

AGENDA

**Park and Recreation Commission
Meeting
December 11, 1989
City Hall-Council Chambers
7:00 P.M.**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
- III. Reports & Correspondence
After School Recreation**
- IV. Discussion Items**
 - (a) Drug Use/Life Abuse**
 - (b) Park District Options**
- V. Adjourned**

CITY OF MILWAUKIE



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

THRU: Dan Bartlett, City Manager

FROM: Sandra Miller, Assistant to the City Manager
Don Robertson, Parks and Recreation Coordinator

Don
Sandra Miller
DR

DATE: November 30, 1989

SUBJ: After School Recreation Proposal

Action Requested

Approve the proposed After School Recreation Proposal to begin January, 1990.

Proposal

Jointly sponsor an after school recreation program at Ardenwald School and/or Seth Lewelling School. The program will operate from January through June. The cost of the program will be approximately \$8,300. This will be offset with a grant and user fees. Donations will be solicited to fund any youth unable to meet the fees.

Background

Every year hundreds of unsupervised, grade school aged children are frightened, injured or even killed because they are left unsupervised after school. Children as young as 5 years old come home after school, lock the doors, turn on the TV and wait for Mom or Dad to get home.

According to Mary Louise McClintock, Child Care Coordinator for the State of Oregon, "Only 7% of current households consist of a working Dad, stay home Mom and Kids. In Oregon, 45% of the workforce is made up of women, 75% of mothers of school age children work outside the home."

On July 13, 1988, seventy (70) people representing all aspects of the Milwaukie community met to formulate Milwaukie's portion of the County report submitted to the Governor on the Children's Agenda. Through a series of small group discussions combined with the large group, a list of 10 prioritized points were prepared in three topics: Community, Education, and Family. The first priority listed was: Affordable, accessible, drug-free year around

2

Memo to Mayor and City Council
Re: After School Proposal
November 30, 1989
Page Two

recreational activities for all ages to include an indoor pool. The seventh priority was: Affordable, accessible child care for infants through school ages.

Over the past six months, I have investigated several after school recreation programs. Most notable of which is the joint program offered by the City of Medford and the Medford school district. I have discussed a similar program extensively with Laird Prouty, Community Services Supervisor, of North Clackamas School District 12, and together we have created a program which is designed to operate on a self-supporting basis. Laird and I have discussed the program with the Principals of Ardenwald and Seth Lewelling schools and received enthusiastic support from both.

The following is an overview of the proposal:

Program Objective

To provide a safe atmosphere with wholesome activities for youth grades K-6. The program will offer supervised activities including active and passive games, arts & crafts, and homework assistance.

Program Description

The after school activity program is a safe and supervised program of games, crafts, study time, and snacks for elementary school students. It is a cooperative venture between the City of Milwaukie and North Clackamas School District and is defined in a written agreement that is renewable on an annual basis. It will operate Monday through Friday, when school is in session. Hours are 1:45 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. at Lewelling or 2:45 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. at Ardenwald.

Community Involvement

Parents from both schools will be involved in program development. A series of meetings is planned at each school to get parents' ideas about whether a need exists for an after school program and how it should be put together.

Staffing

Each program will be staffed by a qualified Recreation Leader and Recreation Assistants. Recreation leaders and assistants will be employees of the City Parks and Recreation Division. Community Education staff and school principals will be actively involved in staff selection and ongoing program evaluation. Staff/student ratio will be no greater than 1:10. Students in the Skills Center's Child Development cluster will be recruited to work as volunteer assistants.

Memo to Mayor and City Council
Re: After School Proposal
November 30, 1989
Page Three

Student Safety

Leaders and assistants will be subject to background and security checks. Students will remain on school grounds and will only be released to parent/guardian. Program, facility and staffing arrangements will be such that leaders are never alone with any particular student. Red Cross Standard First Aid Certification or an acceptable equivalent will be required. The City of Milwaukie will accept liability for the program itself and the actions and judgment of staff while the District assumes the liability for its own facilities.

