Errol Heights Park
Community Advisory Committee
Wednesday, August 29, 6:00pm – 8:45pm
SMILE Station, 8210 SE 13th Avenue, Portland, OR

MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING OUTCOMES/GOALS
This was the fourth meeting of the Errol Heights Park’s Community Advisory Committee. The focus of the meeting was to have the committee provide feedback on the placement of programming options. Ideas submitted by the committee will be presented as design concepts at the September Open House for public input.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE
Joshua Freeman, Pamela Hodge, Adrienne Moat, Michael Riley, Fon Zhang, Caryn Indigo Corwin, Karl Lee, Gillian Murr, Anne Hettick, Paul Ciri
Absent: Jennon Rugg, Brett Bolstad, Erich Pacheco
Staff present: George Lozovoy, Christian Haaning, Ali Young (BES)
Consultants: Carol Mayer Reed (Mayer/Reed), Ryan Carlson (Mayer/Reed), Emily Kuo (Mayer/Reed), Jessica Pickul (JLA), Allison Brown (JLA)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
George Lozovoy welcomed everyone and introduced Allison Brown, JLA, as the new committee facilitator. Allison led a round of introductions with committee members, city staff, and members of the public.

MEETING PURPOSE, REVIEW AGENDA, ROLE OF COMMITTEE
Allison reviewed the meeting agenda with the committee, informing them that there would be several activities for the group to provide feedback. Since this was her first meeting with the group, she revisited the committee roles and the agreement statement and asked if everyone had any questions or would like to amend it in any way. The group confirmed both their role and the agreement statement.

George stated that Portland Parks and Recreation wants to build a park that the committee members and their neighbors are excited about.
Allison walked through some general rules for productive meetings and group participation, which included making space for others to talk, being transparent, and silencing cellphones, among other guidelines.

Allison asked the group if there is anything that she should know or if there is anything that the project team could do differently moving forward. Committee member Caryn Indigo Corwin noted that the group is really thoughtful and that they care about this project – they are invested and there is a high-level of CAC engagement.

PROJECT UPDATES
George provided a few project updates. Portland Parks and Recreation submitted a request for funding for the design and construction of Errol Heights Park for $12.7 million dollars. This number was based on the 2005 comprehensive plan estimate, plus inflation. The good news is that the request for funding was approved, so now the park can be designed and constructed without interruption. The design team now has $2.7 million dollars to complete the design. Construction will now be completed in one phase, including the natural area. The project funding also allows us to use more durable materials, reducing the need for later maintenance.

George informed the group that it doesn’t look like it’s feasible to include a soccer field in the design of the park, and explained that because of that, PBOT is also reconsidering the need to repave the SE Tenino Court. Regardless, the Community Garden will not need to be relocated. PBOT has not yet made a final decision on this. We can’t vacate the road entirely because the Portland Water Bureau has a public easement on the street to maintain access to the existing water line. In terms of design, no trees or structures can be placed over the water line. PBOT is also considering ways to maintain pedestrian and bicycle access through the park along this street.

Additional Discussion included the following questions and comments:

- **Will the path need to remain open twenty-four hours a day?** George responded that Portland Parks typically close at 12:01 a.m., however nothing has been decided yet.
- **Was the reason the soccer field was removed because of the concern for parking?** Yes, if soccer is included it would be for UA teams (younger players). Parking requirements for a field of that size would be for approximately thirty cars, which could be accommodated with what already exists.
- **In the survey created by Portland Parks and Recreation, there appears to be a photo of a baseball field as a programming option. The photo seems inconsistent with what the committee has been talking about.** George responded that a hybrid park was still on the list. The images included with question five appear to include a basketball court and a flexible field. A full-length soccer field is completely off the table and baseball is unlikely. The member followed up by saying that if there is a baseball photo it needs to be removed.
- **Is Survey Monkey the survey platform?** George confirmed that it is.
• When will we know when PBOT has made a decision on the road? George responded that there is an LID meeting on October 17, which is PBOT’s deadline to make a decision, but explained that the project team thought it still made sense to hold tonight’s meeting and come up with an option that doesn’t include a road.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Four members of the public provided comment at the meeting. The following is a summary of those comments:

