Poet’s Beach Pilot Project (Summer 2017)

Summary of season and lessons learned (Oct. 2017)
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Introduction and Background

Historically, swimming in the Willamette River has been discouraged due to unsafe water conditions and water quality. Over the years, remediation along the river, and the installation of The Big Pipe to address combined sewer overflows into the river, have lowered contamination levels – thus making the Willamette safe for swimming and other recreational uses during most of the year.

The City of Portland has evaluated potential swimming beaches along the Willamette in Central City. The Central City Potential Swimming Beach Sites Study (2016) examined several Central City locations to ascertain their potential as swimming beach sites, as well as engaged the public to determine interest in river swimming.

In his State of the City address on March 24, 2017, Mayor Ted Wheeler expressed interest in reconnecting people to the Willamette River in downtown Portland. The City’s 2017-2018 Adopted Budget (approved by City Council on May 17, 2017 and passed June 8, 2017) included $158,000 in one-time General Fund discretionary dollars to underwrite swimming and beach access along the Willamette River at Poet’s Beach during the summer of 2017. Funding was intended to provide for safety (lifeguard) services, Park Rangers, and program staff.

Staff from divisions throughout Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) met the challenge to quickly plan, organize, and deliver the Poet’s Beach pilot program to citizens and guests of the City. The Human Access Project (HAP) has long been an advocate and resource for swimming in the river, and was a partner in realizing this pilot project as well. Similarly, the Friends of RiverPlace have significantly supported this project and contributed to positive use of this site.

Poet’s Beach is located on the west side of the Willamette River, north of the Interstate 5 Marquam Bridge, and is part of South Waterfront Park. The program was open from July 12 through September 4, 2017.

This report serves several purposes:

- to document the effort involved in launching and operating this new program;
- to share lessons learned; and
- to provide specific direction for potential future river swimming beaches.
Successful Summer

The primary goal as shared by the Mayor in his State of the City speech was to reconnect the public to the river. With concerns of the past about sewer overflows and other water quality concerns, this program was an effort to highlight the success of the Big Pipe project in improving water quality and to turn the tide of public perception. As a pilot program to help get message out that the river IS safe for swimming, this summer’s effort was considered a success. People did swim, people came to recreate at the river’s edge, and as discussed below in Goal 7, most of those who responded to our intercept surveys (a small subset of those visiting the park) shared that they had fun (98%), and would return (75%).

From a programmatic perspective, PP&R staff were notified of the possibility of a river swimming program in March. The program budget was identified in May, through the Mayor’s Adopted Budget, two months prior to opening of the program. Extensive collaboration internally helped ensure the site was ready, staff were hired and trained, and most partnerships and contracts were in place to support the program’s success.

How Many People Were Swimming?

While Beach Hosts conducted hourly counts of beach visitors, there are limitations to this approach in terms of 100% accuracy (people can be counted more than once if they are present more than one hour, among other methodology challenges). Therefore, in addition to our hourly counts, we are using staff estimates of the number of site visitors, as follows:

- An average of 80 people per day, or about 4400 people visited the site during the approximate 8-week season of staffed beach coverage (8 hours a day). This included those visiting or passing through on the trail above the beach, as well as those on the beach and in the water.

Given that this program’s primary purpose was to promote river swimming, we tracked where people visited, breaking Poet’s Beach into three areas:

- the park (the trail and grassy area above the beach),
- the path and the beach,
- the water, to capture those who were swimming.

Based on hourly staff observations, persons in the water never accounted for more than 15% of the total beach users at any given hour.

- The means there were an estimated 660 swimmers out of the estimated 4,400 total site visitors for the summer, or an average of 12 swimmers / day.
Table 1 below represents the average number of users at each of our three tracking areas throughout the summer. This looks different than the daily estimate above, as counting people hourly can result in the same user being counted multiple times, if they stay longer than an hour. Findings indicate that *people swimming in the water was consistently the lowest used location within the site*, with the average number of users topping out at eight people at any given hour.

![Graph of Table 1](image)

While there is no perfect comparison to this pilot program, it is illustrative to compare data from other programs which have similarities to which Poet’s Beach might aspire:

- **Urban Parks**: Director Park (staffed 10 hours per day) and Holladay Park (staffed 8 hours per day), are both staffed, established urban parks which see respectively 3200 and 1500 people daily on average in the summer.
- **River Swimming**: According to our lifeguard contractors, who also manage river swimming at other locations, average daily attendance at Glen Otto Community Park (Troutdale) is 370 people, and at High Rocks Park (Gladstone) it is 230.
- **PP&R Outdoor Pools**: PP&R’s outdoor swimming programs (not including swim lessons or pool rentals) range from a daily average use of 153 people at Pier Park to a high of 615 at Wilson Pool.

As a reminder, Poet’s Beach had an average of 80 people use the site daily, with an average of 12 people swimming each day during this pilot season for river swimming.
Program Goals and Measuring Success

At the outset of the season, PP&R staff developed goals to help evaluate the success of this pilot program. We also created two data collection tools to document observations and understand the visiting public’s use and perceptions, so we could measure the program’s success. We also hired a staff of Beach Hosts, who were critical to the success of both tools: a visitor intercept survey and Daily Activity Reports (DARs) by Beach Hosts. Altogether this provided important information and they illustrate the overall Poet’s Beach experience.

Important Notes regarding these tools:

- The intercept survey data reflects a small portion of those park visitors (175 survey respondents from an estimated 4,400 park visitors), and those who took the survey were self-selected – that is people could choose to respond or not when staff asked them to take a survey.
- People from some cultures and communities are less likely to take surveys.
- Counts of people in various parts of the site (documented in the DARs) were done hourly. People who stayed longer than an hour, or who overlapped during each hour’s count, could have been counted more than once.
- These survey and observational results do not speak to the experience of those visitors who did not complete the survey.
- Just as importantly, they do not capture the views of people who did not visit the site/program, and sheds no light on why they may not have come.

The established program goals are outlined below, along with an assessment of each.

1. Safety is the program’s top priority

Given the importance of this effort, and PP&R’s primary goal of public safety in all things, this was a critical metric for determining success. Monitoring and soliciting safety concerns by park visitors was also a way to adjust the program as needed. Safety of the swimming and visiting public, as well as staff, were all important goals. The provision of on-site lifeguards and a defined swimming space in the river helped ensure the swimming public’s safety. No significant issues occurred in the water. Minor issues of broken glass and muddy river edges were addressed, as much as possible.

With the site operating in the downtown core, we anticipated issues with individuals with unmet mental health needs, who were threatening, or who were inappropriate with beach visitors. One incident of violence, an assault, occurred on the property adjacent to the designated swim beach (the boundary was indistinguishable to the public, though an “End of Swim Area” sign did mark the line) whose resolution required closing the beach for two days. This incident took significant staff time from across the bureau, to address media
inquiries, staff and public safety concerns, and policy choices about re-opening the beach and continued programming.

