



**SPRING GARDEN PUBLIC MEETING AND SURVEY
ON GATHERING SPACE OPTIONS
SUMMARY**

October 21, 2016

Spring Garden Park Public Meeting #5 Summary (pages 4-5)
September 20, 2016
5:30 PM to 7:30 PM
Spring Garden Park

Survey Results (page 3)
Closed survey on October 5, 2016

1. Outreach

Outreach for this event included a mass email blast to the Project Advisory Committee, database mailing list, and all parties listed in the Public Involvement Plan. These mass notification emails were sent 5 weeks before the meeting, two weeks before the meeting and a couple of days before the meeting. Six signs were posted within the surrounding neighborhood: one on the Dolph Ct. park entrance, one at the Spring Garden St. entrance, two on each frontage of SW 30th and Dolph Ct. at Fire Station #18, and one at the corner of SW 30th and SW Barbur. Southwest Neighborhood Inc. Friends of Spring Garden posted a flyer on their Facebook page. Members of the PAC forwarded the email flyer to their neighborhood mailing lists. Portland Parks & Recreation volunteers leafleted residences, including apartment buildings, within a ¼ mile radius of the park with 550 flyers. Our meeting flyer was also posted on the SWNI Newsletter of their September issue.

2. Meeting Overview

The goal of this meeting was to give the public an opportunity to view and think through the pros and cons of each gathering space design options.

About 100 people attended the Community Gathering. 67 people signed in on the IPAD. A few people choose not to sign in on the IPAD. A petition “to remove the construction of a pervious, permanent cement stage with electrical service from the proposed plans for Spring Garden Park” with about 120 signatures was submitted to the Commissioner.

We hired facilitator Steve Faust from Cogan Owens and Greene to manage the discussion. Commissioner Fritz did a quick welcome to the public. Our Project Manager, Travis Ruybal presented the three gathering space design options. Community members were given time to discuss the pros and cons of each design options and each table had an opportunity to report back. Hun and Elizabeth scribed as community members reported the results of their discussion. Below is a summary of the report back of the group discussion. Please note that after the discussion, some community members added more comments to the flip chart.



Spring Garden Park Group Discussion Report – at Meeting

Option 1

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On latest plan • Flat area • Dry spot for educational • All around seasonal access • Honors the youth “voice • Better for movies platform would be better for movie • More impervious surface • Social events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage and outlet for electricity make this a end-user park (noise & parking) • Could lead to less peace & quiet • Could be an attractive nuisance • Concrete, falling hazard, lack of nature and social event without concrete

Option 2

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quieter without stage • Less of a draw • Sitting wall for youth and elderly especially • Seating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without pad it will be muddier/less usable • Less possible to do movies etc.... without a pad • No need for seating not by the playground etc. Falling/small kids and skateboarding on it •

Option 3

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More free space to run around • No concrete • Trees/shade • Trees are good for water absorption • Trees boundaries more natural but still a good gathering area • Playground for little kids • Shade in summer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graded/hillier • Swampier • Harder for community to gather • Attractive to dog owners to let dogs off leash • More private –drug use? Questionable behavior



SURVEY RESULTS: Summary of survey which closed October 5, 2016

Survey results from the meeting were also compiled along with results from an online survey. A link to the raw summary results including demographics is portlandoregon.gov/parks/article/595544 and an analysis of the data around the community’s input on Options 1, 2 and 3 is below.

On a scale of 1-5 (1 = not well at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = well, 4 = very well, 5 = completely)—how well do the following design options meet the above goals?

a. Option 1 – concrete pad and seating wall:

Rating	# of responses	# of total responses
1+2	55	53.4%
3	5	4.9%
4+5	43	41.7%
Total	103	100.0%

b. Option 2 – no concrete pad, keeps the seating wall:

Rating	# of responses	# of total responses
1+2	59	57.3%
3	17	16.5%
4+5	27	26.2%
Total	103	100.0%

c. Option 3 – no concrete pad or seating wall, add boulders and trees:

Rating	# of responses	% of total responses
1+2	37	34.9%
3	13	12.3%
4+5	56	52.8%
Total	106	100.0%

Additional details available in survey detail portlandoregon.gov/parks/article/595544.