfaces are secure to the base material and curbing.

Borders
- Playground borders are well defined and intact.
- Playground borders meet ASTM and National Playground Safety Institute standards.

Decks
- Planks are intact, smooth, structurally sound, free of splinters and have no cracks greater than ¼ inch.
- Nails, bolts or screws are flush with the surface.
- Planks are level with no excessive warping.

Fixtures

Benches
- Slats are smooth and structurally sound.
- Hardware is intact and structurally sound.
- Nails, bolts or screws are flush with the surface.
- Seats and backing are smooth with no protrusions and have no exposed sharp edges or pointed corners.

Tables
- Tables are clean, free of rust, mildew and graffiti.
- Table hardware is intact.
- Table frames are intact and slats are properly secured.
- Table seats and tops are smooth with no protrusions and have no exposed sharp edges or pointed corners.

Trash Receptacles
- Receptacles are clean; Area around trash receptacles is clean and free of trash and debris.
- Wood receptacles are painted and free of damage or missing parts; hardware for wood receptacles is intact.
- Concrete receptacles are intact and free of cracks or damage.

Sport Courts

Surfacing
- Surface is smooth, level and well drained with no standing water.
- Surface is free of large cracks, holes and trip hazards.
- Surface is painted and striped as per court specifications.
- Worn painted surfaces do not exceed 20% of total court surface.
- Surface is free of litter, debris, gravel and graffiti.
Goals and Backboards
- Goals and backboards are level with hardware intact and painted as appropriate.
- Nylon nets are properly hung and are not torn or tattered.
- Support poles are secure in the ground and straight.

Restrooms
- Restrooms are clean, sanitary and properly stocked with paper products.
- Lights and ventilation systems are operational.
- Toilets, water faucets, stall doors and hand air dryers are operational.
- Restrooms are free of graffiti.
- Restroom doors are properly marked according to gender.
- Restrooms have clean trash receptacles.
- Restroom doors and locks are operational.
- Restrooms are in compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES
Consultant’s Guide to Park Design and Development; Park and Recreation Department, City of San Diego, CA

Design Standards for Park and Trail Development (Specifications); Park and Recreation Department, City of Bellingham, WA

Accessible Recreation Facilities Guidelines - Access Board

Handbook for Public Playground Safety - National Product Safety Commission