For this, and other incidents, Beach Hosts and the contracted lifeguards called Portland Police and the Park Rangers as needed. Responses and support by both police and rangers helped in addressing these issues, and in continuing to provide a safe environment for staff and the public.

2. Serve a wide demographic, children, and all levels of swim proficiency

This goal contained three distinct categories, each discussed separately below.

**Demographics:**

Data summarized here reflects where respondents live, their age, gender, race / ethnicity, education and income. Further detail and charts are included in Appendix i.

Intercept surveys tell us that 73% of respondents were from Portland, with the highest percent (14%) of those being from the same downtown zip code as Poet’s Beach itself.

A majority of respondents were female, which is common in most of PP&R surveys. Males represented 39% of respondents and 3% identified as genderqueer/androgynous. Two respondents (1%) chose “Other” but did not provide additional information.

Table 2 below illustrates the distribution of race/ethnicity amongst respondents to the survey (156 answered this question), as compared to the general Portland population.  

Table 2 - Race / Ethnicity of respondents compared to Portland

Overall, the respondents represented people with high levels of education, with 89% having at least some college experience and 77% holding a Bachelor’s degree or higher. This is exceptional when comparing the survey respondents to Portland as a whole, where approximately 45% of residents have earned a four-year degree or more.

In addition to having a higher than average education (for Portland residents), survey participants also had relatively higher income than the Portland average. 27% of respondents earn at least $100,000. In Portland, this group represents about 24% of residents. More significantly, in the lower end of the spectrum, only 16% of respondents earned less than $25,000, compared to 24% of Portlanders. Based on the survey data, very few lower income residents were served by this program, though as noted above, some communities and populations do not respond to surveys.

Thus, overall, those responding to our surveys were on average wealthier, more educated and represented lower numbers of people of color than the general Portland population. To the extent that the survey results are representative of attendees, in terms of serving a diverse demographic representative of Portland, this program did not meet its goal.

Groups with children:

PP&R had a goal to provide this free, swimming program for children (people younger than 18). Of those responding, 35% of respondents reported having children in their group. Amongst these, the number of children in a given group ranged from one to five, with the average number of children in a given group being two. Having roughly one third of beach goers bringing children was less than could be hoped for, lending to the average grade for this programmatic goal.
Swim Proficiency:
Regarding swim proficiency, roughly half of respondents (48%) considered themselves very skilled swimmers, with the bulk of the rest (42%) considering themselves somewhat skilled. This seems to indicate that, among the relatively small proportion of beach goers who filled out surveys, Poet’s Beach did appeal to more than just experienced swimmers.

See the Observations and Recommendations (Marketing and Program Attendance and the Broadening the Audience sections) later in this report, for thoughts on how to address this goal more successfully.

3. Connect people to the river; educate them on river environment, and of swim safety
While it should again be acknowledged that the number of people who filled out the survey was limited, given the overall numbers of visitors, among those who did respond, the Poet’s Beach Program did draw some people to the river. Table 3 below reflects people's response to the survey question about how they learned about Poet’s Beach. Given the responses, only 10% learned about the beach by just “passing by.” So, it can be inferred that this program was a draw, helping people connect to the river.

Table 3 - Reason for Visiting Poet’s Beach

Referencing Beach Host notes from the daily activity reports, the topic of river water quality was the top concern raised, brought up 122 times during the summer, followed by concerns about camping (73 times). This provided our trained staff the opportunity to educate the public about current river water quality, and the efforts and successes of our partners at Bureau of Environmental Services to make the river clean, safe, and swimmable.

The topic of swim safety was not raised much by park visitors in their comments to staff, though some site-specific safety concerns (broken glass, pathway down to the beach) were
raised, and were addressed by staff. The lifeguards provided life jackets for swimmers and stressed the importance and reason for using them in a river environment, helping educate people about river swimming.

Thus, the presence of the Poet’s Beach Program had a positive impact – connecting people to the river, and providing information on its health and public safety regarding its use.

4. All participants behave responsibly, and are respectful of neighbors and visitors

For the most part, the summer went well in terms of people behaving responsibly. As with any downtown park, and as with any swimming feature (think downtown public fountains) there were a few incidents where unwanted behavior or illegal activities occurred. There were five calls for service to the Park Ranger program at Poet’s Beach during the summer, with two at Director Park and eight at Holladay Park, for comparison purposes, during the same timeframe. These were few, and Beach Hosts responded appropriately, as trained, in calling for Park Rangers and/or Police as needed. Both these groups were responsive.

When documenting the positive feedback received from park visitors, people’s gratitude for the Poet’s Beach Program was on average the most frequent positive comment, as indicated below in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Cleanliness</th>
<th>Feeling of Safety</th>
<th>Customer Service</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Staff Presence</th>
<th>Lifeguard Presence</th>
<th>Life Jacket Loaning</th>
<th>&quot;Thank You&quot; for providing beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to fielding compliments and concerns, Beach Hosts were also responsible for providing education on the rules of Poet’s Beach. As an indicator of how responsible people were, Table 5 below shows that the rules most discussed were the prohibition of dogs (brought up 61 times) and bicycles on the beach (brought up 39 times).
Note that there were more compliments received during the season than times that rule education was needed by Beach Hosts, which may be a good indicator of generally responsible behavior by park visitors.

5. Don’t create overly-burdensome costs to the City for swim safety, security, and maintenance

This pilot program had relatively low attendance, on average 80 people / day, with significant staff involved, both budgeted and unbudgeted. Some potential reasons for this were that the program was a pilot, it had minimal marketing, and limited lead time to promote. However, any new program requires significant resources to initiate. Poet’s Beach had an estimated 4,400 visitors to the site, with a program budget of $158,000.

Expanding use (or intensity of use) to any park site inevitably generates increased needs for maintenance (more trash, watching for and addressing safety concerns, etc.), as well as need for security (calls for service), particularly given the nature of the activity. Swimming and river recreation can be a draw for those wanting to party, sexual predators, and other negative activities which generate demand for greater public safety monitoring. Rangers significantly increased their frequency of site visits, visiting daily to educate about park rules and encourage responsible behavior, and to address staff and park visitor safety concerns.

If staffed river swimming programs continue, program managers should review the recommendations discussed in this report, for ways to reduce some costs, and broaden the audience of program users, to reduce the per user cost, and increase those benefiting.
6. Strengthen and expand partnerships

While this program was primarily launched and managed by PP&R, it did rely on some existing partnerships. The local neighborhood – with residents from the nearby condos at The Strand and RiverPlace – for the most part supported this program, both through advocacy and some volunteer efforts. Similarly, the Friends of RiverPlace contributed to this program’s success through their efforts. This program was the brainchild of Human Access Project, a partner which will continue to advocate for expanded river swimming opportunities. Lastly, the Poet’s Beach Program built on the long-standing efforts of our partners at the Bureau of Environmental Services, as it highlighted and promoted some of their significant efforts at making the river a healthy, swimmable environment.