Fees

Rates will be \$4.50 per day for kindergarten and primary students and \$3.50 per day for 4th through 6th graders. The difference in fee is based on the lesser number of hours in the program for the 4th through 6th graders.

All fees will be required to be paid in advance. Monthly registration fees will be paid at City Hall. Drop-in fees will be collected at the beginning of each session and accepted at that time by the leaders.

The school PTA and local service clubs will be approached to provide a limited number of partial scholarships.

Facilities

Ardenwald: cafeteria and gymnasium, and for Lewelling: Room 18 and gymnasium.

Budget

The anticipated expenditures for this program is \$8,270 per facility to operate from January through the end of school. A total of 109 days expenditures are broken down as follows:

Labor	\$5,000
Snacks	2,180
Materials	1,090
<hr/>	
Total:	\$8,270 or \$76 per day of operation

4
Memo to Mayor and City Council
Re: After School Proposal
November 30, 1989
Page 4

Because this is a pilot program, revenue projections are very difficult. Based on a 50% mix of primary and elementary students with an average of 20 students per day, the projected daily revenue would be \$80.

Days of operation 109
Revenue per day \$ 80

Total: \$8,720 estimated total revenue

Again, because this is a pilot program for this area, indications are that it will take a couple of months to establish a clientele. The result will be a financial loss in the first month or two. After that, the program should be able to sustain itself. The City will apply for a grant upon approval of the program to help offset the initial loss.

The School District's financial contribution involves the waiver of all fees, donation of utilities, custodial services, and support.

Grant

Available through the State Children's Services is a small grant designed to offset start-up costs for these types of programs. Grant limitations are up to \$500 to be used for initial equipment purchases. Normally, these grants are available in the Fall. However, there is an occasional mid-year grant for which we would petition.

Process

We will be requesting a supplemental budget to recognize the revenues and approve the expenditures for operations of this program. A successful grant coupled with user fees will be used to compensate for the expense.

Ref: DR-385

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURES

ALTERNATIVE #1: TOTAL CITY INVOLVEMENT

Under this alternative, the cities in the area would be included in the proposed parks and recreation service district. The service district would take over existing city parks, maintaining and operating them. The district would also develop new parks and recreational programs in both the cities and the unincorporated area. Once single tax rate would apply to all residents of the North Clackamas Area.

ALTERNATIVE #2: TOTAL CITY INVOLVEMENT, CITIES RETAIN PARKS DEEDS

This alternative is exactly the same as alternative #1 except that the cities would retain the deeds to their respective parks. This would provide the cities with a greater say in the development and improvement of their existing parks.

ALTERNATIVE #3: REBATE MODEL

This alternative is designed to enable the cities to participate in the provision of larger, regional facilities for the area, while still retaining control of their local, neighborhood parks. This model is similar to that currently used for libraries in the County. The same tax rate would be charged to all residents of the North Clackamas area for the development and maintenance of local and regional parks facilities. A portion of the tax revenues, however, would be rebated to each of the cities for the maintenance and development of neighborhood parks within city boundaries. The service district would provide regional facilities for the entire area and neighborhood parks for the unincorporated area. A formula to determine the amount of the annual parks rebate would have to be jointly determined by the Board of County Commissioners and the City Councils.

ALTERNATIVE #4: DIFFERENTIAL TAXATION

This alternative also enables the cities to participate in the provision of larger, regional facilities for the area, while still retaining control of their local, neighborhood parks. In this case, two different tax rates would be charged to residents of the cities and residents of the unincorporated areas. The tax rate to city residents would apply solely to the construction and maintenance of regional facilities. The tax rate to unincorporated area resident would apply to both regional facilities and neighborhood parks. The cities would continue to be responsible for the provision of neighborhood parks within their own boundaries.