• It looks like this project is separate from the PBOT project. Is this going to happen regardless of what happens with the LID project? George confirmed that they are two separate projects, with the Errol Heights Park project following PBOT’s project in the overall timeline. PBOT is anticipated to start construction next spring – what is included with that work is still to be determined. This project is planning to start construction in early 2020.

• Is the $5.7 million dollars for design for just the area by the community garden and trail? Design funding includes the entire park to the curb.

• Are you planning to get rid of the concrete platform? It is a death threat. This was seconded by one member of the public and several committee members present agreed that it would be a good idea to remove it. George responded that it should be possible to remove it.

• One member of the public asked for a show of hands for how many committee members have walked the site. All CAC members’ hands were raised.

• A member of the public provided the following comment: “I’ve been involved with this for a long time. This is the first time that the community and committee have been advocating for transparency. We want the garden to stay because it’s a part of our identity. Thank you for hearing us. It’s been a battle and a lot of hard work. Thank you for hearing us.”

• One member of the public asked by show of hands: “how many committee members live within a couple of blocks of the park?” Most committee members live within walking distance to the park. The member of the public followed up by saying that there are a lot of people who live there that will be directly impacted and are directly adjacent to the park therefore having a big stake in this decision.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
Ryan provided an introduction to an activity focused on the park’s Guiding Principles. The activity asked members to review the guiding principles from the 2005 Errol Heights Park Master Plan and indicate which ones they felt are most important. CAC members were provided three dots to place next to their preferred guiding principles and then were broken into two small groups. Groups were encouraged to have a collaborative discussion, edit the text, and add to the list of guiding principles, as it makes sense. Ryan mentioned that the guiding principles presented were pulled from the 2005 Master Plan, but explained that the project team did some work to better organize and reconsolidate some of them. For the activity, members were asked to point out if there are any guiding principles that don’t feel appropriate or no longer need to be included.
• **What is a systems approach to resource management?** It involves looking at how all the ecology systems work together and support each other versus looking at things separately.

• **The survey asks for participant’s top ten preferred guiding principles. Three is better.**

The Guiding Principles deemed as most important by CAC members include:

• Provide a variety of spaces and facilities that are appropriate to the site and its designation as a hybrid park. *(Guiding Principle with the most support from the CAC)*

• Develop a pathway system that integrates the park’s three access points. The system should include a loop connecting the lower basin to the upper recreation area.

• Develop a systems approach to encompass human/nature coexistence with the least amount of disruption to the natural ecosystem. This is an environmental restoration point as well. *(added by CAC)*

• The path system will consist of two trail types: hard surface path that meets ADA requirements and is 5’-8’ wide, and soft surface paths built of bark mulch or gravel and be used in natural areas where there are no ADA accessibility requirements.

• Develop a “systems” approach to improve habitat values for flora and fauna through an ongoing program of invasive species removal and habitat restoration.

• Honor and respect the park’s historic and cultural precedents *(added by CAC: tribal cultures first; stewardship of land)*.

• Make Precision Castparts a part of the design and provide education about the park’s unique location on the city’s edge and its impacts on the natural ecosystem. *(added by CAC)*

Allison noted that this conversation is not closed and explained that if there are more things that need to be added or discussed related to these, there will be additional opportunities to bring them up. The public will be asked to do the same activity at the public open house on September 8.

**RE-ENVISIONING DESIGN & PROGRAMMING**

Ryan introduced the second activity, focused on imagining the placement of programming and amenities in the park. Ryan explained that now that the garden will not be moved and the street may not be paved, the areas that will be included in the design have also changed. The project team is looking for help in reimagining where the programming and other amenities should be located with those updates in mind. At the end of the activity, the design team would like two or three design ideas that can be presented at the public open house.