7. The beach experience will be FUN!

Lastly, of the limited group (175) who were surveyed, approximately 98% of respondents reported having a lot/some fun, and three quarters reported they “definitely will” return to the beach. Most visitors reported feeling “very / somewhat” safe in the park and in the water (95%, 85%, respectively). This survey data, in addition to our staff observations, indicate that users did enjoy the Poet’s Beach experience. It was fun and successful. As a reminder, these survey results do not speak to the experience of those visitors who did not complete the survey. Just as importantly, they do not capture the views of people who did not visit the site / program, and sheds no light on why they may not have come.

Budget

The budget for this program was $158,000, which covered hard costs including:

- site preparation (cleaning, debris removal, placement of swim line, installation of on-land amenities, etc.)
- equipment (in-water amenities, picnic tables, bike racks, storage container, life jackets, signage [printed in both English and Spanish as feasible], staff supplies, portable toilets, etc.)
- staffing (contracted lifeguards, part-time PP&R Recreation Coordinator, seasonal Beach Hosts, and a portion of a seasonal maintenance worker’s time.)

Unbudgeted Staff Time and Collaboration with Partners

Additionally, staff from across the bureau contributed significant time and effort that was not covered by the Poet’s Beach budget to ensure the success of this pilot program. Some of this work was limited and early in the project. This included several work groups throughout PP&R to provide:
• risk assessment and determine program scope, staffing, and safety protocols;
• site assessment (river bottom inspection, debris removal), site cleaning, and preparation (installation of new bike racks, picnic tables, and cargo container, etc.);
• determining and addressing interagency agreements with several partners and property owners to secure permission to manage the program, apply park rules to neighboring properties, and other property related agreements;
• secure contracts for lifeguarding, debris removal, and swim line placement;
• determine program goals and develop tools for the collection of data to help with program assessment;
• kickoff event with media, as well as social media postings, signage development; and
• staff recruitment, development, and provision of training.

Additionally, volunteers with the Human Access Project and the Friends of RiverPlace helped with cleanup of the site before the opening of the season.

Once the season was underway, the program continued to require time and effort from existing staff (not included in the program budget), in the following ways:

• to support the seasonal Beach Host staff with ongoing training;
• to supervise the part time staff who were dedicated to daily maintenance of the site;
• to address issues with camping on adjacent property, those with unmet mental health needs, and dogs off leash, by the Park Rangers;
• to address issues as they arose, including several security incidents, site improvements, and responding to inquiries about the program progress; and
• to assess the program at the end of the season, development of this report, and other recommendations for future river swimming programs.

Policy and Operational Considerations and Recommendations

As this summer’s river swimming program was a pilot, there are lessons learned regarding how to manage such a program, both from a policy and operational perspective. Below are some considerations and recommendations that reflect input from managers, program staff, the Beach Hosts, and from direct public feedback.

Staffing:

PP&R used a combination of Beach Hosts and contracted lifeguards stationed during all swim hours, with periodic visits by Park Rangers, and Land Stewardship staff to clean and address maintenance issues. For future river swimming seasons, staffing needs should be
For this initial season, Beach Hosts served many functions: welcoming the public; answering questions; explaining the site, river safety, and other PP&R programs; and most importantly documenting the program, through their observations and surveying park visitors, all to help evaluate the overall program. However, they reported feeling unsafe at the site at times, and requested more extensive training, some of which is comparable to what is already provided to Park Rangers. The contracted lifeguards provide many of these same functions at other sites where they operate without comparable Beach Hosts. Surveying and site observation might be done on a more intermittent basis, using staff from other sites. Some specific recommendations regarding staffing are:

- For potential future swimming programs, careful consideration should be given to the program goals and needs, and the site conditions, to help determine the best staffing model. PP&R understands that urban downtown locations face unique social challenges. If future swimming beach programs are planned for Poet’s Beach or similar sites, it is preferred that Park Rangers or experienced Hosts from other urban park environments staff the site, pending staff availability.
- It is also feasible that no PP&R staff would need to be permanently assigned to a river swimming location for the season, with use of contracted, trained river lifeguards providing the constant presence, with PP&R staff (maintenance, Park Rangers, and others) only visiting periodically.
- It is recommended that any river swimming beach program continue to provide additional maintenance capacity, as a recreation program will generate increased use, and the need for increased maintenance.
- It is also recommended that any river swimming program continue to provide lifeguards, particularly if at a busy river location such as those downtown. The downtown river conditions change, need careful monitoring, and have a variety of competing traffic (commercial and recreational boats, etc.) so having trained lifeguards experienced with river conditions is important for public safety and to manage the City’s risk.

River Swimming Conditions and Location

Whether the city offers a program or not, people are swimming in the Willamette River. Providing a program with monitored swimming on the river creates a place that the public can feel safe swimming, expanding the audience of people who choose to use the river for recreation.

Observations here share what was learned and offer recommendations for future swimming programs, to help ensure their success. Much was learned this season about the site-specific
conditions at Poet’s Beach and how it works for the public as a swimming site – including access (parking, transit, etc.), amenities (number and locations for portable toilets, bike racks and picnic tables), and the needs of on-site staff (from materials to training). These lessons will be shared with staff if a public river swimming recreational program is offered again.

Feedback from staff and the public expressed concerns about the quality of Poet’s Beach as a swimming location, and the placement of the swim line. River levels fluctuate, both seasonally as the snow melt ends, and daily with the tides. Consequently, the depth of the water, the conditions of the river floor, and the amount of swimmable space within the swim line all are affected by the water movement. Future swimming locations should consider these changing conditions in placement (and adjustment) of the swim lines, and messaging to the public.

The location of this swimming beach raised concerns amongst planning and security staff when doing a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) review before the program opened. Among the concerns raised were:

- Limited visibility due to a lack of street frontage
- Site topography (steep slopes and berms on the river’s edge)
- Low informal surveillance because the site is located at the dead end of the greenway
- Site along river presently attracts undesirable activities
- The Marquam Bridge casts shade over the site

Careful consideration should be given to the location of a river swimming program in the future for safety reasons, as well as visibility for marketing.

