

**Tuesday, January 11, 2022**

9:00 - 11:00 am

Zoom Virtual Meeting

**Members Present**

Adrienne Feldstein, Alejandro Orizola, Ali Berman, Bonnie Gee Yosick, Casey Mills, David Staczek, Dr. C. N. E. Corbin, Elana Pirtle-Guiney, Erin Zollenkopf, Mike Elliott, Nova Newcomer, Paddy Tillett, Paul Agrimis, and Randy Gragg (ex-officio)

**Members Absent**

Juan Piantino, Lorena Nascimento, Sabrina Wilson

**City Staff Present**

Adena Long, Brian Landoe, Brett Horner, Claudio Campuzano, Katie Dunham, Kenya Williams, Lauren McGuire, Margaret Evans, Maximo Behrens, Nicola Sysyn, Robin Johnson Craig, Sarah Huggins, Serin Bussell, Stephan Herrera, Tim Collier, Todd Lofgren, Tonya Booker, Vicente Harrison

**Social Time/Call to Order**

The group shared their Parks-related New Year's resolution to welcome the new year. Called the meeting to order at 9:18am.

**Approve December Minutes**

Paddy Tillett moved to approve minutes. Second by Paul Agrimis.

No discussion.

The meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

**Director's Report**

Director Long's report – thanks to Stephan Herrera for being here today. Apologies for getting the Monthly Report out late. When Board has a chance to read it, please take note of all the work happening in the PRMS Division. There have been several emergencies that they have responded to quickly and efficiently. Many thanks there. Kudos to Recreation and Rangers for coordinating and staffing Warming Centers during severe weather. PRMS responded to repair damage to prepare for guests and helped us return those centers back to normal operations after the Warming Centers closed. Kudos also to Lands and Urban Forestry for keeping parks safe and clean, even when there is snow on the ground. Operations update: over the last month, 2 trees at North Park Blocks have failed. Operations has helped with cutting and removing trees. Rangers have helped to make sure campers moved safely from areas impacted by fallen trees.

COVID-19 update: there is another spike occurring, due to Omicron variant. Governor Brown extended COVID-19 State of Emergency Declaration through 6/30/22. Multnomah County has extended to end of March, but we expect City to extend to match County and State. Bureau has



seen uptick in COVID incidences and positive cases. Many staff impacted by COVID. Taking steps to look into testing opportunities for staff, so long as they meet criteria around workplace transmission. Recreation has also modified masking requirements to include game-play at Community Centers and Tennis Centers. Previously not required to wear masks while playing tennis and basketball, but now requiring them. Also created and amended tracking tool for program cancelation and tracking that is related to programming due to COVID. There are tools in place to handle operations changes. Keeping community informed as making changes to programming.

Healthy Parks / Healthy Portland update: Listening and Learning team is preparing for Wave II, which will start in February and go through June. The Mission, Vision, Values and Racial Equity Statement Team will draft during second wave. Internal prep team for Actions and Results has worked to identify performance measures that relate to racial equity. This work has been completed for the FY22-23 requested budget. Community members have been recruited to work on the Actions and Results team – they will review the metrics and gaps and help identify priority work moving forward.

Council agenda: Authorize bid for construction of Columbia Children’s Arboretum improvement project, \$2.25M. Aim to have notice to proceed with construction by early April. Updates given at the December Board meeting.

Upcoming events: We encourage Parks Board members to attend. They are open to the public. The Nature Patch ribbon cutting requires an RSVP because of limited parking and smaller parks. We will send out the RSVP again.

- February 12, 2022 Overlook Park Nature Patch Ribbon Cutting Event: [Please RSVP](#)
- February 19, 2022 A Park Nature Patch Ribbon Cutting Event: [Please RSVP](#)
- February 26, 2022 Class Event: [Winter Tree Identification](#)

**Question:** Casey Mills – DCTU may go on strike – how will that affect parks?

**Answer:** Director Long – 25 positions that are represented by DCTU in Parks. We are working with colleagues around to City to keep track of bargaining. We will be putting together a Continuity of Operations Plan in the case where there are staff providing services that are impactful to operations, especially if it more than a few days. We are making sure we have backup plans.