ALTERNATIVE #5: NO CITY INVOLVEMENT

Under this alternative, the cities would play no role in the proposed parks and recreation district. The service district would collect taxes only from residents of the unincorporated areas and supply only these areas with facilities. City residents choosing to use these facilities would have to pay an "out of district user fee" which is generally double the fee charged to residents within the district.

ALTERNATIVE #1: TOTAL CITY INVOLVEMENT

<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>CITY PERSPECTIVE</u>	<u>COUNTY PERSPECTIVE</u>
DIRECT REPRESENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative impact- City would have representation on an advisory board	n/a
EFFICIENCY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive impact: most efficient option in terms of service provision, administration & maintenance- However, will have to deal with a # of jurisdictions for planning/coordination	
TECHNOLOGICAL FACTORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Larger tax base enables the use of more sophisticated technology (eg. indoor pool)	
LEVEL OF SERVICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive impact: allows for development of more regional and neighborhood facilities- Reduced crowding, overuse of existing facilities- Allows for a larger programming staff	
COST	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Eliminates parks burden on city general fund (posit.)- No need for residents to pay high user fees- Additional tax rate for residents (neg.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More tax revenues are available or a lower tax rate can be used to fund same facilities.
COMMUNITY IDENTITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Uncertain impacts- Improved parks facilities will improve city image- City may not get credit for providing those facilities.	n/a
LARGER COMMUNITY BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: provides a better parks system for all residents	
RESPONSIVENESS TO LARGER COMMUNITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative: reduced because district will have a broader constituency	n/a
VOTER APPEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Uncertain- Perception of double taxation by residents. (neg)- Perception that city is subsidizing unincorporated areas (neg)- Perception that burden is being spread over entire area (posit)- May depend on location of facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: clean and easy for voters to understand- Possibility, however that negative city votes could kill dis
EQUITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: cities no longer subsidizing unincorporated- Less neighborhood parks may be built in cities than unincorp. area during early years	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More equitable balance between those paying for and using facilities
MISCELLANEOUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No annexation problems arise with this structure- This option would be preferred by the boundary commission	

ALTERNATIVE #2: TOTAL CITY INVOLVEMENT, WITH DEED RESTRICTIONS

<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>CITY PERSPECTIVE</u>	<u>COUNTY PERSPECTIVE</u>
DIRECT REPRESENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: City retains control over development of local facil.- City would have representation on advisory board	Service district more limited in its ability to develop city facil.
EFFICIENCY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1- More negotiations between city and service dist will be necessary to plan for development of existing city parks	
TECHNOLOGICAL FACTORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
LEVEL OF SERVICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
COST	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
COMMUNITY IDENTITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
LARGER COMMUNITY BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
RESPONSIVENESS TO LARGER COMMUNITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- City can continue to respond to resid. with regards to design and devpt. of local parks	
VOTER APPEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
EQUITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	
MISCELLANEOUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1	

ALTERNATIVE #3: REBATE MODEL

<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>CITY PERSPECTIVE</u>	<u>COUNTY PERSPECTIVE</u>
DIRECT REPRESENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No impact- City retains control over local facilities	n/a
EFFICIENCY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative impact: complicated bookkeeping result from use of a rebate formula- Commissioners must play a strict oversight role, auditing books- Agency raising taxes does not have control over service delivery creating greater inefficiencies- Administrative headaches will result in cases of annexation- Difficult to coordinate multiple jurisdictions for long term planning	
TECHNOLOGICAL FACTORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Larger tax base enables the use of more sophisticated technology for regional facilities	
LEVEL OF SERVICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: improved regional facilities- Neighborhood facilities level of service will depend on level of rebate and use of existing parks funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #
COST	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1- May free up monies for the general fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #
COMMUNITY IDENTITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mixed- Cities retain local control over parks- Residents may not be clear on who is doing what	n/a
LARGER COMMUNITY BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mixed: shares the burden for regional facilities among all residents in the area- Reduces the heavy use of city facilities by the unincorporated areas- Muddies the waters by creating a complex system with poorly defined accountability	
RESPONSIVENESS TO LARGER COMMUNITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Unclear: Although city retains control, community may not perceive this to be the case	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative: service district can receive blame for local problems, but cannot act to solve them
VOTER APPEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Perception of double taxation unless city commits to allocating existing parks \$\$\$- Not clear whether voters support or oppose city control of parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative: confusing concept for voters
EQUITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: cities no longer subsidizing unincorporated area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More equitable balance between those paying for and using facilities
MISCELLANEOUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- This option seems to be preferred by Gladstone	