Referencing the Central City Potential Swimming Beach Sites Study (2016) document would be a helpful starting point. The study evaluated and ranked five potential swimming beach sites in the Central City. Beaches were evaluated according to numerous criteria related to safety and site characteristics. They were ranked in the following (#1 being the best):

1. Hawthorne Bowl (Waterfront Park, PP&R site)
2. “Poetry at the Beach” (called Poet’s Beach here, South Waterfront Park, PP&R site)
3. Zidell Property (not a city Property, at this time)
4. Eastbank Crescent (south of the Eastbank Esplanade, complex property issues)
5. McCormick Pier (complex property issues)

Marketing and Program Attendance

This pilot season benefited from considerable earned media (news coverage) at the start of the season, but had no budget for marketing. Perhaps for this reason, or others (location of
site, river conditions, etc.), the daily count of those swimming (versus using the beach or visiting the park) declined in the second month of this two-month swimming program, though other park visitor numbers remained the same throughout both months.

As mentioned just above, the location of the site posed a challenge to the public. Something more visible would provide a visible draw (crowds draw more people), if a site with the needed amenities can be determined.

As this was a new program, and considering historic opinions about swimming in the river, it is not surprising that the overall attendance this season was relatively low (estimated at 4,400 during staffed time over an 8-week period) compared with heavily programmed urban parks or other outdoor swimming locations.

For future seasons, if river swimming continues, it would be advisable to budget for and implement marketing of the program, to increase the numbers of those benefiting from this new program, and to increase the cost effectiveness of the program.

Broadening the Audience

If one of the goals of the City’s river swimming program remains to provide free swimming opportunities for a diverse population, and provide swimming opportunities for underserved and vulnerable populations, there are a few recommendations to lend to this goal. Time is needed to develop a strategic outreach effort, and a budget is needed to implement such an effort to intended audiences. This is critical to ensuring a well-attended river swimming program and serving the many communities and culture within the greater Portland community.

Project Planning

Launching a new program requires significant effort on the part of many:

- to assess and address risks,
- to consider and respond to policy and practical considerations,
- to design the site and program,
- to secure permits, agreements, contracts, and partnerships
- to recruit, train and prepare staff

PP&R worked hard to realize the Mayor’s proposal to engage the public with the Willamette River, putting time and resources into ensuring the program’s success. Still, there was a lot to do, and some tasks could have used more time.
For example, one critical task that was not resolved before the program opened was securing agreements with adjacent property owners. The river’s edge is a patchwork of ownership, jurisdictions, and legal entanglements. In order to provide a safe experience and consistent rules on what is perceived by the public as “one beach” agreements were needed with state agencies and adjacent property owners. Unfortunately, these agreements were still be worked on once the season opened for swimming. Consequently, Park Rangers had no jurisdiction to educate or enforce camping rules for many weeks into the season on the beach south of the swimming area. It was an individual camping on this adjacent property who assaulted others, triggering the program closure for two days.

Therefore, our recommendation is that as much lead time as possible be provided for any pilot project to ensure all preparations, permits, and agreements are in place to ensure programmatic success.

Policy Conversations

PP&R is encouraged by the success of the Poet’s Beach pilot project and looks forward to its role in shaping the future of river swimming in Portland. As the City contemplates future river swimming programs, collaboration should occur at the Commissioner and Mayor level to identify goals and objectives for future programs. Clarity on goals will help the City continue to deliver successful river swimming programs to the citizens of Portland.
Appendix

Appendix I: Summary of Results from Intercept Survey and Daily Activity Reports

Data collection was completed by two methods: visitor self-report and Beach host observation. Both methods provide important information and together, help create a picture of the overall Poets Beach experience. Both methods also have their limitations and it is important to understand those. The purpose, benefit, and limitation of each method are described in the sections below.

Visitor Intercept Survey (Self-reported)

The data summarized in the next few pages come from the visitor self-report survey. These surveys are offered to park visitors as a paper or electronic questionnaire. (A hardcopy of this questionnaire is available in Appendix IV.). The survey is an opportunity to understand the Poet’s Beach visitor experience.

There were 175 completed surveys starting July 19th through September 4th, an average of less than four per day for the period being reported. It is important to remember the surveys were voluntary and may not truly represent all Portlanders who visited Poets Beach. Therefore, it is not possible to generalize the results to the entire visitor population. Instead, this survey can only speak to those who chose to participate by completing a questionnaire.

Demographics

**Zip (n=160)**

Respondents were asked the zip code of their residence. Approximately 73% of the respondents had a Portland zip code. The largest group (14%) of people came from the 97201 area, the same as Poet’s Beach site. Areas directly southwest and east/northeast of the site saw the next largest group of visitors. Zip codes shaded white (in the map...
Age (n=153)
The average age of survey participants was 42.5 years. The youngest respondent was 18 and the oldest was 73. The age of the respondents was relatively young, with nearly half (48%) being under 40 years old. Note: People under 17 were not surveyed directly.

Gender (n=158)
A majority of respondents were female (which is a common finding in most of PP&R surveys). Males represented 39% of respondents and 3% identified as genderqueer/androgyneous. Two respondents (1%) chose “Other” but did not provide additional information for categorization.

Swimming Skill Level (n=166)
Survey respondents were asked to judge their level of open water swim skills. Nearly half (48%) reported to be very skilled. Approximately 42% reported to be somewhat skilled and 7% reported to be not skilled at all. Three percent of respondents did not know their skill level.
**Race/Ethnicity (n=156)**

The following table illustrates the distribution of race/ethnicity. Note, respondents could choose more than one category, meaning the percentages can (and do) equal more than 100%.

One of the objectives of Poet’s Beach was to provide open water swimming to a wide demographic of Portlanders. When the race/ethnicity distribution of those who completed the survey were compared to US Census Data, American Community Survey (ACS), 2011-2015 data, results showed higher percentage of persons identifying as white (and no other race/ethnicity) among the survey participants, than among the Portland population.

**Note:** the difference in the data from the table above and the bar chart below. The table above takes into account that a survey respondent could chose more than one race/ethnicity and the respondent will be counted in each of the races they chose. The graph groups together any person who chose more than one group and includes them in “Other race/More than one race”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Participants</th>
<th>Portland Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race/More than one race</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education (n=161)**

Overall, the respondents represented a high level of education, with 89% having at least some college experience and 77% holding a Bachelor’s degree or higher. This is exceptional when comparing the survey respondents to Portland as a whole (using ACS data), where approximately 45% of residents have earned a four-year degree or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Survey Participants</th>
<th>Portland Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a High School Graduate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate, GED, or Alternative Credential</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or Associate’s Degree (2-yr degree)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree (4-yr degree)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income (n=146)**

In addition to having a higher than average education, survey participants also had a household income level higher than expected, when compared to the Portland population. More than one quarter of respondents earn at least $100,000. In Portland, this group represents about 24% of residents. The true difference lies in the lower end of the spectrum, where 24% of Portlanders earned less than $25,000 (using ACS data), compared to 16% of respondents.
Getting There

Learning about Poet’s Beach (n = 175)
Respondents were asked to read through a list of communication modes and determine which ones were used to learn about Poet’s Beach. They could also list other options, if missing from the list. News media was the overwhelming common method to gain beach information. This amount (40%) might be even higher, as many people wrote in version of “Internet” and “Social media”, which were combined into one group. Depending on whether respondents categorized news media as coming from websites, these groups might have some overlap. Regardless, it was clear news media had an impact in disseminating information. Another category listed below that came from the write-in list was “passing by”. Respondents recalled being on a bike ride and seeing people at the beach or on a walk and just happening upon it. There may be some relationship to this category and “Saw a sign” since some of those bicyclists and walkers may have not been in eyeline with the area but near enough in proximity to see a sign.

