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Executive Summary

Lents Park is an important hub and focal point of the Lents community. Located 6 miles from downtown Portland, what began as a 5 acre open space has expanded over the years and is now a 38 acre park and a highly valued asset for the Lents neighborhood and the City of Portland parks system. As the neighborhood and the city have grown, a wide variety of improvements have been made to the park to provide active and passive recreational opportunities.

As a result of gradual improvements, the park has limited cohesion of design themes among the various built elements, both active and passive.

In 2009, Portland City Council considered a proposal to redevelop Walker Stadium and portions of Lents Park to house the Portland Beavers baseball team. This proposal was not acted on, but the proposal did lead to the discussion about the future development of Lents Park, its current uses, and lack of a long term plan.

Later that year, the City of Portland identified the need to develop a 25-Year Master Plan for Lents Park using funds provided by The Portland Development Commission through the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area.

The master plan for Lents Park aims to establish a framework for future park improvements while enhancing uses valued by the community. The primary goal of the master plan is to create a long term design that strikes a programmatic balance and provides year round enjoyment for the neighborhood and region. Working with Portland Parks and Recreation (PP&R), neighborhood members and stakeholders, current conditions of the park and its uses have been assessed along with community needs. Through this process, the 25-Year Master Plan has been developed which creates a park that the public views as innovative and serves as a platform for future development and public reinvestment.
Executive Summary

The goal of this project was to use information gathered from a diverse range of public and professional sources to create a vision for Lents Park that addressed the needs of the community, Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R), and The City of Portland. To do this, we:

1. Collected background information
2. Assembled the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
3. Analyzed a variety of site influences and conditions
4. Conducted stakeholder interviews with community representatives

To further understand community and citywide needs, the first Public Open House distributed a survey to measure public opinion about park features and to determine what users desire for the park within the next 25 years. Based on community feedback, a vision and guiding principles were established by PAC members. This framework was used to direct the design team through the planning process and to determine programmatic needs and desired site improvements.

Subsequent stages of master planning included the creation of three, and then two, concept plans which were reviewed by the PAC, TAC, and local residents during open house events. After gathering public input, a preferred master plan for Lents Park was created by the design consultants and reviewed by PAC members who were responsible for the final concept recommendation. The PAC meeting notes and open house summaries are included in the appendix.

Through this process of gathering community input, the consultants were able to isolate significant elements to consider in the 25-Year Master Plan. Passive recreation was regarded as a very important component to include in Lents Park and was an underlying theme throughout the process. Many people expressed the opinion that the park was over programmed with active uses. Residents felt that Lents Park in its current condition lacks the necessary elements to make it a diverse space for a variety of users.

In the same vein, active spaces were analyzed to determine if they were necessary, properly located, or in need of renovation. By eliminating underutilized park elements and consolidating active sports uses, the community agreed that additional space could be allocated for non-programmed use in addition to newly designed passive areas.

The master plan is a conceptual vision to be implemented over the next 25 years as funding becomes available. It is intended to build on the community’s positive response to a range of elements found in draft alternatives. As a conceptual master plan, it provides future designers with flexibility to determine design details while moving forward with a diagram that embodies the community’s recommended vision for the park.
Existing Play Area at Lents Park
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PURPOSE OF THE MASTER PLAN

An area rich in history, Lents Park has been the center of the community since the park’s founding in 1914. Beginning as a 5 acre open space, Lents Park has expanded over the years and is now a 38 acre park and a highly valued asset for the Lents neighborhood and the City of Portland parks system.

Park improvements have been added incrementally over the years as population and needs increased and as funds became available. As of result of the 1981 Lents Master Plan, site improvements have been made to include recreational activities such as field sports and other active uses. Areas of passive recreation are less developed and are lacking in design intention and overall unity. Additionally, because the improvements have been made over decades, the park has limited cohesion of design themes among the various built elements, both active and passive.

The master plan for Lents Park establishes a framework for future park improvements while preserving existing uses valued by the community. The primary goal of the master plan is to create a long term design that strikes a programmatic balance and provides year round enjoyment for the neighborhood and the region. Working with PP&R, neighborhood members and stakeholders, current conditions of the park and its uses were assessed along with community needs. Through this process, the 25-Year Master Plan was developed which creates a park that the public views as innovative while providing a platform for future development.
Introduction

LOCATION AND CONTEXT

The Lents neighborhood, bordered by SE Powell on the north, the Clackamas County line on the south, SE 82nd Avenue to the west, and SE 112nd on the east, is one of the oldest and most diverse neighborhoods in the city. In 1998, Lents was established as an Urban Renewal Area in order to fund development projects that support community goals. These include generating family wage jobs, assisting new and existing business, improving local infrastructure such as streets and parks, supporting new housing construction and improving existing housing.

Located 6 miles from downtown Portland, Lents is a transportation hub for the Portland region. Three major arterials pass through the neighborhood which include Interstate 205, Powell Boulevard, and Foster Road. The MAX light rail system recently expanded to Clackamas Town Center bringing the Green line within two blocks of the park. Six bus lines and five existing parks are located in a one mile radius of the park. Within 1/2 mile of the park there are three schools and the Wattles Boys and Girls Club.

The diagrams on the following pages show the existing context of Lents Park and its relationship to the Lents neighborhood and the surrounding region. The map highlights how the area is divided by Interstate 205. To access the park, users on the east side of the highway must cross at SE Holgate, SE Harold, or SE Foster.
Introduction

LOCATION AND CONTEXT
HISTORY OF SITE

Lents Park is named after Oliver Perry Lent, a stonemason who came to Oregon in the 1850s to farm a 190-acre land claim. The area became the center of a growing farm community. George P. Lent, the eldest son of Oliver Lent, platted the town of Lents in 1892.

In 1912, the Lents community was annexed from Multnomah County and incorporated into the City of Portland. According to neighborhood reports, the original 5.2 acres of Lents Park had previously been used as a gravel quarry. During the 1940s and 1950s, parcels of land were gradually added to the park to assemble all of the land between SE 88th & 92nd and SE Holgate and Steele.

In 1953, the city prepared a central plan for the park, proposing locations for a baseball stadium, athletic playing fields, tennis courts, community buildings, pathways and parking areas. Construction on the stadium began in 1956. The stadium was named after Charles B. Walker. From 1930 to 1934, Walker, as a playground leader, supervised playground softball teams, and in 1934 organized the first industrial and commercial softball leagues. In 1935, he was appointed as the city’s first sports director.

In 1980, Lents Park was targeted to receive funds for general park improvements that addressed the needs of the surrounding neighborhood. A study was initiated to ensure that public improvements to the park were undertaken in a manner consistent with neighborhood recreational objectives and opportunities inherent in the existing function and character of the park site. Completed during 1981-1982, the Lents Park Study has since served as a guide for further development and improvements throughout the park.

In 2009, Portland City Council considered a proposal to redevelop Walker Stadium and portions of Lents Park to accommodate the Portland Beavers baseball team. This proposal was not enacted after significant community opposition. However, the proposal did lead to the discussion about the future development of Lents Park, its current uses, and lack of a long term plan.

Later that year, the City of Portland identified Lents Park as an area to receive funding for the development of a 25-year master plan. The Portland Development Commission, through the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area, provided PP&R with the funds to create a new master plan.
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HISTORY OF SITE

Below is the proposed improvement plan from 1981-1982 for Lents Park.
THE PLANNING PROCESS

The Lents Park Master Plan process provided an opportunity to review the existing uses in the park, evaluate their effectiveness, and consider opportunities to improve the overall park experience. The development of the vision for the 25-Year Lents Master Plan was a collaborative process. By engaging key stakeholders and the greater Lents community, park design options were developed and refined to create a final concept plan. The process took place from May 2010 through December 2010.

The PAC (Project Advisory Committee) was created to represent the interests of the community and stakeholders and advise project staff and consultants. The PAC was charged with assisting the design team with program development, creating a vision and guiding principles, reviewing conceptual design options and guiding the development of the master plan. The PAC was responsible for making the final master plan recommendation to the consultants and PP&R.

The TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) assisted the PAC and consultant team to clarify operations and maintenance considerations for the park. TAC members provided input related to stormwater, safety, crime prevention, and sustainability. The TAC attended the PAC meetings to aid in the design process.

The Consultant Team was assembled to guide the design process and create a final master plan for Lents Park. After a Request for Proposals process, Portland Parks and Recreation selected Walker Macy, Landscape Architecture, Planning and Urban Design as the prime consultant. Sub-consultants included Sargent Designworks for architectural analysis; Grummel Engineering for civil and structural analysis; and Architectural Cost Consultants for cost estimating.

The design team worked closely with the PAC and TAC members to create a final master plan that represents community needs. This preferred plan was presented to Commissioner Nick Fish and Parks Director Zari Santner of Portland Parks and Recreation as the final recommendation for the park’s 25-year master plan.
Introduction

The following diagram describes the dynamics of the planning process:

- **Project Advisory Committee**: Community sensibilities, values and needs
- **Technical Advisory Committee**: Policy, maintenance and regional needs
- **Project Team**: Design, coordination, public involvement and funding

**Recommendation**

**Parks Director + Commissioner**
THE PLANNING PROCESS

During the master planning process, public input was the main generator of ideas to create a 25 year vision for the park. Recognizing the need to reach diverse populations, where possible, materials and surveys were translated into Spanish, Russian, and Vietnamese. Three listening sessions, as described below in Task 4, also were added to the process.

