



# PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

## MEETING SUMMARY

PROJECT: Spring Garden Park PAC #2  
DATE: August 24, 2015  
TIME: 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM  
LOCATION: Fire Station #18, 8720 SW 30<sup>th</sup> Ave.

### Meeting Goals:

- Identify priorities from Community Gathering #1
- Provide feedback and direction for design based on community input
- Make recommendations on conceptual design options

**Attendees:** Michael Barton, Sara Childers, Terri Preeg Riggsby, Ray O'Dell, Candy Wells, Kathy Fong-Stephens, Lee Braymen-Cleary, Brian Stevenson, Ken Klein, Lori Howell, Hannah Davidson, Hibah Khan, Humaira Khan, Ihsaan Mohamed, Carole Schmidt-Davis. **Absent:** Amelia Howell

**Staff:** Elise Scolnick, Community Engagement Coordinator, PP&R, Travis Ruybal, Landscape Architect / Project Manager, PP&R, Terri Davis, PP&R Zone Manager

**Guests:** Najma Mohamed

### I. Introductions and Check In

- a. Elise Scolnick, Community Engagement Coordinator, welcomed new PAC members Humaira Khan, Hibah Khan and Ihsaan Mohamed. The group introduced themselves and the facilitator reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting.

### II. Review of Community Gathering Event #1

- a. Overview of Comment Form Results: The facilitator gave a report on the results of the National Night Out/Community Gathering #1 event that took place on August 4, 2015 at Spring Garden Park. She reviewed the most relevant findings in the [Summary of Comment Forms Received](#). There had been 77 comment forms received. Significance was considered high at 60% or greater for responses.
- b. Goals & Element Review Based on Comments: The Master Plan Goals were reviewed by the PAC and considered for amendment, based upon the results of the Community Gathering comment results. **The PAC unanimously agreed to add “teens” to the**

#### Administration

1120 S.W. 5th Ave., Suite 1302  
Portland, OR 97204  
Tel: (503) 823-7529 Fax: (503) 823-6007

PortlandParks.org  
Amanda Fritz, Commissioner  
Mike Abbaté, Director

**goal addressing educational resources. The new goal will read: “Use the park as an educational resource for children, teens and adults.”**

- c. The PAC agreed that it should remain a neighborhood park and not attract people from outside the neighborhood.

**III. Recommendations for Conceptual Design Options:**

Travis Ruybal, gave a presentation of two options for design of Spring Garden Park based on the Master Plan and public input received from the PAC and the public at the August 4<sup>th</sup> gathering. He showed maps of the site and presented options for location of amenities. Each option was reviewed by the PAC and comments on each are listed below.

Option A-More developed concept	Option B-More Master Plan concept
Q. How do we limit skateboards on the paved walkways?	Soft surface paths added <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance concerns</li> <li>• Quiet gardens with tables, benches</li> </ul>
Q. Is dog off-leash area (DOLA) not an option? A. It is an option.	Q. What about irrigation? A. The park will be irrigated.
Q. 2x - Could there be a barrier for the play area? A. Possibly yes.  Issue is fencing off dogs or kids. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fencing for autistic children would help it be more inclusive.</li> <li>• Educate dog owners on the dog’s impacts to others</li> <li>• Concern expressed about the location of the DOLA entrance-if people bring dogs from the Dolph Ct. entry, dogs would have to be on-leash until they got to the DOLA entrance gate.</li> <li>• Q. Can the PAC get data on how DOLA’s are currently used? A. ½ acre or more is the best size.</li> </ul>	Sledding is maintained  Lighting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff indicated that low level lighting is problematic as there has been vandalism</li> <li>• Is there liability if not lighted?</li> <li>• There are impacts on wildlife if the park is lighted.</li> </ul> <p><b>The PAC consensus recommendation was that there should be no lights in the park.</b></p>
The Option A proposed DOLA location would preclude sledding during the winter as it is fenced off on the hillside.	This option has a softer, more natural feel.
Concern about the effect of dog area on the daylighted creek area.	Plantings provide an exploratory benefit. Keep some wild area on the perimeter.
Q. What are the criteria for dog areas? A. Staff will provide that to the PAC for next meeting.	Keep the lupine field.