## **Working Group Reports**

### *Community Engagement*

Bonnie Gee Yosick noted that much of the information shared in the breakout sessions from December will be incorporated in the Community Engagement Working Group.

Erin Zollenkopf: Community Engagement Working Group has been working on a public comment procedure and forming broader strategy around Board visibility and community engagement at the Board level. Regarding Board meeting time, now that there is feedback, goal is to have something to the Board by spring/summer. Want to bring public comment procedure to the Board, along with the strategy. For future Board meeting, would like to learn more about

how the Parks Board and Parks Foundation operate together. This will also be discussed during the Parks Foundation report presentation today.

### *Financial Sustainability*

Mike Elliott: In last working group meeting, Dylan Paul gave overview of Property and Business Development meeting he manages, to give the Board a better understanding of the services provided through this group, as well as how Parks utilizes the asset portfolio and the services provided by his team to generate revenue for the Bureau. Customer Service Center in a typical year issues over 5,000 permits – events, weddings, etc. There are also non-Park use permits that are for commercial use – construction staging, and other non-operational uses. Revenue is 3.5M-\$4M from these permits, so not super impactful from a revenue perspective, but help offset some costs and contribute to the mission.

Staffing update – Financial Analysis and Planning Manager position has been filled. Bob Del Gizzi comes from the Housing Bureau and will help to fill additional roles on the team that need to be filled.

Budget update – 2022-2023 budget – no significant update from the last Board meeting. Focus of budget is to absorb and implement significant number of decisions that were made in the Fall, so not many new asks from Division Managers. There were 14 asks that were requested and scored using the Revised Decision Support Tool. By comparison, there were 32 requests last fall. Recommendations were reviewed by Commissioner Rubio last week. BAC will also review. BAC is made up of Board members from FSWG, Labor representatives, and members of community groups, so there is some overlap and repetition. The BAC will be integrated into the scheduled Working Group meetings. They are working on how that integration will go.

### *Land Use/Infrastructure*

Paddy Tillett: Met last Tuesday and had a presentation from Multnomah County on progress with Burnside Bridge - earthquake redesign process. The whole process has been extended by a year because of need to reduce the overall cost of the bridge. Target is \$800M-\$900M, but as things stand, the cost is beyond that. Type of bridge has not been decided yet. Decision points regarding structure type at the east end of the bridge have not been made and expected in the Fall. Expectation is that applications for Federal grants will be made toward the end of this year, so will have a clearer design this summer of what the bridge will look like. Currently, no architect has been engaged. Next meeting will occur in June.

Level of Service report –Working Group had substantial comments on the draft report they saw a few months ago. Staff has been very responsive and changed the way topics are being presented. There will be a report to the full Board today. Lauren McGuire gave an update on several Bond issues – Columbia Children’s Arboretum and the 28-acre renovation there; projects at Errol Heights; and a small update at North Portland Aquatic Center. Long list of “watch” topics, but nothing yet on those.

### *Board Affairs*

Casey Mills: Board Public Comment Procedure has been covered by Erin Zollenkopf. We were going to wait for draft mission statement for Parks to come out before developing the Parks Board mission, but think we need to start working on Board's now. Reached out to Commissioner Rubio's Office and several ideas generated about how PP&R Board can best help PP&R staff. Ideas that came from the last Board meeting breakout sessions were compiled. Additional conversations have been had with Adena Long, Todd Lofgren, and Tim Collier. We were starting to coordinate in-person meetings, but due to COVID in-person may not happen until Summer. Working on Absentee Policy – on a rolling 12-month basis – if absent 3 times during a rolling 12 months – Chair will speak with those folks. There have been 3 people that fall into that category and Bonnie Gee Yosick has had a chance to talk to those folks. Because of large amount of work that Juan Piatino has had to do due to COVID, Juan Piatino is going to come off the board. Lorena Nascimento will also be coming off the board due to workload. This is the first time with written Working Group reports – solicited feedback from folks regarding how that is working.

**Question:** Bonnie Gee Yosick – at this point, Board is getting written reports from Director Long and Working Groups, so the only standing report not receiving is from Randy Gragg/PPF. Just wanted to point that out – not advocating either way, but just making an observation for the Board and Randy Gragg to consider. Does anyone have comments on that? (No comments generated.)