Tasks 1&2: Project Start-Up & Site Analysis
The first phase of developing the project included the Project Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Stakeholder interviews were conducted to gather information from agencies which represent broader community interests. To better understand community and citywide needs, the first Public Open House used a survey to measure public opinion about park features and to determine what users required for the park in the next 25 years. Based on community feedback, a vision and a series of guiding principles were established by PAC members. The vision and guiding principles directed the design team through the planning process and determined programmatic needs and desired site improvements.

Task 3: Concept Plan Alternatives

The next stage of planning included the development of three concept plans. These plans were created based on site analysis and initial feedback from the public comment process and showed a diverse range of options. The concepts were presented at the Second Public Open House.

Task 4: Preferred Plan Refinement & Master Plan Report
Based on public feedback on the three concept plans, the design team developed two refined concept plans. The two options were aired publicly in a number of forums including:
1. Listening Sessions
2. Open House Events
3. Online Comment Forms and Periods
4. Lents Commons Coffee Shop

This information was used to generate a final master plan for Lents Park and was reviewed by PAC members who were responsible for the final concept recommendation.

Task 5: Master Plan Review
The Master Plan Report is an overview of the planning process and recommendations for Lents Park, based on public involvement and site assessment. This document establishes the final master plan for Lents Park and describes how the preferred concept was achieved using a collaborative design approach with the community.
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THE PLANNING PROCESS

The images below are from Open House #2 on August 26th, 2010. Residents had the opportunity to help the design team refine the concept plans through interaction with PAC members, PP&R staff, and consultants.
THE PLANNING PROCESS

The design team established the following approach to lead the project through master plan development. The Master Plan Concept was developed from May through December 2010.
Lents, one of the largest neighborhoods in Portland, is located six miles from downtown Portland and is one of the oldest and most diverse areas within the city. This distinct neighborhood is home to Asian, Russian, East European, and Latino immigrants along with many young families and established residents. According to the 2000 census, the Lents neighborhood has a slightly greater percentage of people who are under 18 (27% compared to 21% citywide), and a higher percentage of residents who are non-native English speakers (28% compared to 16% city-wide). The community embraces its ethnic diversity, strives to celebrate cultural differences, and promotes cultural understanding within the neighborhood. In planning Lents Park for the next 25 years, it was important to provide opportunities for a variety of populations and users to participate in active and passive uses.

Over the past several years, this neighborhood has also been the subject of much debate related to the proposal of the Portland Beavers baseball stadium in Lents Park. While the proposal was not pursued, the impact of this proposal created a sense of fatigue and frustration with regard to the public planning process, as well as lack of trust within the community. A goal of the Lents Park master planning process was to ensure that residents have their voices heard and to guarantee that their feedback was taken into consideration. In addition to developing a master plan, it was essential to do it in a manner that directly responded to the community’s concerns and needs and showed an appreciation of the unique nature of the Lents neighborhood.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Lents Park has a variety of passive and active recreational uses. This 38 acre site is widely used by both local and regional residents. The northern and central portions of the park are flat and open and are used mainly for active sports such as football, baseball, softball, soccer, ultimate frisbee and rugby. Circling the central soccer fields, a bark path provides a fitness loop for joggers and walkers. South of Walker Stadium, and northeast of the soccer fields, a gazebo with a stage platform and adjacent open lawn area provides a gathering space for public events such as live music, outdoor movie showings and community gatherings while taking advantage of the level topography.

The southeastern section of Lents Park was the earliest area to be developed. Beginning with a neighborhood playground park in the 1920s, this area has two tennis courts, basketball courts, ball wall, horseshoe pits, picnic areas, a dog off-leash space and a community garden. The dramatic topographical change in this zone makes it distinct in character from the northern and mid-sections of the Park.
EXISTING PARK USES

Since Lents Park is a developed and highly used park, with some recent financial investments, the project scope assumed that some major features would remain. It was decided, prior to the beginning of the design process, that Walker Stadium and the little league fields would not be moved. Other features in the park also were slated to remain however, their location could change as follows:

1. Community garden
2. Off-leash dog area
3. Sports fields to accommodate soccer, lacrosse, football, and other field sports
4. Children’s play area / water play feature
5. Park pathways
6. Restroom facilities

Additionally, a public process identified Lents Park as a site for a 5,000-6,000 sq. ft. skatespot to offer neighborhood users a closer location to learn basic skating and BMX techniques in a safe environment (Skatepark System Plan, 2008).
The park is mainly surrounded by single-family homes on three sides with some commercial properties located to the east across from SE 92nd Avenue. Given the direct connections with adjoining residential uses, the park should be planned to be inviting while minimizing its impacts on the neighborhood. Traffic, parking, noise and night-time uses all affect the surrounding neighborhood and have been evaluated in terms of park function and interface with adjacent neighbors.

Visitors can arrive via six different bus lines within a one-mile radius, and via the MAX light rail system. If driving, there are four on-site parking lots which provide a total of 149 spaces. Additional on-street parking is available in the public right-of-way on bordering streets east, west and south of the park. No on-street parking is available on the northern edge of the park (SE Holgate). Currently, pedestrians can access the park at major cross-road intersections.

Surrounding the park are sidewalks lined with street trees. These sidewalks allow pedestrians to circulate the perimeter of the park. Within the park, a central trail loops around the sports fields and is ½ mile in length. Circulation on the site is limited mainly to north/south movement with insufficient cross-circulation.

As a part of the 25-Year Master Plan, a recommendation has been made for improving diagonal pedestrian movement, ADA access and through-park connections. Additionally, enhancing connections to Lents Town Center is recommended to allow improved access to and from the park and to emphasize its status as a part of the greater Lents community.

PARK ACCESS, PARKING & PATHS
PARK ACCESS, PARKING & PATHS

The adjacent diagram highlights existing circulation through the park, key entrance points, parking areas, and significant topographic changes.

SUMMARY TABLE: Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Lot</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE Parking Lot</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Parking Lot</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Parking Lot</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Parking Lot</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including two ADA accessible parking spaces at NE Parking Lot and four ADA accessible parking spaces at SE STEELE ST. Paved Path.
Example of soccer game on synthetic turf
PARK STRUCTURES & AMENITIES

In an effort to establish the current conditions of Lents Park, an initial report was created by Portland Parks and Recreation to help identify areas in need of improvements, upgrades and renovations. The design team later toured the stadium and accessory facilities on June 21st, 2010 in an effort to become familiar with the facility program and general condition. Observations were made on-site with input from PP&R staff who were also present. Prior to the site visit, both the project architect and structural engineer reviewed as-built drawings of the original stadium construction.

Based on this background information and on-site observation, the following is a synopsis of the park’s built structures.

Walker Stadium
Walker Stadium is constructed with poured concrete with a brick facing tucked into an earthen berm. Above this is a central wood-framed structure housing bleachers and press box. The north and west wings are composed of reinforced concrete structures which are buried on three sides with earth. On top of both of these are aluminum bleachers.

The stadium was built in 1956 in a contemporary style reminiscent of Frank Lloyd Wright and emphasizes thin brick with horizontal projecting roof lines. There has been some deterioration of the brick facing which may require its replacement. This should be tested to confirm its structural integrity. Review of the archival drawings shows that the structure was well-built, and was constructed using a significant amount of reinforcement for wall beams and foundations. This is surprising, considering the age of the structure (1950). The base structure surrounding the field is all poured-in-place reinforced-concrete, and seems to be in reasonably good condition.

Center Structure: Currently, the stadium seating is only being partially used, as the bleachers in front of the press box, and the press box structure, are dilapidated and in need of reconstruction. This area was constructed with wood framing, and the wooden bleachers show extensive signs of dry rot, and have been closed. The rot is likely due to inadequate drainage in the stands. Additionally, the stadium seating does not provide ADA compliant access.

The central structure’s restrooms have been recently upgraded and should not require improvement other than routine maintenance. The “press box” area above the newly constructed restrooms have also been closed off due to dry rot.

North and West Wing: The earthen portions of both wings supporting the aluminum bleachers appear to have settled, thus making the asphalt surface lower than the top of concrete over the concession area and dugout. Another area of concern is the poorly designed dugouts, which are insufficient in depth. This lack of depth creates access issues, and drainage appears to be a problem as well. This may be contributing to water intrusion issues in the dugout. Additionally, the field surface has been built up since its initial installation, most likely through the addition of soil amendments as a part of routine landscape maintenance, and now drains into the dugouts. Consequently, the dugouts are currently not usable because of these drainage issues and the resulting sanitary conditions.

The backstop and wings are in need of new paint on framework and new fabric.

Outfield fences are in poor condition and merit refurbishment or replacement.

Stadium field irrigation and lighting are in good condition and require minimal upgrades.
Site Assessment

Example of softball game
Restroom Buildings
There are currently two restroom structures at Lents Park. One is located near the tennis courts (upper restroom), and the other is located near the play area (lower restroom). Plans and documentation of these structures were not available, but review of these buildings during our site reconnaissance indicates that these structures were constructed with unreinforced masonry walls and wood roof framing.

Upper Restroom: This facility will require barrier removal improvements to meet ADA requirements if it is reactivated as a restroom. Currently, it is non-functional and is being used as storage because its drain lines were plugged as a result of vandalism.