Mode of transportation (n = 172)
Respondents were asked to identify the primary method of arriving to Poet’s Beach. Car/motorcycle was the most common method (38%). More than a quarter walked/rolled to the site, almost a fifth rode their bike, and a tenth used public transportation.
Difficulty finding site (n= 172)
Eighty percent of respondents reported no difficulty finding Poet’s Beach. Seventeen percent had at least some difficulty, with 1% feeling that locating the site was very difficult.

Reason for visiting (n= 175)
The questionnaire listed several reasons why someone might visit the beach. Survey participants were asked to mark all reasons that applied to them. More than two-thirds of respondents were appreciative of the opportunity to be near a natural body of water and because it was free. Less than a quarter of participants were inspired by the accessibility of the public transportation.

Site Usage

Group numbers (n=175)
Group sizes ranged from one person to thirty people. The average group was made up of two adults and zero minors. In groups with minors (35%), they numbered from one to five, with an average of two.

*Area of use (n= 172)*
An overwhelming majority (85%) of Poet’s Beach visitors used the beach itself. More than half the visitors (52%) went into the water and nearly a quarter (23%) took advantage of the park.

*Length of stay (n= 175)*
Respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time they stayed at Poet’s Beach. Six responses were removed because they listed zero or one minute. The remaining 169 responses ranged from seven minutes to four hours. The average amount of time per visit was about an hour and fifteen minutes. The most common response was two hours (n=39).

**User Experience**

*Safety in the park (n=169)*
All but 5% of respondents felt safe (somewhat/very) being in the park area of Poet’s Beach. Four percent (n=6) felt either somewhat or very unsafe. All six of those respondents used the beach, three also used the water, and one also used the park. When asked about their concerns, one person mentioned homeless camps and three mentioned issues related to the condition (rocks, broken glass, and mud). Four of the six respondents reported having “some fun”. One person reported “no fun” and one person did not respond to the question about their level of fun. Five of the six respondents answered the question about their willingness to come back. Two reported “definitely will”, two “not likely” and one reported “maybe”.

*Safety in water (n=81)*
Respondents who went into the water (n=91) were asked to evaluate their feelings of safety in the water. All but ten of those responded to the question. Of those that responded, 85% felt safe (somewhat/very) on the water. Nine percent (n=8) felt either somewhat or very unsafe. The overwhelming concern among those not feeling safe in the water was the presence of broken glass and slippery rocks. Despite this, one person reported having “a lot of fun”, six had “some fun” and one person had “no fun”. Two persons “definitely will” come back, three “maybe” will, and three were “not likely” to return.
Level of fun (n=166)
More than 98% of respondents reported having fun (61% “a lot” and 37% “some”). Two respondents did not have fun and one person was not sure of their fun level. Of the two that had “no fun”, one did not provide their concerns but the other person expressed concern the homeless camps on the beach, stating that they “found people sleeping at lifeguard station”. That person stated they are “not likely” to return to Poet’s Beach while the other person reported “maybe” they would.

Willingness to return (n=166)
Three-quarters of respondents “definitely will” come back. Twenty percent of respondents might return while 5% (n=8) were not likely to revisit Poet’s Beach. One person was not likely to return because they were visiting Portland. Two of the eight did not feel safe in the park and three of the eight did not feel safe in the water. Seven of the eight had “some fun” and one had “no fun”. Concerns included the homeless camps, broken glass, sharp and slippery rocks, difficulty navigating the volume of mud, and a location that was not ideal (too loud, no trees/shade). In addition, one person referenced that while swimmers were not supposed to drink the water, children often do while swimming and that set up a concern about the safety of the child swimming.

Concerns (n=79)
There were two parts of the section where respondents could provide additional information. The first, was labeled “Concerns” and was position after asking about perceptions of safety and fun and willingness to return to Poet’s Beach. Because respondents, did not know there would be another place to comment, some used the concerns area to express general comments, words of encouragement, or appreciation.

Among those who did express concerns it was clear that the condition of the beach was a high priority. Respondents often remarked on the presence of broken glass and sharp rocks on the beach. In addition, the river bed was found to be muddy and full of slippery rocks which made getting in and out of the water difficult. Respondents wanted trash receptacles available on the beach and it sounded like many people were picking up the glass but did not have a proper place to dispose of it.

A few respondents felt the lack of trees/shade and the proximity to the bridge and its accompanying noise made the location less than ideal. In addition, the swim zone seemed small and the water too shallow for those expecting to swim. Some concerns also focused on the quality/cleanliness of the water; some people felt it was dirty, murky, and just did not feel clean.

A few concerns were expressed about homeless camps and associated safety issues.

A full list of concerns can be found in Appendix III.

Comments (n=79)
Since there was an area available for concerns, located earlier in the questionnaire, the comment section tended to be almost all positive. Many people expressed an appreciation for having a place to enjoy. There was a clear appreciation for the AMR lifeguards. Some asked that it be open again next year. A full list of comments can be found in Appendix III.
Beach host Observational Data

The following information comes from data obtained from Beach host observations (also known as Daily Activity Reports, referred to as DARs). There were 53 days’ worth of data from July 13th through September 4th, though not every day had a complete set of data. In addition, no data was collected on August 8th, as the beach was closed. A hardcopy of this questionnaire is available in Appendix IV.

The DARs can be divided into two sections: user counts and visitor interactions. User counts represent the Beach host’s best attempt to capture the number of people using the beach, water, and park and activities taking place throughout the site. Counts focusing on where users were located (beach, water, park) were taken throughout the hour and every attempt was made not to count the same person twice within an area. For example, if someone was in the water at the beginning of the hour and still there at the end of the hour, they were only counted once.

Users could be counted more than once for two reasons. First, if they used an area (for example, the water) during an hourly count and were still using the same area during the next hourly count. Second, if a person was counted as using an area (for example, the water) and then moved onto the beach and were counted in the hourly beach count. Because of the potential for someone to be counted more than once, the counts do not represent the number of unique visitors to the site.

Another group of user counts focused on various activities that visitors might engage in, such as reading, playing games, relaxing with their dog, etc. These were part of a total daily count and were not tracked hourly.