Q. Why wasn't a DOLA considered initially with the original Master Plan? A. Per FSGP*, It wasn't considered due to ecological impacts, size of the park and a desire of the community to not have the park as a destination for the larger community.	Fence the access to SW Dolph Ct. Staff: We could add a low retaining wall with fencing on top.
Have a place for dog owners to sit while dogs play.	Merge the two options: include the shelter and field in Option A with Option B.
	Suggestion to put the top of Option A and the bottom of Option B together for new option
The whole park should be welcoming to all.	Erosion is taking place already. Prevent more.
Maintain access to nature	Like the peace and quiet
In the stairway/trail to SW 35 <sup>th</sup> , use railroad ties or other natural materials. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern of staff and some PAC members that wood presents a maintenance issue and is slippery when wet.</li> </ul>	Keep open grass space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of cross paths is an issue</li> <li>Safety concern</li> </ul>
	Provide a "draw" to the nature area.
Q. What will the shelter/picnic area look like? A. It would be an open air (roof & posts) structure with 6' x 12' picnic tables	DOLA is a major issue to be resolved by the PAC
Periphery landscaping is good. No trees on the interior desired.	Get willow artist Patrick Dougherty to provide art work for park.

General comments:

- Design for teens.
  - No skate park, maybe a Frisbee golf game, soccer, wall ball, basketball.
  - Performance space
  - Sports
- What about seniors?

**IV. Plan for Next Open House/Community Gathering**

The PAC made some recommendations for the upcoming open house/community gathering to be held September 29<sup>th</sup> at Multnomah Arts Center.

Format: Open house

- Hold facilitated conversations
- Use large projected images of the design options
- Collectively talk about the options
- Use a loudspeaker system so the event is accessible to hearing-challenged folks

- Emphasize that there is funding available to develop the park
- Identify key actions that are needed and have been done
- Remind people they are stakeholders
- Hold a virtual open house online or at least post video
- The following PAC members volunteered to review updated flyer: Michael, Candy, Hannah, Lori and Terri Preeg-Riggsby. Elise will send them updated flyer language to review.

**V. Meeting Review:** At the end of the meeting PAC members were asked to share what they most appreciated about the meeting. Comments: We still need to address teens more; felt like there has been accomplishment on the project; good vision presented.

**Next Meeting:** Next PAC meeting is **Thursday, September 17, 2015 [5:30-7:30pm]** at **Multnomah Arts Center, Room 7.** **THIS IS A CHANGE OF LOCATION FROM YOUR SCHEDULE.**

\* Friends of Spring Garden Park

## Appendix

### Appendix D: Siting Criteria

There were many challenges in siting the off-leash areas. While the goal was to meet all the criteria listed below, in most parks, ideal spaces for off-leash use were simply not available. In some parks, there is little available flat land at all. In most parks, flat land is almost always in use for playgrounds, sports fields, or picnic areas. Some potential sites were simply too wet or too close to busy streets. With limited available space, close proximity to other activity areas could not be avoided in some cases.

#### *1999 Citizen Task Force Criteria Recommendations*

- Minimum of 5,000 square feet
- Avoid affecting fish & wildlife habitat
- Avoid risk to water quality
- Relatively level
- Minimal impact on adjacent residential areas
- Away from school playgrounds
- Close to parking
- Distributed throughout the city

#### *Specific Sites Recommended by Neighborhood Coalitions:*

In 2001 PP&R requested help from the Neighborhood Coalitions. In 2002-2003, recommendations for Off-Leash sites were received from four of the Coalitions. Some Coalitions included additional criteria as well as recommendations for specific sites. The parks recommended or discussed in the Coalition reports, as well as their criteria, were the starting point for siting evaluation.

#### East Portland Neighborhoods:

East Holladay Park (#1 recommendation. Fencing and parking would be required.)

Other possibilities:

- Parkrose High School (School District Property)
- Cherry Park (recommended as fenced site)
- Parklane Park (consider when Master Plan is undertaken)

Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

1. Hillsdale Park
2. Willamette Park
3. Duniway Park
4. Gabriel Park – alternative or additional site

Southeast Uplift

1. Establish one-year trial Off-Leash Areas in Creston, Berrydale, Brentwood and one year trial off-leash hours in most parks in inner southeast.
2. Long-term creation of separate permanent off-leash areas.

CNN (these are not in priority order)

1. Former landfill site at SE 82nd and Siskiyou. (Madison South)
2. Identify areas in all parks. (Roseway)
3. Sacajawea Park is too small but if expanded could potentially include an off leash area. (Cully)

*Additional PP&R Staff Considerations:*

- Slopes and heavy tree canopy should be avoided whenever possible.
- Areas should be dry and irrigated rather than wet.
- Playgrounds should be away from dogs.
- Park's main circulation should be outside off-leash areas.
- Avoid siting OLA adjacent to streets with heavy traffic.
- Consider areas with current high dog off-leash use.