Lower Restroom: The restroom is functional and appears to meet ADA requirements. The existing lunch program requires accommodation of one or more refrigerators, prep area and shelving. Its restroom functions may be better accommodated in a new separate structure freeing space for expanded Park Lunch Program.

Gazebo & Stage
Currently, the stage platform below the gazebo does not meet ADA requirements for access. The gazebo itself functions as a bandshell, and while it is small, it is fairly new, as it has been constructed within the past 5-10 years. Its overall condition is good.

The gazebo is currently being used for performance events. This unique structure consists of cantilevered 8” x 8” columns which support a custom trussed roof with an art installation on the performance-facing side. This structure could easily be relocated to a new location within the park which may be more suitable for performance events.

Basketball Courts
The two basketball courts were renovated by Nike 5 years ago and are in fair condition. Adjacent to the basketball court is a wall ball court in good condition with a community-painted mural.

Tennis Courts
There are currently two tennis courts located near the existing basketball courts. These courts are currently in disrepair and need maintenance. Resurfacing, crack repair, and fencing upgrades could restore these courts to a good condition for public use. Re-purposing this area for basketball could also be an option.

Fields
The ball fields are in excellent condition as they have been renovated in 2009. There are temporary restrooms located adjacent to the little league fields.

The football field is in fair condition, but has some constraints due to its close proximity to SE Holgate and SE 92nd Avenue.

The northern soccer field needs removal of the synthetic goal mouths and renovation of the natural turf. The southern crumb rubber field is in very poor condition. Turf will not grow well on this field.

Soft Surface Path
There is a soft surface jogging path around the perimeter of the soccer fields and provides 1/2 mile loop. It appears to be very popular with park users, is easily maintainable, and is currently in good condition.

Picnic Areas A, B, C and D
While several picnic tables near the little league area were refurbished within the last 3 years, picnic tables at all other locations require refurbishment or replacement.
Playground and Wading Pool
Both pieces of play equipment (ages 2-5 and 5-12) are wood and need replacement. The wading pool is obsolete, and will need replacement.

Parking & Park Access
There are currently four on-site parking facilities. These include 62 spaces near Walker Stadium off 92nd street, 68 spaces off 88th and Holgate, 17 spaces off Steele Street, near the public garden area, and 24 spaces along SE 88th Street. In addition to the on-site parking, there is a significant amount of on-street parking surrounding the site, which typically seems to provide sufficient parking during large events.

SE 88th and Holgate Parking Lot: This lot primarily services ball fields 1 and 2. The entrance located along SE Holgate Street is a safety concern. This access could potentially be closed off, forcing cars to enter and exit on 88th street, or a new exit could be located along SE 88th Street to allow for a drive-through lot.

SE 88th Street between SE Liebe and SE Steele Street: This lot currently provides 24 parallel parking spaces and serves the off-leash dog area. This lot could be reconfigured to accommodate more parking by removing the separation island and providing diagonal front-in parking spaces. This potentially could add approximately 15 additional parking spaces if approved by Portland Bureau of Transportation and the community, while meeting the requirement of no impact to parkland or trees. If additional parking is not required, the existing island separating SE 88th from the parking area could be planted with trees to provide shading and stormwater absorption.

SE Steele Street Parking Lot: This lot provides 17 diagonal parking spaces that serve the community garden and the play area, and is separated with an island between Steele Street and the parking area. Improvements here could include planting the separation island with trees or shrubbery for stormwater abatement, or extending the lot eastward to provide more parking spaces.

92nd Street Parking Area: This lot provides 62 spaces and serves the Walker Stadium area. This lot could be reconfigured to allow for diagonal parking which would reduce the lot width, and provide additional green space. To provide the same amount of parking, or to increase parking, the lot would need to be lengthened, and one way circulation would be necessary.

All of the parking lot areas would benefit from resurfacing. This could be done with crack repair and asphaltic surface treatment, or with an asphalt overlay. This sort of maintenance would significantly extend the life of these parking areas.
Well Water & Irrigation
There is currently an active well on the site which is located at 92nd Avenue and SE Liebe Street. Presently, this well is causing some maintenance problems. The well has adequate capacity to serve the irrigation needs of the site, however the pipe used for the well shaft is corroding and causing blockage in the irrigation lines. The maintenance staff has provided filters and other repairs near the well head, but the ideal solution would be to reline the well pipe with a corrosion resistant pipe. Irrigation source is a well and the system is in good shape. It may need a filter on the feed line due to minerals in the groundwater.

Site Drainage
There are a few drainage issues on the site, including the south side of the large soccer field. It has been reported by park staff that this area tends to collect and pond water. Another area with drainage issues is the area east of the play area, and the base of the hill. These drainage problems are relatively minor, and could be addressed with the installation of gravel french drains which could be used to collect the water and drain it to existing drainage structures.
Site Assessment

Example of park with unique water feature
DESIRED FUTURE PARK AMENITIES

As the design process proceeded, there were several reoccurring themes reflecting users’ feelings about improvements that would enhance the quality of the park. The theme of increased passive recreation was a prominent topic. There were also suggestions to improve existing active recreational sports facilities. Many residents felt that Lents Park in its current condition lacks the necessary elements to make it a diverse space for a variety of users. The objective to design a park that also meets the needs of users who want to enjoy non-active recreation was addressed with the following suggestions:

- Increase number of plantings throughout the site.
- Limit removal of existing trees.
- Redefine circulation within the park to increase pedestrian movement.
- Create spaces that encourage users to sit and enjoy the surroundings.
- Provide a central open lawn gathering space for the community.
- Create a small, covered gathering space for educational and gathering purposes.
- Consider ways to increase acreage that can be used for passive recreation without reducing sports field availability.
- Situate the gazebo in an alternative open space area to increase usability.
- Convert wading pool to a functional water play amenity.
Lents Park currently supports a large number of recreational activities which are used by numerous schools, organizations and leagues in the community. The majority of recreational programming takes place in the northern and mid-sections of the site during spring, summer, and fall when team sports are practicing and competing. Walker Stadium is used by baseball leagues from April through November and does not serve any other use. In the 25-Year Master Plan, these recreational opportunities are examined in the context of their viability and ability to coexist with other uses over the long term. Through this process, program, hours in use, as well as community preferences are analyzed to gauge which activities and sports programs are under or over utilized.

The renovation of active recreational uses, while increasing open space areas for alternative applications, was a topic of substantial discussion during the master planning process. It was apparent that Walker Stadium was in need of a variety of structural and aesthetic updates. The center fields were talked about in the context of redefining their location and improving surface conditions. Synthetic turf was discussed as an option for all playing fields to increase quality and maintenance while allowing for multiple sport uses to occur year round. It was noted that synthetic turf would allow for less space to be used for active recreation, thus increasing available land for passive areas.

The adjacent chart highlights the seasonal recreational use of active sports.
PROGRAM SUMMARY

Through the community process of gathering input from residents, stakeholders, PAC (Public Advisory Committee) members, and TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) members, the consultants were able to isolate significant elements to consider in the 25-Year Master Plan. Passive recreation was regarded as a very important component to be included in Lents Park. Many people felt that the park was over-programmed, with active uses dominating the park. In the same vein, it was decided that active spaces should be analyzed to determine if they were necessary, properly located, or in need of renovation. By eliminating underutilized park elements and consolidating active sports uses, residents agreed that additional space could be allocated for non-programmed use in addition to intentionally designed passive areas.
VISION

The city’s project team and consultants worked with the community and Project Advisory Committee to define a vision statement for Lents Park. This statement was used throughout the master planning process as a concept that embodied the current and long-term goals of the community.

Lents Park is a signature park, celebrated for its wide variety of activities and users, and as an important community gathering place. The park’s distinct areas are connected by a system of pathways, and there are many opportunities to enjoy the natural environment, gardens, and landscape. People of all ages and backgrounds come to the park to relax, visit, attend neighborhood scale events, and use the sports fields and Walker Stadium in this safe, welcoming community gem.
Recommendations

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The city’s project team and consultants worked with the Project Advisory Committee to define a set of guiding principles for Lents Park. The guiding principles served as a directional tool and point of reference to steer the design process as follows:

• Provide a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities.
• Create good circulation systems and pathways into and within the park
• Design the park to be economically*, environmentally and socially sustainable
• Improve maintenance, programming, and development of athletic facilities to optimize their use
• Honor the visual character of the park
• Improve access for all park users
• Enhance community and neighborhood integration with the park
• Create a welcoming environment
• Celebrate history, culture, architecture, and botanical features

* Economic sustainability is defined as a project that Portland Parks & Recreation can afford to build AND maintain.

Examples of design possibilities
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SITE CONCEPT PLAN

The 25-Year Lents Park Master Plan concept is built on the community’s response to a range of elements found in the draft alternatives. As a conceptual master plan, it provides future designers with flexibility to determine design details while moving forward with a diagram that embodies the community’s vision for the park.

Entrance

The primary entrance to Lents Park will be located at 92nd & Steele to create a connection to Lents Town Center and create a focal point to welcome users. This grand entrance will not only serve as the principal entry, it will be an icon that local residents as well as regional users identify with the park. The entrance will serve as the starting point for the botanical walk which will meander through the central field zone and terminate at Walker Stadium. The secondary entrances along SE Holgate, SE 88th Street, and SE Steele Street will receive new waiting areas for public transit users along with plantings to create a more hospitable zone in this busy area. Interpretive signs and way-finding devices will be dotted throughout the landscape to facilitate park navigation and increase awareness.