The second section of data is based on the interaction a Beach host had with visitors. This can include greetings, addressing concerns, and providing rule education. Like the activity counts, these were tallied throughout the day and totaled to obtain one number for the whole day. All the following information comes from data obtained through the DARs.

User Counts

Location Use

There are several ways to measure the use of the three site locations. The following graph represents the average number of users for each hour that the site was open. Water was consistently the lowest used location within the site, with the average number of users topping out at eight people at any given time of a count. The beach was used more often and a spike can be seen between 1 and 4 pm. The most often used location was the park. Besides a clear increase in the noon (lunch) hour, the number of visitors remains consistently between 23-26 people, until the last hour the park is open.
Another method of understanding site use is to gauge the percent of visitors using each of the locations at any given hour. Those in the water never accounted for more than 15% of the users at any given hour. The highest percentage of use always occurred in the park. For four out of the eight hours the site was “open”, more than half of the visitors were in the park location.

Children
When Beach hosts count the number of people visiting Poet’s Beach, they group the numbers by men, women, and children. The number of children using each site is compared to the total number of users, to illustrate which locations were most used by children. Approximately 13% of all park users were children, compared to 23% users at the beach, and 43% of those in the water were children.
**Estimated Number of Users**
The system employed to estimate park usage is a common method used when it is impossible to get exact counts. These are only obtainable when the location has exact entry points with an ability to count those coming in and identify those who leave and then return (think concerts and sporting events). In locations such as a park, where visitors are free to enter and leave at different points and repeatedly do so, attendance is often a rough estimate. Poet’s Beach is no exception.

Counting users is performed throughout the hour for each location. This means a person could be counted as using more than one location and could also be counted in more than one hour. It is impossible to determine an exact count of unique users for any given location or hour. Calculating an average number of users per hour and day and considering that some users will be counted twice creates an estimated average of about 30 visitors per hour to the site. However, estimates from frontline staff put the average number of visitors at about 10 per hour. The discrepancy between the two estimates could be attributed to the double-counting, as previously described. *Despite the presence of count data, the anecdotal information provided is probably a better representation of the true number of visitors.*

**Bikes**
Beach hosts counted the number of bicyclists riding to and through the site. The average number of bicyclists remained steady at about 13-15 until 3pm and then steadily dropped off until 6pm. Between 6 and 7pm bicyclists dropped off significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average per Hour</th>
<th>11:00 AM</th>
<th>12:00 PM</th>
<th>1:00 PM</th>
<th>2:00 PM</th>
<th>3:00 PM</th>
<th>4:00 PM</th>
<th>5:00 PM</th>
<th>6:00 PM</th>
<th>7:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activities**
The following tables describe the minimum, maximum, and average number (in a day) of each activity/interaction throughout the time period in which Poets’ Beach was open.

Visitors to the site were keen on bringing their dogs. An average of 14 visitors per day had a dog with them. In terms of activities, sitting/lying on the grass was the most popular, by far. Very few used the site for playing any type of games and instead chose less active behavior such as reading, eating, and taking pictures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Water Games</th>
<th>Sitting/Lying on Grass</th>
<th>Lawn Games</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Dogs</th>
<th>Eating</th>
<th>Photography</th>
<th>Board Games/Cards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Visitor Interactions**

**Customer Service**
The Beach hosts kept busy by offering a welcome and site orientation to visitors. Very few questions were asked regarding restrooms and questions about safe swimming did not arise often.
Compliments
Visitors seemed appreciative of the location. Compliments regarding other customer service features and amenities had roughly the same overall support.

Rule Education
In addition to fielding compliments and concerns, Beach hosts were also responsible for providing education on the rules of Poets’ Beach. The rules most discussed were the prohibition of dogs and bicycles on the beach. Previously data illustrated that visitors on bicycles and visitors with dogs were popular among site users; therefore it could be that these rules came up so often because those on bikes or with dogs had specific questions.

Concerns
The following two tables are part of one count – concerns voiced to the Beach hosts. Except for river water quality, Beach hosts heard an average of two or less concerns with all issues listed in the tables below. The low average illustrates that though there may have been some days when a certain issue was a concern, overall those issues were not a constant concern every day.

River quality, maintenance/cleanliness of the beach/swim areas, and camping all had large numbers of visitors voice concern the first couple of weeks and then the levels decreased drastically. Concerns about dogs were not as linear, with levels rising sporadically across the period in which the site was open.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Welcome/Site Orientation</th>
<th>Safe Swimming</th>
<th>Restroom in South Waterfront Garden</th>
<th>PP&amp;R Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Park Cleanliness</th>
<th>Feeling of Safety</th>
<th>Customer Service</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Staff Presence</th>
<th>Lifeguard Presence</th>
<th>Life Jacket Loaning</th>
<th>&quot;Thank You&quot; for Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Average</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>
<tr>
<td>Season Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Smoking/Tobacco</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>No Dogs on Beach</th>
<th>Dog Leash Required in Park</th>
<th>No Bicycles on Beach</th>
<th>No Glass on Beach</th>
<th>No Structures/BBQs on Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Aggressive Behavior</th>
<th>Alcohol and Drug Use</th>
<th>Bicycle and Pedestrian Conflicts</th>
<th>Camping</th>
<th>Dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Analysis
The point of the data collection was to determine if the Poets’ Beach pilot project was a success, as determined by metrics for user experience and user counts.

Based on the quantitative data available from Beach hosts and voluntary surveys, Poet’s Beach proved to be a place for some Portlanders. Approximately 98% of survey participants reported having a lot/some fun and three quarters reporting they “definitely will” return to the beach. Most visitors reported feeling “very/somewhat” safe in the park and in the water (95%, 85%, respectively). It seems that users who completed the survey did, in fact, enjoy the Poets’ Beach experience. This does not speak to the experience of those visitors who did not complete the survey and just as importantly, does not take into account those who felt the area was too unsafe to even visit.

Appreciation for the beach is being shared with Beach hosts, though river quality, beach maintenance, camping, and dogs posed some level of concern for visitors. Beach hosts help educate the public on the prohibition of both dogs and bikes on the beach.