### **Portland Parks Foundation Report**

PPF sees themselves as allies and partners with PP&R. From the public view, people think the PPF = PPR. People think the PPF is the Parks Bureau. Many folks think of PPF as an arm of the Bureau. In reality, PPF works with a community of donors and activists. Rule of thumb for PPF projects, which have primarily been Capital over time, is that they have been initiated by private sector, friends groups, or citizens groups. Anything initiated by PP&R was generally initiated by the Commissioner; SFFA for example. PPF really works for the community. Examples of projects were discussed – Holly Farm, improvements to Sellwood (Columbia Sportswear), Gateway Green, and Director Park. Randy Gragg's work after leaving the Oregonian contributed towards the development of Director Park (transferred from the Schnitzer family), rather than it becoming a 12-story parking garage.

Current Initiatives – Moving away from Capital projects and moving to more programmatic to meet equity goals. Had been raising money for SFFA and Lunch + Play. Currently working on Friends & Allies initiative to pull separate programs PPF had done to consolidate separate programs into a single initiative, have increased Small Grants program to give out 10 grants each year, started Green Dreams public conversation series, Paseo, and played role in the 2020 Parks Levy. They were the political leaders due to the death of Commissioner Fish and Mayor's competing priorities, so worked on polling and raised half of funds for the campaign. Also trying to have fun! Barbara Walker Crossing, for example, largest project ever – instead of just a

ribbon-cutting, they closed the street and had a pancake breakfast. Want to keep 'fun' as a major part of programming.

Who are we? Fully budgeted to 4 people, up from 3. PPF Board includes Kia Selley as Chair and many other outstanding community members, including ex officio and emeritus members. Also, more than just the PPF Board – working over the last 2 years to build steering committees. Board is not as diverse as they would like – 4 of 14 are BIPOC. However, steering committees are much more diverse, over 50% BIPOC, and engaging with communities of color and see folks as future board members.

Other activities: Budget snapshot – budget is around \$500,000 per year. Revenue comes from mostly individuals, some (\$100K) from the City through the Mayor's budget. Also surveyed donors last year – top priorities include: would like to see new parks and play areas in underserved parts of City, develop underused land that may not belong to PP&R, and revive Downtown. PPF did an independent study to look at overall funding climate – PPF is well-regarded, but lots of confusion around PPF and PP&R. The Levy further complicates this, as it gives the perception that PP&R is fully funded. Many potential donors restrict giving to Capital projects. To meet equity goals, PPF needs to grow annual fund and PPF must better articulate its own value proposition to distinguish from PP&R.

Upcoming: Want to expand work with communities of donors and activists. Committed to serving underserved communities, so need to expand unrestricted income. What's ahead? Will continue with programs highlighted earlier. Will give out first grant through Joey Pope Fund. First Capital project since Barbara Walker Bridge will be the Rose City Playground. Lastly, PPF hoping to work with private sector and PP&R to work on reopening O'Bryant Square.

**Question:** Adrienne Feldstein – how do you plan to separate the role in community mind between PPF and PP&R? What is the vision and how will you raise awareness?

**Answer:** That began when the Foundation hired Randy Gragg. He acts as a promoter of the Foundation. The Foundation was known but not very well. He can send out a booklet that tells the PPF story in a new and fresh way. The conversations happening with PP&R leadership will lead to a more strategic sense of what our respective lanes are – how we're working together and separately. Did well with year-end fundraising. Most important step now is to button down the relationship with the Bureau.

**Question:** Stephan Herrera – Wanted to know if Randy Gragg could share copy of presentation with the group and Commissioner's office?

**Answer:** Yes, Randy Gragg will do that. Will do some updates before sending out.

**Question:** Erin Zollenkopf – Foundation receives operating support from the City, correct? Because it is difficult to fundraiser for operating support, so then use the operating support to fundraise for Capital projects, correct?

**Answer:** Yes, really started with the Barbara Walker Bridge. The Foundation needed a little boost after the Great Recession, so trying to move away from that and fundraise for all their

needs. Operating expenses also comes out of the Mayor's budget because they work across Bureaus and other agencies.