Dog Off-leash Area

The dog off-leash area will remain in its current location. Residents along with the design consultants felt that this was a successful use of park space given its proximity to parking lots and separation from other programmatic elements. Improvements and new amenities will include benches, a drinking fountain and a clearer delineation of the boundaries at SE 88th and Steele. Low shrubs or bollards will be used to help better delineate the off-leash dog use with an emphasis on separating this area from traffic along SE 88th and Steele.

Natural/Botanical Areas

There will be several new areas of natural and botanical treatment throughout the park. These natural zones will add shrubs, trees, benches, and picnic tables to enhance the visual and physical experience for users. This area will begin at the grand entrance of 92nd and join an interpretive trail that will wind along the eastern side of the park near 92nd Avenue. It will also connect with the central field area which will receive the highest concentration of botanical elements.

Natural berms, punctuating the walkway, will serve as vegetated buffers to diminish street noise, and provide users with a sense of intimacy within the park. These vegetated mounds will boast seasonal and annual plantings and will have seating opportunities close by to allow users to enjoy the landscape elements.
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SITE CONCEPT PLAN

Open Lawn/Gardens

A new open lawn and garden area will be created adjacent to the southern playground area at 92nd and Steele. This area will take advantage of and enhance the natural slope of the existing landscape while creating an area that residents can use for passive recreation. A grand staircase will be a focal point which connects the lower gardens to the upper botanical area. It is recommended that the staircase be designed to deter skateboarding and other unintended uses. It will be planted with landscape materials that are hardy in character, as well as aesthetically interesting. Density and height will be restricted for increased security while still providing a sense of separation from street activity. Similar to the botanical area, this section will also be dotted with new seating. The location of this new informal space allows for focus to be shifted away from the park’s core, while providing additional program to Lents Park.

Existing and new trees

Residents and community members have a high appreciation for the existing trees on the site. The preservation of trees should be prioritized, especially mature trees, while also allowing for exceptions to implement the 25-Year Master Plan. PP&R will assess the health and longevity of existing trees at subsequent design and construction phases. New trees are proposed in the center of the park to create a more natural design aesthetic.

Play Area

The current location of the playground is desirable to the community. As part of the 25-Year Master Plan play equipment will be replaced and the decommissioned wading pool will be converted to a spray feature. The existing restroom will be updated for the summer free lunch program, an additional restroom structure will be added, and an expanded picnic area be created. Adjacent to the new spray feature, a children’s basketball court will be created to provide young users with a safe environment to practice their skills. This will also allow parents to supervise youth without having to leave the playground vicinity. Non-traditional equipment and environmentally friendly solutions should be considered at the play areas and spray feature.

New Play Area

An additional playground area will be added in close proximity to the little league facilities, and will be smaller in scale than the area to the south. This new area will allow parents to
supervise children while remaining in the sports field area.

**Picnic Shelter**

There will be three new picnic shelters added to Lents Park. One will be located along the natural walk, adjacent to the central fields and 92nd Avenue. It will accommodate approximately 8 tables and portray an architectural quality that is appropriate for Lents Park. The shelter is located to easily access parking and pathways. A second picnic area will be located near the new play area to accommodate those using the playground, little league facilities, and central field. A sink and counter area should be considered to provide residents with a food preparation space. The third shelter will serve as a community gathering area near the dog-off leash area and community garden. Additional clusters of picnic tables will be located near ball fields, central fields, and play areas.

**Community Garden**

The community garden area has been an integral part of the neighborhood for the past 35 years. The garden is heavily used with a waiting list of 15-25 families. The 25-Year Master Plan recommends that the garden remains in its current location and expands by 30% to the east. To integrate this feature into the park design, a planting buffer will be added around the garden as well as an upgraded, more aesthetically pleasing fence.

**Community Garden Shelter**

A community shelter will be incorporated into the garden area to create a gathering space and refuge from inclement weather. It is envisioned that this space will have flexible programming to accommodate multiple needs. Although the space will adjoin the garden, it will allow access to all members of the community. It may also house two picnic tables to accommodate small group meetings and events.

**Tennis**

The tennis courts will remain in their existing location and receive improvements as needed.

**Pathways and Loop Pathway**

A highly regarded feature at Lents, the central loop pathway, will be slightly expanded to be ½ mile in distance. Many users favor its soft surface material, but some worry because of its lack of ADA accessibility. To meet both identified needs, the path will be widened to create a dual surface treatment of soft and hard materials. This will enable a variety of users to take advantage of the path and more easily navigate through the...
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SITE CONCEPT PLAN

A new pathway will connect with this loop and diagonally weave through the park. This will facilitate pedestrian movement from the primary entrance to the northwest entry point, a key element that the community has requested.

Central Field

A new synthetic adult soccer field will be installed in the northern section of the park’s core. In order to minimize tree removal, maximize open space, and take advantage of other park amenities, it will be located adjacent to Walker Stadium. By converting to synthetic turf and adding new lighting, the number of usable hours will increase, making the field accessible to residents throughout the year and in the evening. This will allow for a large portion of the park’s center to be used for passive, non-programed use. New pathways, shrub plantings, trees, and benches will be added to allow users to enjoy the park’s open landscape and new botanical elements. Making this a synthetic field will necessitate a barrier to protect the investment. Aesthetically interesting options should be considered such as a seat wall, burm or low plantings. PP&R should avoid using a chain-link fence which will diminish the character of the park.

Gazebo

The gazebo will be relocated to the southern section of the park’s core in response to the new synthetic soccer field. This move will alter the rotation of the gazebo to north/south creating a more desirable orientation for performers and audiences alike. The structure will receive ADA improvements, a new foundation and any acoustic upgrades. PP&R will work with the neighborhood to manage any noise impacts resulting from events at the new bandshell.

Walker Stadium

Walker Stadium will receive much needed repairs and renovations to its facilities as indicated in the structural recommendations. The field will be converted to synthetic turf making it available for multiple sports uses during the entire year.

Restrooms

New restroom facilities will be added in four sections of the park as follows: adjacent to little league sports fields, in-between the adult soccer field and Walker Stadium, near the tennis courts, and adjacent to the southern play area. These structures will replace the portable services on site. New and innovative models such as the Portland Loo should be considered to maximize safety and sustainability while allowing access to residents year round.
SITE CONCEPT PLAN

Adult Basketball
The basketball courts will be relocated to the north of the 92nd Street parking lot, and an additional court will be added, totalling three full size courts. This location is advantageous to users due to its close vicinity to public transit stops and parking areas while clustering active uses. Fencing may also be considered to ensure that balls do not enter 92nd Street.

Vavrek Field
Currently, the football field is functioning well on its existing site and will remain at the northeast corner of the park. Improvements will be made to the natural grass field to enhance play. Lighting upgrades may be considered to maximize playing time along with partial fencing options to prevent balls from entering the street.

Skate Spot
During public outreach for the Skate Park System Plan, Lents Park was identified as a location for a skate spot. The community reaffirmed this during the planning process. This new area will be approximately 5,000 to 6,000 square feet, and is intended for younger, less advanced users. It will be located adjacent to Walker Stadium to minimize noise impacts and cluster active uses together.

Horseshoes
It was determined that the existing horseshoes feature may be removed due to a lack of community use.

Wall Ball
Wall ball will be removed. However, PP&R will look for other opportunities for a community mural in the park.
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SITE CONCEPT PLAN

The following plan illustrates the preferred concept selected by PAC members. The design encompasses the key elements listed in recommendations section.
SITE CONCEPT PLAN

PREFERRED CONCEPT PLAN: Enlargement

MATCHLINE - SEE PAGE 42
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SITE CONCEPT PLAN

PREFERRED CONCEPT PLAN: Enlargement

MATCHLINE - SEE PAGE 41
IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY AND PRIORITIZATION

It is estimated that full implementation of this plan would cost approximately 13 million dollars. It is common practice for projects of this magnitude to be implemented in phases. The PAC, PP&R staff and the design consultant discussed priorities for implementation. The PAC provided input on elements important to the community as well as how to group items to maximize cost-effectiveness. Also, it is assumed that any of these master plan concepts can be initiated via additional stages or singularly if funding becomes available.

PRIORITY ONE:
- Park Entry Points
- Dog-Off Leash Area
- Dual-Surface Path
- Natural Planting Areas
- New Basketball Courts
- Large Playground Improvement
- Water Spray Feature
- Small Play Area
- Community Garden Expansion
- Community Garden Structure
- New Pathways
- SE Lawn/Stair and Pathway improvements
- Restrooms at Play Areas
- Large Picnic Shelter
- Natural Planting Areas
- Walker Stadium Improvements
- Synthetic Soccer Field

PRIORITY TWO:
- Skate Spot
- Gazebo Relocation
- Vavrek Field
- New Pathways
- South Storage Structure Renovation
- New Restroom at Synthetic Field
- North Storage Structure Renovation
- New Restroom East of Tennis Courts
- Tennis Court Improvements
Recommendations

Example of proposed Grand Entry and Open Lawn Area for Lents Park
COST CONSIDERATIONS

Based on the preferred design concept, the consultant worked with the cost estimator to determine the total cost to implement the master plan for Lents Park.