Use of the park, beach, and water are being seen throughout the day, though the park was by far the most used location within the site. The estimated average number of users (~10 per hour) was relatively low, compared to other parks that employ Beach hosts (Director and Holladay Parks). In addition, user counts illustrated the popularity of the park, a location within the site that exists outside of the Poets’ Beach Pilot Project. Meaning, visitors who used Poets’ Beach for the park location can still enjoy the area, even after the project has ended but that the use of the beach and water (where a majority of resources were employed) were secondary to an already existing park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Lack of Potable Water</th>
<th>Maintenance and Cleanliness of Beach and Swim Areas</th>
<th>Maintenance and Cleanliness of Park and Facilities</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>River Water Quality</th>
<th>Smoking and Tobacco Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Concerns from Intercept Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>access right at end of sidewalk was a bit difficult for my cane-using husband...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After spending time here, it is clear why there weren't any swimmers. The water is too shallow, the rocks too slick, the ground too muddy, and an overwhelming abundance of glass. a fine area to sit and read but over all unpleasant to be in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beach could have been sandier, more park like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broken glass near the cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broken glass, making sure people know to wear water shoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleanliness of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debris and trash (our feet and dog being cut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult to get into the river due to mud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fantastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fight down the way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floating dock would be nice mushy walk in water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating dock would be nice. mushy walk in water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found a couple pieces of glass, no way to dispose of glass. lifeguards said it was not for them to take. were also disappointed in no trash bins on the beach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get rid of sharp rocks. add more sand. get rid of mud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glad rangers patrol area, give them back their horses!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glass in the sand- very dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glass on beach, but we wore shoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i am very happy there is an optional beach for ppl w/o cars wish the dates for access were longer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i would like if there were more garbage and recycling receptacles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would love to swim here. I was only prepared for a group/sand use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it would be delightful if it could be a full on sandy beach. Also, a dock/raft to be deeper into the water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just gotta keep your eyes and ears open for suspicious behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keep the beach clear of bums and beggers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less rocks, more sand, larger swim zone, otherwise it could be fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifeguards at 11a seems a bit late but with our climate, its to be expected. no other concers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter (i.e. glass) on the beach was a major concern today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots of broken glass, able bodied life guards doing nothing (could be picking up the beach, in my humble opinion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots of broken glass., very dangerous!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love it!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loved it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low water, lots of rocks as a result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>micro glass kept us from going in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more sand. safer steps to beach for elderly, remove jagged rocks from beach. keep dangerous people/smokers out!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muddy river rock was a little tough with the shoes on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muddy water was awful, glass was awful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My concerns are with the South Beach.
noise from bridge was disruptive
none. im so pleased to see this beach
Nope. Hope it continues for years to come.
not enough places to sit on the beach if you didn't ring a towel
not enough squishy mud, but otherwise, NONE...
not the best swimming
parking is a major problem
pay your green shirts more and thank you
perhaps make the beach a non dog area since kids are swimming in a small space
Please bring it back next summer
please don't close. im worried this wont come back.
proximity to noise of traffic
rocks on the beach... ouch!
rocky af
Rocky bottom, had to stand in water.
sand/shore texture is unpleasantly slimey
so murkty, sharp rock, danger of glass, to loud, no shade, no trees, slippery rocks
so rocky!
still rocky under water. kids tripped. we enjoy sandy play area. wish there is a kid friendly wash off area and drinking funtain
still some lingering litter
the bottom of the river floor is really slimy & gross.
The boundaries of the beach contain a lot of rocky areas, we went over to the area just outside where it was both sunny and smooth sand.
the cordoned off are is too shallow and could be extended
the glass and muddy/super soft riverbed... not sure if there anything that can be done about this
the stepping stone that says "welcome" is difficult for people with bad knees(me!) to navigate, as there is no handrail. planting a pole next to it would help a lot(+simple to do). the ramp ended in water that looked too deep to wade in fully clothed.
the willamette needs to be cleaned by the people and companis like chevron who pulouted it. the beach and water were VERY DIRTY AND POLUTED WITH BLACK AND GREY. THE WATER FELT GROSS. I COULD NOT EVEN SEE MY TOES IN 2" inches of water. the boggy muddy muck of the beach and once in the water felt slimey and pooply and disgusting. it is sooooo dirty and polluted and gross. i wont be going in the water again. i justlike the view. i could not stand to go further inthan my shins. ive swum in lakes swamps that were cleaner. clean the water
There are no many more homeless camps on the beach. we came down and found people sleeping at life guard station.
there is lots of glass on the beach. staff should pick it up as much as possible
tide was out; got stuck in the mud getting out of the water. it was kind of gross, then had to almost crawl back not get stuck, and i couldnt wash it off because i couldnt get back to the water.
too many rocks in shallow water
traffic above noise
transients/campers
trash on otherside.

Visiting Portland
water depth - more info on that mammals known and unknown inside and out
water depth- more info on that mammals sdkljhfsdfjl
water shallow
glass

will you be here next year?
would love to see a sandy beach a shower/foot rinse station,, deeper water swim area

you say its safe to swim but not drink. as a parent kids drinking the water while swimming is inevitable. so how safe are my kids in this water?!
you should ban glass
Appendix III: Comments from Intercept Survey

:) 

:) 
A nice effort, but i hope the money will go to something else next year. staff and lifeguards seem very unnecessary.

a smile =)

as above
thank you!

awesome initiative to make use of nature even in the city

bare bonez

Clean the rivers! these natural resources are vital to our economy
dirty sand ditry water clean it . also maybe import clean sand.
felt safe with the lifeguards. thank you for giving us this fun place.
good job!
good luck! x2
good stuff!
great idea, good work!

Great Job Keep It Up
great job!
great place in the city to go to
great project! thank you!
great sandy beach!
great signage. wish there were deeper areas to swim. duckworth dock? Audry McCall? but so great
great visit
had a great time. thank AMR for lifeguards

homeless by choice. thanks for the awesome beach!

I <3 POETS BEACH

FOOD CART

I feel like poets beach, upon first impression, isn't for young children. it was comforting to see life guards, but without swimmers is feelt they could have been putting their time to better use.

I also would love to volunteer for clean up so if there is any info available me email is kspivaok12@gmail

I love that you opened this! its really nice to have a beach option so close.

if there was a pier or dock to get out to the water so one didnt have to trek thriugh the mud and rocks i would come back. even high tide i have doubts about.

invite more diverse groups to participate

it is encouraging that this place and opportunity exist at all. very hopeful! loved children’s poetry and landscaping.

