



## North Portland Aquatic Center Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #3 Notes January 9, 2023 5:00pm – 7:00pm

### Welcome and Agenda Review

- Ken Rumbaugh provided a welcome.
- Full project details can always be found at the [North Portland Aquatic Center](#) project page.
- **Project News:** Pier Park has been removed from consideration as a candidate site for the NPAC. Pier Park has received two Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants (LWCF #41-00423 and LWCF #41-01560). With any LWCF grant, if any part of the property is altered to a use other than public outdoor recreation, a conversion will be triggered and the only way to resolve a conversion is by acquiring replacement property of equal or greater fair market value, and of equal or greater recreational utility directly adjacent to the existing park boundary. As we are targeting a footprint of development of potentially 2 to 3 acres in size, our options for acquisition of 2 to 3 acres of land adjacent to Pier Park and conversion to open space for park use are extremely limited if not impossible. This would present a significant schedule delay to acquire land, additional costs for land acquisition, and additionally, a schedule delay and additional costs to coordinate with the federal government on a conversion process to unhinge LWCF grant requirements on a Pier Park development area. For these reasons, Pier Park was removed from consideration as a candidate site. This takes the candidate site list from 6 to 5 (Columbia Park, Columbia Park Annex, Northgate Park, St. Johns Park, and University Park).

### Introductions

#### Attendees:

- **PAC members:** Igancio Castillejos, Dion Jordan, Patricia Kasper, Millie Haley, Daniel Smith, Morgan Spriggs, Jenny Hoyt, Derrell Wheeler, Erica Cuesta, LA Walker, Sheryl Juber, Jamar Summerfield (*Not present: Itzel Cruz Megchun, Bea Gloth, Xiaa Crowl, Tod Pitstick, Elaha Alizada, and Ashley Bubnick*)
- **ELS Architecture and Design team:** Beth Cantrell, Jessica Stanton, Jeramie Shane, Clarence Mamuyac, Jeana Woolley, Laura Hartzell, Susan Vutz
- **Portland Park staff:** Robin Johnson Craig (Project Manager), Ken Rumbaugh (Community Engagement Lead), Payton Stang (Community Engagement Aide), Anna Brown (Community Engagement Aide)

## **Roles, Group Agreements, and “How We Define Success” Review:**

- Review of PAC roles and group agreements by Ken.
- The Group Agreements and “How We Define Success” documents are working documents that PAC members are welcome to review and add to as desired.

## **Community Workshop #1 Review:**

- Ken shared a summary and key theme of the Community Workshop #1 event:
  - [NPAC Community Workshop #1 Summary](#) (pdf)
- NPAC Community Workshop #1 was hosted Saturday, December 10, 2022 10:00am-2:00pm at Charles Jordan Community Center
- This event was the first of five Community Workshop events scheduled through August 2023
- All materials were provided in English, Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Somali.
- PP&R contracted with the Community Engagement Liaison Services (CELS) to provide Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Somali translation and interpretation services at the event.
- 11 PAC members were in attendance- thank you to all who were able to come and speak to community members!
- Over 140 community participants attended the event
- 66 boards that made up 22 “Gallery Walk” stations to learn about where the state-of-the-art facility will be built and what the amenities and programming could look like in the facility. [NPAC CW1 “Gallery Walk” Presentation Materials](#)
- Community expressed thanks and appreciation for the clear communication of complex information
- Community Workshop #1 Survey launched on Saturday, Dec. 10, and kept open until January 2, 2023
- Over 400 responses in post workshop SurveyMonkey and notes from the in-person workshop. Community expressed following priorities:
  - Ease of access (walking, biking, public transit)
  - Proximity to community resources (schools, affordable housing, organizations doing work with vulnerable populations)
  - Minimizing negative impacts (tree loss, loss of current amenities)
- In the NPAC CW1 Summary, “lap” pools and “competition” pools were talked about as separate amenities. Clarence commented that

competition pools can be looped in with lap pools since they have similar features but can be used for tournaments etc. One distinction though, competition pools often require a greater minimum depth.

- Darrell mentioned that competition pools require more equipment (lane dividers etc.) which would require extra storage space
- Therapy pools require their own room. These pools are typically kept at high 80's to low 90's temperatures. Currently, there no therapy pools in the Portland Parks system. Lazy rivers, hot and cold exposure (hot tub/cold shower) and a lap pool that is shallow enough to stand in also provide aqua therapy benefits.
- Saunas (wet and/or dry) are not recommended by PP&R staff, too much of a safety risk. Windows get steamy and staff are unable to safely monitor.