- Estimate reflects 2011 dollars
- Inflation of 3% per year is recommended to be added to these figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Demolition</td>
<td>$444,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>$49,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Fields</td>
<td>$1,847,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Courts</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Equipment</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences and Gates</td>
<td>$117,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Structures</td>
<td>$744,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovated Structures</td>
<td>$349,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Areas</td>
<td>$1,073,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway Surfaces</td>
<td>$562,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Areas and Planting</td>
<td>$632,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Subtotal** $6,604,168

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimating Contingency (25%)</td>
<td>$1,651,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions/ Insurance/ Bond (12.5%)</td>
<td>$1,031,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contractor OH and Profit (10%)</td>
<td>$928,711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Construction Cost</td>
<td>$10,215,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs (30%)</td>
<td>$3,064,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost** $13,280,569
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OVERVIEW & SYNTHESIS

A Stakeholder Advisory Committee was formed to represent the interests of the surrounding community. Public and non-profit organizations were interviewed to gauge their sentiments on the current conditions at Lents, and to ascertain their sentiments regarding future growth and redesign of the park. After the initial interview, constituents were updated regularly on the progression of the master plan as well as public open house opportunities. This Stakeholder Committee consisted of the following agencies to serve as representatives for the neighborhood:

Lents Neighborhood Association
Foster-Powell Neighborhood Association
Friends of Lents Park
Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Council
SUN Program at Lents School
Rose Community Development Commission
Foster Area Business Association
82nd Avenue of Roses
Lents School
Wattles Boys & Girls Club
City Sports Workgroup
Lents International Farmer’s Market

SE Works
Portland Police Bureau
Portland Interscholastic League (PIL)
PAL Portland Youth Football
Portland Fruit Tree Project
Zenger Farm
Growing Gardens
Portland Sustainability Institute (PoSI)
Green Lents
The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was formed to represent a variety of interests and advise project staff and consultants. The PAC was charged with assisting the design team in the process of programmatic development, formulating visionary goals, reviewing conceptual design options and guiding the development of the master plan. Additionally, the PAC provided input on public involvement and facilitated community outreach and education.

All PAC meetings were open to the public and time was set aside during each meeting for public comment. Portland Parks & Recreation and other city staff provided administrative support and project expertise to the committee. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, which consisted of city staff from multiple bureaus, attended PAC meetings when necessary to provide input and guidance as the project developed.

Additionally, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) assisted the PAC and consultant team to clarify operations and maintenance considerations of the park.

In order to garner information and feedback from the public, a series of open house meetings were conducted in the Lents neighborhood. These meetings provided the community the opportunity to engage in the design process, and voice their sentiments about the current conditions of the park, as well as its future. Following each open house, a questionnaire and/or survey was distributed to attendees and community members to gauge public opinion and overall attitudes about the Park. Portland Parks and Recreation analyzed, collated, and distributed this information to the design consultant to aid in site program and conceptual development.

In addition to the open house meetings, Portland Parks and Recreation conducted three listening sessions with specific subjects to allow community members the opportunity to focus their interests. The topics discussed were active recreation, sustainability and community spaces at Lents Park. The goals of these sessions were to help participants understand the master planning process, engage participants in discussion, and allow for a free exchange of information and ideas. Input gathered was used for the final open house session as well as by the design team for the final Lents Park Master Plan.
The design team established the following schedule and approach to lead the project through master plan development:

---

### Lents Park Master Plan

#### Project Tasks & Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Project Start-Up (7 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Site Analysis / Program (8 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Concept Plan Alternatives (8 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Preferred Plan Refinement &amp; Master Plan Report (14 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Master Plan Review (9 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**LEGEND**

- Consultant Work Task
- Meeting with Portland Parks & Recreation - O&M
- Meeting with Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
- Meeting with Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- Public Open House
- Final Report
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STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Lents Park Master Plan - Stakeholder Interview Synthesis
Interviews Conducted by Walker Macy - June 2011

Interviews were Conducted with the Following Stakeholders:
- Lents Neighborhood Association
- Foster-Powell Neighborhood Association
- Friends of Lents Park
- Lents Town Center URA
- SUN Program at Lents School
- Rose CDC
- Foster Area Business Association
- 27th Avenue of Roses
- Lents School
- Watts Boys & Girls Club
- City Sports Workgroup
- Lents International Farmer’s Market
- SE Works
- Portland Police Bureau
- PPS High School (Portland
- Interandemic League (BLL)
- PALS, Portland Youth Football
- Portland Fruit Tree Project
- Zenger Farm
- Growing Gardens
- Portland Sustainability Institute (PSI)
- Green Lents

Overall Ideas:
- Redefine Lents as an active central gathering and activity space for the community; a strong symbol of the neighborhood that is more active with and is more directly beneficial to the neighborhood.
- Open space within the Lents Neighborhood is highly valued, especially as it is a dense neighborhood and will continue to increase in density.
- How could Lents Park aid in economic development or the creation of jobs within the neighborhood?
- Improve the links between the park, schools, transportation and town center.

Existing Assets:
- Public Transit Access – Promote the current strong transit infrastructure to the park.
- Create better defined and more welcoming entrances by bus stops and a stronger link to the MAX.
- Town Center – Promote a stronger connection
- Diversity – Continue to celebrate and promote the cultural diversity of the neighborhood and look to promote cultural understanding. Provide opportunities for a variety of populations to actively participate in the park.
- Soft Surface Fitness Track – Well used and loved by community

Improvements/Renovations:
- Playground Area
  - Renovate and improve existing restroom structure to include hand washing station and
  - Create a Spray Park – this would be a huge draw for the greater community, not just Lents neighborhood
- Sports Fields – Numerous schools, organizations and leagues are dependent upon the availability of Lents’ Fields although some find the fees prohibitive or so high that they discourage use (basketball fields in particular)
  - Improve quality and maintainability of fields, making play safer and fields more desirable.
- Make Walker Stadium a synthetic turf field that would support multiple uses and year-round play.
- Through the improvement of Walker Stadium and other sports fields on site, bored tournament play could occur at Lents, creating a draw with significant social, recreational and economic benefits.
- Make Walker Stadium ADA accessible.
- Football Field (Sports Field 1) – improve field, create a spectator area and add lighting for extended use.
- Create or Designate One Flexible Use : First Come, First Served Field for informal community use.
- Restrooms – Create more access to restrooms, particularly as stadium restrooms are generally closed.
  - Look for new opportunities or alternative designs that discourage vandalism (Portland, etc)
- Community Gardens – Keep existing and consider expanding locations for gardening (both for educational programs, instruction, and actual growing space). Gardens (both home and community) are an important food source for this community.
- Consider Smaller Plot Sizes to 10x10' to increase total number of available plots and reduce waiting list.
- Create a Small Covered Gathering Space within the Community Garden for educational and gathering purposes.
- Dog Park
  - There are relatively few complaints or conflicts with the dog park in its location, but there is a desire to improve boundary signage so that it is better defined. Is a different location in the park better?
- Relocate and Improve the Gazebo
  - Redesign so that it is ADA accessible.
  - Look to relocate it where sports activity does not interfere with events.
  - Look to extend so that entering sun does not interfere with performances.

Requests for Interest in:
- Amphitheater/Larger performance Space – Combine with Gazebo renovations or create a new space
  - Use natural slope in SE corner of the Park?
- Meeting Space – For community and educational groups to use as a meeting place or outdoor classroom.
- Create a Covered Space so that community can use it during inclement weather.
- Create/Highlight Educational and Historical Components - Within the park, provide the opportunity to create links between schools, individuals and the park through
  - Engaging Wayfinding
  - Historical and Botanical Information.
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- **Native Planting and Green Technology Demonstration Areas** – Heighten environmental awareness within neighborhood to promote the current sustainability efforts of the city and various organizations.

- **Skate Spot** – Viewed as a positive addition to activate NE corner and provide people, especially children, an alternative to crossing I-5 to get to Ed Beardsley.

- **Increased Passive Recreation Space**
  - Provide more areas for gathering both reserved and unreserved: picnicking and gathering.
  - Informal gathering space is very important for families and teens.

- **Improve Lighting** in parking areas, as well as the NE corner and Southern areas of park.

- **Create Accessible Paths** through the center of the park that allow for greater cross-park movement and connections to transit and the Town Center.

- **Create a Public Events Board** to keep community aware of events and programs taking place in the park.
  - Many people do not have access to or are unable to navigate the internet.
  - Ensure information is distributed in multiple languages.

- **Improvements Aimed to Host Vendors and Events** – this will increase the use of the park by local organizations.
  - Ensure that access to electricity, restrooms and some “dine-up” areas are available so that vendors can access the park and support events occurring in the park.

- **Increase Seating Opportunities** throughout the park.

**Park Safety & Security:**

- **Police Patrols Frequently** (24 times per day) and often engage in extra patrols to ensure safety.
  - Crime issues that do occur include drugs, drinking, suspicious vehicles.
  - Change in demographics in the past few years has led to a need for greater police activity in the area.

- **Most Cells Regarding Disturbances are the Result of Cultural Misunderstandings**
  - Example: People call in about loud, angry voices or report a light in the park and in reality, there is simply a boisterous game of basketball being played.

- **Currently, There is Good Visual Access into the Center of the Park**
  - Additional vehicular access through the center of the park limited to police access would be helpful.

- **Restrooms** – Auto-locking restrooms (that lock in evening when the park is closed) or Portland Loos would be a wonderful addition.

- **Lighting** – Fairly good except for the southern, sloping side of the park.