Keep doing what you are doing.

keep the beach open every summer

Keep up the good work!

keep up the great work! Kate and the other hosts ive met have been fantastic.

lifeguards

awesome
lockers on beach
looks great out here!
love it
love the beach, just lean it up a bit
love the fact the city is finally embracing the river! keep it going!
love the poetry and how it is displayed on the stones. beautiful path
love this project. Sauvie is too far, anyway.
lovely find. great group/alliance of sponsors
lovely walk down to the river if you stop and read the children's thoughts

MAHALO
mahalo. the poetry is moving
maybe there should be a better name?
more & nicer sand
nice addition to the waterfront
no that's all
nope! =)
nope, you asked enough
please promote more merfolk practice
please promote more merfolk practice! for boys and even girls, eco friendly fins. coach - challenge - create.
we pro choice in mertailing or visit common sense
provide access to deeper water for swimming as well as wading. boat dock?
seems like the fear is your biggest obstacle with people from Portland. but if the kids got in, the will eventually
grow up and not be scared, well done.
so happy there is a safe place for people to swim. we need more beaches! thank you portland!
swam in the river at the docks just south of Hathorne Bridge the other day and it was great!
Thank you for opening another park in the neighborhood. It's beautiful.
Thank You!
thank you!
thank you!
thank you!
thank you!
thank you!
thank you! Excellent beach & space!
Thank you!! when I first moved here (1978) the river was dirty and shoreline access was minimal or nonexistent.
thanks
thanks
thanks for having pfd's
thanks for making accessible spaces
thanks for opening this park!!!
thanks for staffing the beach with lifeguards and life jackets
thanks!!!!
the host Linda was a delight! very helpful :) 
this is awesome
This is fantastic. Please fund this for next year.
thrilled it opens now!
very nice
very nice place to relax
water eco system education near beach would be nice
water fountain nearby would be fantastic along with shower for quick rinse would be great. =) 
we appreciate all natural beaches! would love a less noisy beach on the Willamette. Adding some snad or round pebbles would help. Add trees.
would love to be able to rent kayaks here
Appendix IV: Intercept Survey (175 respondents)

Poet's Beach User Survey

Please complete this brief survey to provide Portland Parks & Recreation with feedback about your visit to Poet's Beach today.

1. Including yourself, how many people are in your group?
   Adults (ages 18+) _____  Youth (less than 18) _____

2. How did you hear about Poet's Beach?  [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]
   □ Portland Parks & Recreation  □ News media (television, radio, etc.)
   □ Friends of Riverplace  □ Saw a sign
   □ Human Access Project  □ Through a friend or family member
   □ Other [please specify]: __________________________________________

3. What was your primary mode of transportation to Poet's Beach today?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Walk/Roll (wheelchair/power mobility device)  Public transportation (bus, streetcar, MAX)
   Bicycle  Skate (Inline/rollerboard)
   Car/Motorcycle  Other [please specify]: ______________________________

4. How difficult was it for you to find Poet’s Beach?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Not difficult  Somewhat difficult  Very difficult  Don’t know/No opinion

5. What attracted you to Poet’s Beach today?  [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]
   □ I enjoy natural bodies of water  □ It is located close to where I live and/or work
   □ It is accessible by public transportation  □ I feel safe/comfortable here
   □ It is accessible by walking or bicycling  □ I feel the river is a safe/clean place to swim
   □ It is free  □ Other [please specify]: __________________________________

6. What areas did you use today for playing and relaxing?  [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]
   □ The park/grassy area  □ The beach/sandy area  □ The water

7. Approximately how long did/will you stay?
   (hours: minutes) __________

8. How safe do you feel in the park areas (such as lawn, picnic tables, trail) of Poet's Beach?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Very safe  Somewhat safe  Somewhat unsafe  Very unsafe  Don’t know/No opinion

9. If you went in the water today, how safe did you feel?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   (Skip this question if you did not go in the water today.)
   Very safe  Somewhat safe  Somewhat unsafe  Very unsafe  Don’t know/No opinion

10. How would you rate your swimming skills in open water (lakes, rivers, oceans)?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
    Very skilled  Somewhat skilled  Not skilled at all  Don’t know/No opinion
11. Based on your experience today, how much fun did you have?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   A lot of fun  Some fun  No fun  Don't know/No opinion

12. Based on your experience today, how likely are you to come back?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Definitely will  Maybe  Not likely  Don't know/No opinion

13. If you had/have any concerns about your experience today at Poet's Beach, please share them with us in the box below. If you did not have any concerns, please write "None".

   Please tell us a little bit about yourself. We will combine this with the information we get from everyone who filled out the survey to describe the group of people who participated.

14. What is the zip code of your residence? _________

15. What year were you born? _________

16. How do you identify?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Male  Trans Male  Genderqueer/Androgynous
   Female  Trans Female  Other [please specify] _________

17. Which of the following best describes your highest level of education?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Not a High School Graduate  Bachelor's Graduate (4-yr degree)
   High School Graduate, GED or Alternative Credential  Graduate or Professional Degree
   Some College/Associate's Degree (2-yr degree)  Other [please specify] _________

18. Which best describes your race or ethnicity?  [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]
   □ Alaska Native  □ Hispanic or Latino
   □ American Indian or Native American  □ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   □ Asian  □ Slavic or Eastern European
   □ Black or African American  □ White
   □ Another Race [please specify:] _________

19. Which of the following best describes your household's total annual income for 2016?  [CIRCLE ONLY ONE]
   Less than $25,000  $25,000 - $49,999  $75,000 - $99,999  $100,000 or more

20. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

   Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey!
Appendix V: Daily Activity Report (Beach Host observations)

Poet’s Beach Program Daily Activity Report
(Recreation Facility Hosts – Public Beach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff #1</th>
<th>Staff #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Weather: sunny cloudy rainy windy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hourly Counts: Count by using the clicker throughout the hour, not just on the hour. Map below depicts count locations.

**In South Waterfront PARK** includes people sitting, standing, walking, or riding through the park and greenway, and people sitting at picnic tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11a</th>
<th>12p</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>4p</th>
<th>5p</th>
<th>6p</th>
<th>7p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On the BEACH** includes people sitting, standing or walking on the sandy beach and banks, and on the ramp leading to the beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11a</th>
<th>12p</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>4p</th>
<th>5p</th>
<th>6p</th>
<th>7p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In the WATER** includes people swimming, standing, floating, and wading in the delineated swimming area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11a</th>
<th>12p</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>4p</th>
<th>5p</th>
<th>6p</th>
<th>7p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BICYCLES** includes bicycles in the park, including those placed at bicycle racks and those not at bicycle racks, and those being ridden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11a</th>
<th>12p</th>
<th>1p</th>
<th>2p</th>
<th>3p</th>
<th>4p</th>
<th>5p</th>
<th>6p</th>
<th>7p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poet's Beach site map
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Service – How many times did you inform guests about:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/.site Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP&amp;R Recreation Programming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity – How many times did you observe the following at Poet’s Beach?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliments – How many times did guests compliment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Cleanliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Jacket Loaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns – How many times did guests communicate their concerns to you regarding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule Education – How many times did you educate guests on the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking/Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bicycles on Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Security/Emergencies**

Itemize any incidents/accidents.

*If you called 911, please call & text SUPERVISOR ASAP: XXX.XXX.XXX / XXX.XXX.XXX.

**Staff Questions / Comments / Ideas / Help Needed:**

Please note issues so that we can be aware, and work to develop solutions.

- Odd situations/patterns/incidents or items found in the park or beach. Construction updates / field trips / flash mobs / etc.
- Maintenance issues – note on this form and contact Downtown Operations Supervisor Seth Menzer at (503) 823-3635.