## **Community Workshop #2 Presentation and Materials**

- Clarence and the ELS team presented a (draft) preview of the material that will be shared at Community Workshop #2.
  - [NPAC Community Workshop #2 \(draft\) Preview Materials](#) (pdf)
- NPAC Community Workshop #2 is scheduled for Tuesday, January 24, 2023 5:30pm-7:30pm at Charles Jordan Community Center.
- Reviewing criteria to narrow in focus for workshop #2 – at a minimum mirroring elements at SW Community Center or Dishman
- Site Selection Criteria Tool
  - els/BCA showed examples of tools to determine site criteria including estimated number of youth in the area, the proportion of households, estimated number of people of color, estimated number of people with low incomes, and language data. Future projected data will be considered as well. This will help to tell a story of each location.
  - Still trying to distinguish the discrepancies between the data shown for Columbia Annex and Columbia Park
  - Census Bureau information is not always accurate. It is not all inclusive and it requires some flexibility with how the data is interpreted.
- Programming Comparisons – **each building design is very similar across all locations except when comparing a 25M pool vs. a 50M pool as a larger pool would require more space**
  - Proposing a spa, fun pool, and a 1,000 sq/ft lap pool

- With all the rooms the building is roughly 47,000 sq/ft with an additional 20,000 sq/ft parking lot (25,000 sq/ft for a 50m pool)
    - 2 parking spaces per 1,000 sq/ft which is about 50-60 cars total
- Context and Test Fits
  - **Columbia Park** – Good access. Both 25M and 50M designs do not impact any currently programmed community resources (sports and ball fields), but do impact green/open space and 9-10 existing trees.
  - **Columbia Annex** – Good access. Test fits are shown in two different locations. Significant tree loss in both scenarios. The ball field would require a slight relocation.
  - **Northgate Park**– Comfortable access with limited impact to existing sports field and tree canopy. The rugby pitch remains unaltered in both 25M and 50M scenarios. The use of the north end of the park would require significant tree loss.
  - **St. Johns Park**– Access is limited and requires some creativity in where to place the building as current resources and trees take up a lot of the park. Would have to walk a fair amount to access major bus route. A 50M option would require >50% reduction in green/open park space.
  - **University Park/Charles Jordan Community Center**– Good access. Plenty of open space for the building site. Rich community resources nearby. Ample parking lots available nearby for possible parking sharing. 25M and 50M version would not impact sports field capacity. Minimal loss of tree canopy in the 25M scenario. 50M scenario is similar but has a greater impact to tree canopy.

### **Next steps, Questions, Feedback from the PAC:**

- Can the parking design be “just enough” to meet the needs of the building?
  - PBOT doesn’t currently have parking requirements and there aren’t clear answers, but the project team and design team are working on getting more information
- Could there be a pool between 25M and 50M?
  - Yes, the designs are to show that two extremes are feasible on all the five potential sites. The 50M designs show that we have wiggle room to work with features within the building.
- What, as a group, is the role of the PAC in these decisions?

- Narrowing the site selection will be decided in the coming weeks. This group will be helpful in discussing and providing feedback.
- PAC members playing the role as table captain will help to answer questions during the community workshop #2 in getting closer to a decision.
- Reviewing and digesting information on the presentation and community feedback, providing feedback on this information, and, with all of this context, eventually helping to determine crucial criteria and top three site locations
- Engaging community to weigh in on these questions (to understand the top criteria and top site locations)
- A lot of positive feedback on the visualizations and presentation to understand the site test fits.
- How does this presentation apply the criteria that the community voiced?
  - At workshop #2 - There will be a presentation similar to the one today (with a little more context and information)
  - There will be teams broken up into 10 tables, the first 20 mins of charrette time to go over data, discuss, and determine the top five programming items. One “captain” will report back on what the table decided.
- Ken asked PAC members to consider acting as “Table Captains” at Community Workshop #2. The following PAC members offered to be in attendance and serve in a role as “Tabel Captain”:
  - Morgan Spriggs, Millie Haley, LA Walker, Sheryl Juber, Jenny Hoyt, and Ignacio Castillejos
- Our first focus group was originally planned for middle of January but will be moved to after the second community workshop so these folks will have the benefit of seeing and hearing all of the materials and information available. Notifications of this delay will be sent this week by Jeana Woolley and Jessica Stanton.
- Action item: Ken will send the “Test Fit” presentation to the PAC
- Action item: Ken will work with project team to create a form for advisory members to provide feedback after they’ve digested this information (this form may look like the form that will be shared with the public later on)

**Meeting adjourned at 7 PM**