- **Steel Ave Parking Lot** – Very prone to car vandalism and break-ins due to hidden location.
  - Break-ins occur throughout Lents neighborhood. They are not concentrated around the park.

- **Skate Spot** – This would be an excellent addition.
  - Would provide a place for kids to gather, socialize and be active and further activate the park.

  - Be sure to design well so that it is safe and used. It’s the unused skate spots are prone to vandalism.

- **Continue to Design with Surveillance in Mind**
  - For future design and renovation keep CPTED in mind (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design).
  - This may conflict with high interest expressed in the introduction of native plants and additional natural areas within the park.

**Thoughts to Keep in Mind as we Continue with the Planning Process:**

- **The Impact of the Stadium Proposal**
  - Many people in the community, particularly following the Stadium proposal have “planning fatigue.” Look to implement projects to show forward movement and a response to neighborhood concerns.

- This concern may be temporary, a divide within the community and in some cases a lack of trust, bear in mind it may take time to heal and overcome the impact of this.

- The community wants their voice to be heard and feels unsure that their feedback will be taken into consideration and acted upon. Ensure that comments are being properly recorded and paid due attention.

- **The Cultural Diversity of the Lents Neighborhood**
  - As we think about Lents Park for the next 25 years, remember that Lents prides itself on its diverse nature and strives to continue to be diverse in the future.
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Existing Lents Park playground
PAC MEETING #1 - AGENDA

Agenda:

I. Call to Order
   Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong
   6:00

II. Welcome
    Sarah Costes Higgins
    6:10

III. Introductions
     EKW
     6:15

IV. Project Overview
    a. Committee Process
       S&F
       6:15
       EKW
       Walker Mays
       6:45
    b. Project Timeline / Process

V. Committee Business
   a. Meeting Schedule
      EKW
      7:30
   b. Open House Outreach
   c. Next Steps - home wdc

VI. Public Comment
     EKW
     8:00

Adjourn
     8:15

Tentative Meeting Schedule:

May
- 1st Advisory Committee Meeting - May 18

June
- Open House #1
  Week of June 21 - 26

July
- 2nd Advisory Committee Meeting - week of July 6-8 (preferable), or 12-15

August
- 3rd Advisory Committee Meeting - week of August 9-12
- Open House #2
  Lents Founders Day (14 or 21) or 28

September
- 4th Advisory Committee Meeting - Week of September 20-24

October
- Open House #3
  Week of October 4-7
- 5th Advisory Committee Meeting - Week of October 25-28

Portland Parks & Recreation
PAC MEETING #1 - SUMMARY

Public Advisory Committee Attendees:
- Nick Christensen, Lents Neighborhood Association, Friends of Lents Park
- LaTonia Foster, member-at-large
- Emily Golden, Rose Community Development Corporation
- Rachel Gonzales-Plan, member-at-large
- Ryan Greene, member-at-large
- Kelley Jones, member-at-large
- Kathleen Juergens de Pace, Friends of Lents Park
- Samuel Kael, member-at-large
- Sonia Montalbano, SE Works
- Core Lee Porter, Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Committee

Consultant Team Attendees:
- Colleen Wolfe, Project Manager, PP&R
- Ebrock Ralls, Project Staff, PP&R
- Anna Sirota, Smolen Gorski, WM

Public Attendees:
- Judy Welch

Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) and Portland Development Commission (PDC) Team Attendees:
- Doug Bresmer, Zone Manager, PP&R
- Sarah Groes Huggs, Project Manager, PP&R
- Kevin Cronin, Project Manager, PDC
- Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Public Involvement Coordinator, PP&R

Meeting Summary:
Welcome and Introduction (Sarah Groes Huggs and Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, PP&R):
- The Project Manager welcomed the group and thanked them for their attendance to the meeting and process. The facilitator led a brief round of introductions. During introductions, PAC members indicated their favorite thing about Lents Park. Comments included:
  - Trees, sloping area on the southern side of the park, and the play area
  - You can discern distinct areas of the park, and the park has great scale
  - The park across everything, it's a great amenity for a diverse section of the neighborhood
  - The size of the park and amenities in it
  - Varied fields, seating
  - Variety of things in the park
  - Large open space
  - The southeast corner, where you can still see a little of Lents history, a preserved stand of fir trees, and a sense of the gravel quarry that was once there
  - Sense of spaciousness, a variety of amenities
  - The park has the feel of having individual "rooms" - and a casual manner

Project Overview (Sarah Groes Huggs, Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, PP&R & Colleen Wolfe, Walker Macy):
- Project Manager gave an overview of the project. She highlighted that a master plan is a strategic planning document, representing the vision of what Lents Park would be, and why. Lents Park is a grand, developed park, and a signature park for Lents. The PAC discussed the specific scope for this project, and existing amenities and ideas that will be included in part of the Master Plan. Funding is not identified for the Master Plan improvements. A Master Plan is a first important step to seeking future funding. The PAC's recommendation on the preferred master plan will be forwarded to the Commissioner Nick Fish and PP&R Director Zuri Smerly. Once approved by the Director and the Commissioner, it will be presented to City Council for acceptance.
- The facilitator provided the PAC with an overview of their PAC notebook, and discussed the project description and goals. PP&R members discussed how to avoid email communication except for information sharing. As the project progresses, PAC members would like to use email for informational purposes only, that can be considered a future date. The committee agreed to and understood the decision making structure of the committee.
- The Consultant outlined the individual project tasks that will culminate in a final master plan, highlighting the PAC meetings and open houses will be incorporated into the master plan.

Committee Business (Sarah Groes Huggs and Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, PP&R):
- Identified PAC availability to set the open house dates and the rest of the PAC meeting dates.
- PP&R recommends to use "PCAC" and "who's who" for the upcoming open house and for stakeholder interviews. Their feedback was incorporated into the "Outreach and Survey Plan".
- PAC was informed to look out for homework shortly, asking them to think about and share their thoughts on a vision for the park, and objectives for the master plan.

Public Comments:
One community member suggested the committee work with Portland Youthbuild to distribute flyers.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.
Meeting Outcomes:
- Approve Committee Vision and Guiding Principles
- Agree to a list of program priorities and direction for consultants to use to develop design options

AGENDA

I. Call to Order
   Review Minutes
   Review Agenda
   Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong

II. Project Manager Update
    Open House
    Budget
    Process Review
    Sarah Coates Huggins

III. Vision and Guiding Principles
     EKW & SCH

IV. Site Assessment
    Colleen

V. Program Priorities
   a. Review Input
      i. Stakeholder Interviews
      ii. Comment Form
      iii. Scavenger Hunt
   EKW

VI. Public Comment
    EKW
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PAC MEETING #2 - SUMMARY

Meeting Outcomes:
- Approve Committee Vision and Guiding Principles
- Agree to a list of program priorities and direction for consultants to use to develop design options

PAC Attendees
Cora Lee Porter: City Parks Director
Nick Christiansen: Planning
Kathleen Foushee: Community Affairs
Nancy Chapin: New Member

Staff Attendees
Doug Berns: PPR Manager
Lisa Frank: PPR Intern
Sarah Coates: PPR Manager
Elizabeth Kennedy: PPR Manager
Brooke Balle: Project Staff
Colleen Wolfe: Project Manager

Meeting Summary

I. Committee Business
   - Elizabeth Kennedy: 6:00
     - Members reviewed the minutes from the May 18 meeting and were introduced to the decision-making process. Each member has a green, yellow, or red card that they will use to indicate their opinion. Green = support; yellow = support with reservations; and red = cannot support. The committee will attempt to reach consensus from comments by working together to solve problems that members can live with.

II. Project Manager Update
   - Sarah Coates: Hugino
   - Open House: The committee was thanked for helping with a great event. There were 300-400 attendees and 152 comment forms.

Budget: Copies of the project budget were distributed. $20,500 for PPR staff and overhead, $4,000 for PPR reimbursables, and $73,500 for consulting (Walters Macy-WM).

Process Review: Some committee members were upset that the survey was only available for 1 week after the Open House and thought there should have been more responses. Staff were satisfied with the responses and discussed what outreach was done. Some processes have received more responses, others less. Online surveys are not as effective as people might assume, and extending the deadline leads to procrastination. Kathleen Foushee de Foushee suggested that we postpone the project until there were hundreds of responses. Cora Lee Porter specified 200, and Cora Montanaro suggested rescheduling the survey for 1 more week.

Result: 0 green, 3 yellow, 3 red

The 3 people opposed to re-opening the survey were concerned about having to redo the project schedule and related costs, and were not confident re-opening the survey would yield better or different results. A second vote was taken to move forward without more surveys, recognizing that community members will have more opportunities to comment after the next open house when they will see 3 project designs, which can help people form opinions.

Result: 5 green, 0 yellow, 0 red

III. Vision and Guiding Principles

The vision was created from committee members' breakdowns and suggestions from survey respondents. 80% of whom agreed with the vision. Members wanted events to be neighborhood-scale without excluding non-neighbors, and natural features before sports.

Vision: Lents Park is a signature park, celebrated for its wide variety of activities and uses, that is an important community gathering place. The park's distinct areas are connected by a system of pathways, and there are many opportunities to enjoy the natural environment, programs, and hardscapes. People of all ages and backgrounds come to the park to relax, visit, attend neighborhood-scale events, and use the sports fields and Walker Stadium in this safe, welcoming environment.