**Question:** Dr. C.N.E. Corbin – Is fundraising done to increase operations and maintenance and support to hire PP&R staff that must maintain new Capital projects?

**Answer:** No. That has never been a consideration, for several reasons and probably won't be. The PPF donor base is interested in raising funds that serve the community and will likely not be interested in fundraising for increasing staffing levels. Levy also complicates the fundraising because a large part of the Levy is for maintenance and operations, so would be virtually impossible to raise money for staffing.

Todd Lofgren – From the Parks perspective, as we receive gifts, one of our considerations is to make sure there is funding for operations. Japanese Garden is an example where, even with a philanthropic gift, there was an agreement for maintenance and operations. Admittedly, there is some inconsistency when maintenance funds are required, but the Racial Equity Tool might be something to apply to make sure there are operations and maintenance dollars for future projects.

**Question:** Paddy Tillett - When RACC started raising funds for public art, they did 1% for arts, but they realized there were no funds for maintenance of the art. So, then it was raised to 1.5% so that fund could go to maintenance. Wondering if a similar concept would apply – if there is a gift for a capital initiative, then can a percentage of that gift go to operations and maintenance? Would like to make sure there is always a set-aside that comes out of capital funding that is for maintenance and operations, not only in the Foundation but from PP&R.

**Answer:** Yes, this should be a consideration for larger projects. There was a maintenance set-aside for Barbara Walker Crossing.

In conclusion, over the last two years, PPF has revamped their mission statement. They have also developed an Equity Lens that will be applied to all new projects. This will help in appraising how well they are “walking their talk.” They are striving hard to meaningfully contribute to change in the Parks system.

### **Level of Service Guidance Presentation**

Brett Horner and Katie Dunham: Have been working on this for quite some time – over the last 3 years or so – lots of research, listening, and community outreach. Here to let you know how we intend to use it in plans going forward. Looking at an abbreviated, high-level review today. There will be an Executive Summary, a full report for Parks and Natural areas, and a report for Community Centers. Encourages everyone to review those when published.

What is Level of Service (LOS)?

We have a level of service today – it's what we are providing Portlanders and the public currently, in terms of built assets. This is all about our built features in parks and parks themselves. It's all about assets, their distribution, special distribution, and proximity of residents to those built things. There are target levels based on what the public has told us they would like to see. This gives us a framework to plan the system's growth over time and will set

targets for assets that PP&R can work to provide, as resources are available. We can match what people want with our resource levels.

#### Level of Service Guide:

LOS does inform decision-making for what assets PP&R provides and where they are located, including review of costs of maintaining assets over time, and it gets updated fully every 5 years. LOS does not decide how, where, and when PP&R provides assets. It does not override specific park designs, plan parks operations, recreation programming, or condition of assets. It is very much asset-based and geographic-based.

Guiding Plans include Vision 2020, Strategic Plan, Parks Levy Commitments, 5-year Racial Equity Plan, Growing a More Equitable Urban Forest, Natural Areas Restoration Plan, Natural Areas, and more. The LOS findings will be used with Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland (HPHP), Capital Projects process (to see where gaps are), Sustainable Future, and to meet Equity Objectives. Will use LOS to see where gaps are, in terms of number of households in proximity to assets, equity, and what else is around. This was already used in the Sustainable Future plan that went to Council two years ago – used to cost out if we were to fill gaps.

In relation to HPHP, the LOS falls with the Actions & Results, along with Budget, Policies, and Plans. It is cyclical and will be updated, require listening and learning with community on a regular basis. Regarding Capital Projects Prioritization, potential projects are ranked and scored, and investments are considered using this formula: 'Service Variety \* Household \* Equity'. They will look and see what other assets are around a particular area, that gets scored. Then, they look at the number of households in the radius. The equity score looks at the number of people of color, number of youths, and number of people experiencing poverty.

#### Equity Lens Impact and Community Engagement

LOS was used in evaluating Sustainable Future scenarios. LOS work was very much grounded in what they heard from community members, in different methods. Community Engagement approach was to work with many community groups – communities of color, immigrant and refugee communities, and youth. Conducted a survey with over 2,000 participants. They asked people if they would use a Parks asset and how far it needed to be from a person's home to use it. Also conducted 36 community meetings, with over 1,100 participants – worked with IRCO, Verde, and others to have listening sessions across the City. And engaged Parks staff to make sure LOS team understood their needs.