Committee members were split into two groups, each with a map of the park. Groups were asked to design the park by placing programming tiles (which included a variety of ideas including a pollinator garden, basketball court, etc.), and by drawing trails and other features on the map.
Ryan mentioned that the team has been paying attention to the Committee’s feedback over the last few months and understand the desire for something that is more nature-based in aesthetics. We are looking at things that fit in with the character of the park and are natural colors.

Several questions and comments came up during the activity. Those posed to the full group include:

- **Is there a site in the park that, based on topography, makes the most sense for the amphitheater?** Carol Mayer/Reed responded that there is a lot of topography and options for an amphitheater. A committee member added that an amphitheater could be a good spot for an outdoor educational area or classroom.
- **Can we assume that the area with the old concrete pad can be cleaned up and used?** Staff responded that it is an old PGE substation and that non-toxic remediation can be performed.
- **I have children, so we would like something that can meet their needs. We feel like this is our one opportunity to get something for our kids because we don’t think more money will come into the neighborhood for other parks.** A member responded that there may be additional funds that could be used for other parks.
- **I understand that there may be people that come from other areas to use the new park features, but the neighbors can use it too.**
- **Nature can be fun and educational. Let’s not look at this as either/or. There is room to do both.**
- **It will be interesting to see where the public lands on the survey question that asks about preference on nature versus people setting.**

Following the small group break out activity, members of each group walked the entire committee through the ideas that they came up with. Based on those ideas, Mayer/Reed then drafted the following designs to match what the committee came up with.
The following images are representations of the CAC-inspired designs, developed by Mayer/Reed following the CAC meeting. Larger versions of these images are included in the Document Library.

Idea 1: Park Amenities West

Idea 2: Park Amenities Central
Idea 3: Park Amenities Dispersed

Comments and considerations on the design ideas included:

- There wasn’t group consensus on where the skate park should be located.
- Committee member Gillian Murr would like to have a bench included in the park that is dedicated to her son who passed away this month.
- Portland Loo’s are expensive and it might not be worth the money. They are being considered because they are cheaper, easier to maintain and can be safer because you can see if someone is using it.
- The splash area should be by the park entry for easier access by kids and families.
- One member commented that they would like to keep the park as natural as possible.
- If there isn’t going to be a road, we need to consider how maintenance materials will be delivered, like bark dust.
- Two of the designs clustered the amenities, leaving some nature areas.
- The group generally agreed that flat grassy areas were good places for people to congregate.
- One of the groups decided to leave picnic shelters off their designs because they thought they might be wasted space. Trees can provide sun coverage.

George reminded the group these ideas will be presented at the public open house on September 8\textsuperscript{th}. The CAC was encouraged to attend the event to help answer questions by the public on how they came to these recommendations.

NEXT STEPS
Jessica Pickul announced several upcoming activities:
• **Public Open House**: September 8, 2018, 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., at Errol Heights Park at the 52nd Avenue entrance
• **Public Survey**: Live now through September 22, 2018. Available at: [www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/errolheights](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/errolheights)
• **Next CAC meeting**: October 10, 2018

**What outreach will be done for the public open house?** Portland Parks and Recreation will be sending mailer invitations to all neighbors within a ½ mile around the park as well as email notifications, and fliers will be posted at key community locations, yard signs will be posted around the perimeter of the park, and posts will be made on social media (Facebook, Twitter, and Next Door).
Information about the open house was also included in several of the school newsletters and bulletin boards through CAC members.

**Can we hold the next CAC meeting closer to the park? Perhaps Brentwood Darlington Community Center?** We will look into that.

George informed the group that they would send the draft design ideas to the Committee for review prior the public open house. Allison closed the meeting by thanking the committee for their feedback.

The meeting was adjourned.