Guiding Principles were taken from previous planning efforts and updated (changes bold):
1. Provide a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities.
2. Create good circulation systems and pathways into, and within the park.
3. Design the park to be economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable.
4. Improve maintenance, programming, and development of athletic facilities to facilitate their use.
5. Honor the visual character of the park.
6. Improve access for all park users.
7. Enhance quality of neighborhood integration with the park.
8. Create a welcoming environment.
9. Celebrate history, culture, architecture, and botanical features.

Economic sustainability is defined as a project that Portland Parks & Recreation can afford to build and maintain.

Guiding Principles: 6 green, 0 yellow, 0 red

IV. Site Assessment

Collins
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WM met with PPR staff and visited the site multiple times. Parking is generally adequate except for very large events like Founder’s Day. There could be signs for supplemental parking at Marshall H.S. and Holgate Park & Ride. Some parking and traffic issues from Little League and soccer but community members support those things.

Nancy Chapman, of the Foster Business Association, arrived and said she was supposed to be on the PAC. Members voted to accept her 6 green, 5 yellow, 9 red.

V. Program Priorities

Program Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Newer better playground, like being away from balloons, add sports court, add sports court, add tennis court, add basketball, add tennis court, add parking, add seating, add seating, add seating, add seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic</td>
<td>Move, covered area, add electricity, water, near activities and quiet spaces, cool sustainable design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>Keep trees, lose grass, existing trees, open areas, add bike path, add bike path, add bike path, add bike path, add bike path, add bike path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet space</td>
<td>Bench, located in mounted garden areas, attract birds, resources, beneficial insects, more dedicated, water, noise, shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/jogging</td>
<td>More crosswalks, more benches, connect paths define entry points, signage, keep it simple, could be more; consider multiple uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Courts too close together, add another court, adjustable height, benches, add playing area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking</td>
<td>Dog bags, better signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Underutilized, Marshall kids like to make their own, adjustable nets, add tennis court, enclosed out of park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Move to SE corner to take advantage of both, not next to parking, consider the noise, mandatory, closer to play structure, electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallball</td>
<td>Outdoor handball court, don’t like it, lower preference in survey, doesn’t feel like it fits, kids love wallball, make tennis court multisport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Public Comment

Walkers Stadium is expected to remain in the park. The committee was asked to comment on ways to improve it use.

Walkers Stadium: Artificial turf, fix up bathrooms, bleachers along field, multi-use, needs updated lighting.

The following list of features is expected to remain in the park. It can be altered, moved or otherwise modified depending on public input and committee recommendations:

- Off-field area: Site, dog park, area, benches, bags, trash, boundaries
- Community garden: Lawn for tools, meetings, 30-35 people, smaller plots, raised beds for seniors and AAA biggers, fruit trees, enhance bug trees
- Spray play: Near play area, lots want water, benches, shade, gabage, visibility, tables, bathrooms, picnic
- Skatepark: Kids need a place to go, noisy, great near one at St. Benedict
- Synthetic turf: Like grass, area synthetic, lacrosse, like turf, fencing fields in middle of park feel crowded, reduce amount of field space
- North field: Keep ball out of street, doesn’t get use.

The following items were suggested as additions to the park:

- Disc golf: Limited space near regional intersection, check out Pier Park
- Botanical garden: Integrated into passive areas, open areas, edge border
- Larger event space: Could be for farmer’s market etc. although most want to keep market in current location

VI. Public Comment

Raymond, Here: I work online isn’t enough for survey. None is big neighborhood with 5 parks so “neighborhood scale” is large. History, developed by volunteers, parking impacts on 84+ more swings and another playground in north open space used to be more people lying in grass but not now with dog area and 2nd field. Some basketball courts have mounds for sitting, gazebos should be ADA, PPR promised but hasn’t delivered, SE too small for soccer so old for soccer field, maybe smaller size there, used wallball as a kid, by playground, nice mound by Portland Youth Basketball, like spray, sprinklers also fine, skatepark really noisy, north field called Vach Field and used for football, soccer, lacrosse.

Adleren 9/60
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PAC MEETING #3 - AGENDA

Meeting Outcomes:
- Present design options
- Ensure the variety of public preferences is represented in the designs
- Commit to maintaining outreach for Open House

AGENDA

I. Call to Order
   Review Minutes
   Review Agenda

II. Project Manager Update
    Sarah Costes Huggins

III. Design Options Presentation
     Mike Colleen Wolfe
     Design Goals: Opportunities and Constraints
     Design I - rationale, strengths, challenges
     Design II - rationale, strengths, challenges
     Design III - rationale, strengths, challenges

     The committee will be given the opportunity to ask clarifying questions after each design is presented

IV. Open House Outreach
    EKW

V. Public Comment
    EKW

Adjourn
    8:50
PAC MEETING #3 - SUMMARY
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Members reviewed and accepted the minutes from the July 12th PAC meeting. Two changes were requested and supported by everyone on the committee.

The changes were:
1. Sonia Montalbano requested we change her statement under item II - open house process, reflecting that she had wondered what the project implications would be if the survey was extended another week.
2. Kathleen Jorgensen de France requested we note that her agreement for moving forward with the planning process (instead of re-opening the first comment form online) was based on an understanding that there will be further opportunities for people to comment (in an open-ended manner) as the process moves forward.

II. Project Manager Update

Sarah Costas Higgins (SCH)

The Vision and Guiding Principles as approved by PAC members at the 7/12 meeting were distributed. PAC members again unanimously agreed to these as the measures to hold themselves accountable throughout this process. (Pending correction of two typos).

PAC members were again reminded to refer to the Vision and Guiding Principles as the project progresses - making sure the concepts will result in a park that matches the vision, and embodies the guiding principles.

- There is not an arborist report on the park. The Urban Forester is aware of, and involved with, the project and will be even more involved once we get to the stage of implementing the Master Plan. The trees are generally in good condition today, though their condition may change by the time the plan is implemented.
- A handout was distributed containing requested information comparing Lewis, Columbia, and Laurelhurst Parks (size, acres, age of trees, active programmed space, open space). Columbia and Laurelhurst are older parks (1919 and 1912), while Lewis Park was primarily constructed in the 1950's - when recreation needs had changed. In 1959, for example, we weren't thinking about playing community games of basketball, or skate sports. Columbia and Laurelhurst do not have Master Plans. The Lewis Park Master Plan process really is an opportunity for us to think about Lewis Park, how it is used today, and how it should develop over the next 25 years.
- One PAC member had requested we look at adding disc golf to Lewis Park. PP&R and Walker Macy do not recommend this, as Lewis Park is too developed. PP&R has recognized there is a need for more disc golf, and is actively looking for appropriate larger, undeveloped sites to meet this need.
- Distributed a handout regarding Dog Off-Leash Areas, outlining the pros and cons of each, and providing some background information.

III. Design Options Presentation

MK2 and CW presented 3 draft concepts for Lewis Park, based on all of the input received thus far. They reviewed the project process, the project context, and the site context. Walker Macy has also looked...
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Q. Could all of these concepts actually be implemented? A: Yes, PP&R’s goal is to develop Master Plans that are planned to be implemented.

Q. How many attendees could fit into each of the proposed gazebo spaces? A: Walker Macy will determine.

Q. In each of the schemes, could you have vehicular access to the gazebos for getting honey baskets, equipment, etc., up to events? A: Yes, that can be provided.

Committee Discussions

Team members discussed the likelihood and difficulty of each of the 8 concepts. Attendees were encouraged to highlight pros and cons of each design. No final recommendation was placed on committee comments. Committee members were encouraged to show progress cards in support of other members comments.

The committee unanimously agreed to extend the time of the meeting to allow for complete participation of all Advisory and Technical committee members.

Q. Any general comments about all concepts:

More benches and seating areas should be added throughout the park (all PAC members agreed).

Paddling areas should be well lit.

Interested to see what the gazebo entrances could look like.

Unfamiliar, but better demonstrated DOLA 08.

One PAC member doesn’t like fencing — in general.

Concept Plan A:

Q. Football is fenced along 92nd & Holgate.

Q. Smaller additional play areas up by the ball fields (4)

Q. New gazebo placements (3)

Q. Play area may be acceptable by the SE corner if it were moved a little further from the street. there will be new tenant housing on that corner, and it would be nice to add some-ten activities.