#### Key Outcomes:

Key outcomes and themes included barriers, such as cleanliness and transportation, cultural relevance, and programming (people want to be able to see themselves in parks), older adults' access to parks (including paths and places to gather, and programming), and safety and security (staff presence and lighting). When asked what should be found in every park, people responded with: passive open space, restrooms, and trees. LOS team also included the Parks Board in this process, when it started in 2016, with community engagement in 2018, and review of findings in 2019. Met with Parks Board LOS subcommittee, including discussing appropriate

serve levels for each asset, capacity to serve demand in dense neighborhoods, and planning for reservable assets.

Parks 2020 Vision LOS goals were to keep up with demand to serve an increasing population as growth occurs. The goal that applies to the LOS project is to have a park or natural area within ½-mile from every household. It also recommends a full-service Community Center within 3 miles of every household. This has been the goal for the last 20 years. The next level of planning is for experiences and assets in each park, and how much service each park provides to community in terms of benefits. Next, the HPHP process will identify new goals for the future. Currently, 77% of households live within ½-mile of a park or natural area goal. However, we currently need 29 more developed parks or natural areas to meet the ½-mile goal. Community Centers are not addressed in this work.

#### Recommendations by Asset:

Overview of the type of assets and distance in miles from households, including ballfields, tennis courts, dog off-leash areas, skate parks, community gardens, basketball courts, and play areas. Findings by asset summarized the number of current assets and the additional assets needed to cover the geographic gaps. Will be looking at asset conditions to make sure improvements are prioritized. This work also reaffirmed the ½-mile goal for community parks and natural areas. For implementation and near-term options, several factors were considered to develop additional near-term guidance for assets: construction cost, operation and maintenance costs, capital replacement, and look at what is already nearby and what is around. Need to prioritize where service levels are lowest and use equity to identify areas where new assets will be located.

Project team also looked at full-service Community Centers LOS and wanted to share that 70.6% of households are within 3-miles of a full-service Community Center. Full-service Community Centers have pools, so there is a link to aquatic LOS. Community Center work can be shared at a future Board meeting to go into more detail. Community Centers are at varying levels of age, condition, and size. Some carry a larger burden in terms of the number of households they are serving. Project team will share the slide deck with Serin Bussell to send out to the Board.

#### Comments:

Paddy Tillett appreciated staff for being very responsive to Parks Board's questions and recommendations. Paul Agrimis also echoed his appreciation for the level of detail that went into the LOS study. Bonnie Gee Yosick echoed what Paddy Tillett and Paul Agrimis mentioned – PP&R staff did incorporate a lot of PPB recommendations. There is a level of analysis done for the Community Centers that has not been done for other asset classes and that is important. Other than Community Centers, the LOS does not address density of the population served. Future analysis should apply density to the analysis as was done for Community Centers. Related to natural areas – might need to think of distance considerations in terms of being served or not served.



Dr. C. N. E. Corbin noted that “proximity does not equal access.” Ali Berman noted that natural areas are important for people to have access to, but also important corridors for animals. Even ballparks can have naturescapes and pockets of resources for wildlife.

**Question:** Adrienne Feldstein - How are services per person being calculated? Some areas seem overserved, but they are denser. And pool service – are pools being considered separately?

**Answer:** Pool service is not a part of this yet. Indoor pools are looked at as part of the full-service community centers. In terms of density, yes, analysis was done on assets in dense areas, but was not included specifically in this presentation. Do look at number of households when prioritizing Capital projects.

**Question:** Ali Berman– Will disability be considered in the future? In terms of an intersectional lens, more than half of people living in long-term poverty also tend to experience a disability, so important to look at equity in a variety of ways.

**Answer:** LOS team has a meeting with the ADA Transition Coordinator to integrate the LOS work into the ADA work and make sure that access for people with disabilities is incorporated into the LOS analysis. Lauren McGuire noted that Jill Hutchinson is the ADA Transition Coordinator, and she will give a presentation at a future Board meeting.

### **February Meeting Agenda**

If anyone has meeting agenda items, please email Bonnie Gee Yosick and Casey Mills.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59am.