ALTERNATIVE #4: DIFFERENTIAL TAXATION

CRITERIA	CITY PERSPECTIVE	COUNTY PERSPECTIVE
DIRECT REPRESENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No impact- City retains control over local parks	n/a
EFFICIENCY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Relative easy to administer- Efficient provision of regional facilities but neighborhood parks are still under many jurisdiction- Administrative headaches will result in cases of annexation	
TECHNOLOGICAL FACTORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Larger tax base enables the use of more sophisticated technology for regional facilities	
LEVEL OF SERVICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: improved regional facilities- Neighborhood facilities level of service remains the same	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same level of regional facilities but may be less funds available for neighborhood park
COST	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #1- May free up monies for the general fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Same as alternative #
COMMUNITY IDENTITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mixed- Cities retain local control over parks- Residents may not be clear on who is doing what	n/a
LARGER COMMUNITY BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mixed: shares the burden for regional facilities among all residents in the area- Reduces the heavy use of city facilities by the unincorporated areas- Muddies the waters by creating a complex system	
RESPONSIVENESS TO LARGER COMMUNITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Unclear: Although city retains control, community may not perceive this to be the case	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative: service district can receive blame for local problems, but cannot act to solve them
VOTER APPEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No perception of double taxation- Not clear whether voters support or oppose city control of parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Negative: confusing concept for voters- Focuses attention on tax differentials rather than the need for parks
EQUITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive: cities no longer subsidizing unincorporated area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More equitable balance between those paying for and using facilities
MISCELLANEOUS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- This option has been discussed, but never used in the county. Its adoption could establish a precedent for other services in the County	

ALTERNATIVE #5: NO CITY INVOLVEMENT

CRITERIA	CITY PERSPECTIVE	COUNTY PERSPECTIVE
DIRECT REPRESENTATION	- No Impact: city retains control over development of local facil.	n/a
EFFICIENCY	- No Impact	- Slightly less efficient
TECHNOLOGICAL FACTORS	- Smaller tax base suggests that less sophisticated technology can be used	
LEVEL OF SERVICE	- No Impact - Greater negative perception of existing parks due to comparisons with larger district - Increased pressures to expand	- Fewer regional facilities due to smaller tax base - More out of district users
COST	- No impact on city taxpayer - Higher user fees for residents desiring to use regional facilities	- Less tax revenues available or a higher tax rate necessary to support same regional facil. - More user fees revenues due to large # of out of district users
COMMUNITY IDENTITY	- Uncertain - Reinforces the separateness of the city (good? bad?)	n/a
LARGER COMMUNITY BENEFITS	- Negative Impact: non-involvement is divisive	
RESPONSIVENESS TO LARGER COMMUNITY	- No impact: cities continue to have same level of responsiveness - Cities may not have sufficient resources to keep up with increased community desires	
VOTER APPEAL	- n/a	- Positive impact: clear cut options placed before voters - No risk of negative city votes hurting the district - Higher tax rate or a scaled-back product may have less voter appeal
EQUITY	- Cities will be subsidizing unincorporated areas less than in the past - Higher user fees will hurt lower income groups	- District will be subsidizing cities with those facilities that do not charge fees

MISCELLANEOUS