Q. Large covered picnic area (2)

Q. Play area location + expansion

Q. Tennis court stays

Q. Bigger events could be hosted at the gazebos.

Q. Preserves existing uses of the park, and the sports fields.

Q. Path in the center of the two central sports fields is a nice addition.

Q. Additions to the play area, and that it stays where it is, with some separation from other park areas.

Q. Football stays in its current location

Q. Basketball court location

Q. Natural area placed by 92nd (3)

Q. SE corner used for the play area — would not be compatible with senior housing at 92nd and Harold.

Q. Two sports fields in the center of the park (2)
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**Concept Plan C (overall, the least popular)**
- Skateboard basketball at the NE corner field place/residence area (1)
- Botanical area location
- Gazebo in the NE corner

**Likes**
- Two sports fields in the center of the park
- Terraced community garden
- Loss of trees (1)
- Basketball court
- Too many radical changes
- Play area too small, near street
- Gazebo is too far from 92nd & the Lents Town Center, and senior housing

**TAC Comments on Concept C:**
- Skateboard and basketball are too close to each other
- The football field can move, but it's season overlaps with soccer, so you won't be getting as much field use

**IV. Open House Outreach**

**Concept Plan B**
- Southern end is for quieter activities
- Gazebo is moved away from the sports field
- Botanical area is away from the street
- One central field is not in use
- Play area is away from the street, and close to the active sports field
- Like the location of it – distant northern area, central area, and southern area
- Like the new location – it would be nice to see new, bold, bold structure
- Only one central sports field is nice
- Botanical area is nice
- Play area by the ball fields is a good addition (general agreement)

**Dislikes**
- Lack of community garden expansion
- Central path loop isn't a closed circle at the northern end
- Needs more cross path pathways
- Don't like hedges (general agreement)
- Gazebo location
- Tennis should stay near the basketball (2)
- Gazebo location is not closer to houses
- Play area is smaller
- Skateboard is too close to houses (not 200' away)

**TAC Comments on Concept B:**
- How far will people walk to a picnic area? Picnic areas are better closer to the street.
- PPBRC does not currently have carts for picnic area users, but we could consider offering this with an appropriate storage space
- Public Safety (L. Lee) likes the play area being away from the street
- Like the presentation (NEC)
- Like Walker Stadium as synthetic

**Concept Plan C**
- Skateboard basketball at NE corner field place/residence area (1)
- Botanical area location
- Gazebo location

**Dislikes**
- Two sports fields in the center of the park
- Terraced community garden
- Loss of trees (1)
- Basketball court
- Too many radical changes
- Play area too small, near street
- Like the idea of a different community garden footprint – but don't like the proposed location
- Loss of active area (tennis, baseball)
- Basketball and skate这对 are too near each other (general agreement)
- Feels incongruent
- Community garden location
- Gazebo is too far from 92nd & the Lents Town Center, and senior housing

**TAC Comments on Concept C:**
- Skateboard and basketball are too close to each other
- The football field can move, but it's season overlaps with soccer, so you won't be getting as much field use

**IV. Open House Outreach**

**Concept Plan B**
- Southern end is for quieter activities
- Gazebo is moved away from the sports field
- Botanical area is away from the street
- One central field is not in use
- Play area is away from the street, and close to the active sports field
- Like the location of it – distant northern area, central area, southern area
- Like the new location – it would be nice to see new, bold, bold structure
- Only one central sports field is nice
- Botanical area is nice
- Play area by the ball fields is a good addition (general agreement)

**Dislikes**
- Lack of community garden expansion
- Central path loop isn't a closed circle at the northern end
- Needs more cross path pathways
- Don't like hedges (general agreement)
- Gazebo location
- Tennis should stay near the basketball (2)
- Gazebo location is not closer to houses
- Play area is smaller
- Skateboard is too close to houses (not 200' away)

**TAC Comments on Concept B:**
- How far will people walk to a picnic area? Picnic areas are better closer to the street.
- PPBRC does not currently have carts for picnic area users, but we could consider offering this with an appropriate storage space
- Public Safety (L. Lee) likes the play area being away from the street
- Like the presentation (NEC)
- Like Walker Stadium as synthetic

**Concept Plan C**
- Skateboard basketball at NE corner field place/residence area (1)
- Botanical area location
- Gazebo location

**Dislikes**
- Two sports fields in the center of the park
- Terraced community garden
- Loss of trees (1)
- Basketball court
- Too many radical changes
- Play area too small, near street
- Like the idea of a different community garden footprint – but don't like the proposed location
- Loss of active area (tennis, baseball)
- Basketball and skate这对 are too near each other (general agreement)
- Feels incongruent
- Community garden location
- Gazebo is too far from 92nd & the Lents Town Center, and senior housing

**TAC Comments on Concept C:**
- Skateboard and basketball are too close to each other
- The football field can move, but it's season overlaps with soccer, so you won't be getting as much field use

**IV. Open House Outreach**

**Concept Plan B**
- Southern end is for quieter activities
- Gazebo is moved away from the sports field
- Botanical area is away from the street
- One central field is not in use
- Play area is away from the street, and close to the active sports field
- Like the location of it – distant northern area, central area, southern area
- Like the new location – it would be nice to see new, bold, bold structure
- Only one central sports field is nice
- Botanical area is nice
- Play area by the ball fields is a good addition (general agreement)

**Dislikes**
- Lack of community garden expansion
- Central path loop isn't a closed circle at the northern end
- Needs more cross path pathways
- Don't like hedges (general agreement)
- Gazebo location
- Tennis should stay near the basketball (2)
- Gazebo location is not closer to houses
- Play area is smaller
- Skateboard is too close to houses (not 200' away)

**TAC Comments on Concept B:**
- How far will people walk to a picnic area? Picnic areas are better closer to the street.
- PPBRC does not currently have carts for picnic area users, but we could consider offering this with an appropriate storage space
- Public Safety (L. Lee) likes the play area being away from the street
- Like the presentation (NEC)
- Like Walker Stadium as synthetic

**Concept Plan C**
- Skateboard basketball at NE corner field place/residence area (1)
- Botanical area location
- Gazebo location

**Dislikes**
- Two sports fields in the center of the park
- Terraced community garden
- Loss of trees (1)
- Basketball court
- Too many radical changes
- Play area too small, near street
- Like the idea of a different community garden footprint – but don't like the proposed location
- Loss of active area (tennis, baseball)
- Basketball and skate这对 are too near each other (general agreement)
- Feels incongruent
- Community garden location
- Gazebo is too far from 92nd & the Lents Town Center, and senior housing

**TAC Comments on Concept C:**
- Skateboard and basketball are too close to each other
- The football field can move, but it's season overlaps with soccer, so you won't be getting as much field use

**IV. Open House Outreach**

**Concept Plan B**
- Southern end is for quieter activities
- Gazebo is moved away from the sports field
- Botanical area is away from the street
- One central field is not in use
- Play area is away from the street, and close to the active sports field
- Like the location of it – distant northern area, central area, southern area
- Like the new location – it would be nice to see new, bold, bold structure
- Only one central sports field is nice
- Botanical area is nice
- Play area by the ball fields is a good addition (general agreement)

**Dislikes**
- Lack of community garden expansion
- Central path loop isn't a closed circle at the northern end
- Needs more cross path pathways
- Don't like hedges (general agreement)
- Gazebo location
- Tennis should stay near the basketball (2)
- Gazebo location is not closer to houses
- Play area is smaller
- Skateboard is too close to houses (not 200' away)

**TAC Comments on Concept B:**
- How far will people walk to a picnic area? Picnic areas are better closer to the street.
- PPBRC does not currently have carts for picnic area users, but we could consider offering this with an appropriate storage space
- Public Safety (L. Lee) likes the play area being away from the street
- Like the presentation (NEC)
- Like Walker Stadium as synthetic

**Concept Plan C**
- Skateboard basketball at NE corner field place/residence area (1)
- Botanical area location
- Gazebo location

**Dislikes**
- Two sports fields in the center of the park
- Terraced community garden
- Loss of trees (1)
- Basketball court
- Too many radical changes
- Play area too small, near street
- Like the idea of a different community garden footprint – but don't like the proposed location
- Loss of active area (tennis, baseball)
- Basketball and skate这对 are too near each other (general agreement)
- Feels incongruent
- Community garden location
- Gazebo is too far from 92nd & the Lents Town Center, and senior housing
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#### PAC MEETING #4 - AGENDA - OCTOBER 13

**Lents Advisory Committee Schedule:**

**May**
- 1st Advisory Committee Meeting, May 18

**June**
- Open House #1
  - Wednesday, June 23, 4:00 – 7:30 PM
  - Lents Park

**July**
- 2nd Advisory Committee Meeting
  - Monday, July 12th, 6:00 – 8:00 PM
  - Portland Youth Builders

**August**
- 3rd Advisory Committee Meeting
  - Monday, August 9th, 6:00 – 8:00 PM
  - Portland Youth Builders

- Open House #2
  - Thursday, August 26th, 5:00 – 8:00 PM

**October**
- 4th Advisory Committee Meeting
  - Wednesday, October 13th, 6:00 – 9:00 PM
  - Marshall High School

- Listening Sessions
  - October 25th – Active Recreation, 6-8 PM Lents Commons
  - October 27th – Community Spaces, 6-8 PM Lents Commons
  - October 30th – Sustainability, 5-11 AM Lents Commons

**November**
- Open House #3
  - Monday, November 1st, 5:00 – 8:00 PM

- 5th Advisory Committee Meeting
  - Date and Location TBD

---

**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kennedy-Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Minutes</td>
<td>Review Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Check-in</td>
<td>Sarah Coates Huggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Update</td>
<td>Sarah Coates Huggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>Design Option Presentation</td>
<td>Mike Zilch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basis of Design</td>
<td>Colleen Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarifications from Committee</td>
<td>Colleen Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Committee Discussion</td>
<td>EKW / MZ / CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferences, Strengths, Weaknesses, Suggested refinements</td>
<td>EKW / MZ / CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Consensus on Design Options</td>
<td>EKW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Open House Outcomes</td>
<td>EKW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Sessions Sign-Up</td>
<td>EKW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>EKW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PAC MEETING #4 - SUMMARY - OCTOBER 13

Portland Parks & Recreation
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

Lents Park Master Plan
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Marshall High School, 525 NE 82nd Ave
October 13, 2010 - 6:00 to 9:00 pm

Meeting Outcomes:
- Clarify Advisory Committee Role and Communications
- Review Feedback from Public Input
- Agree to Draft Preferred Design to be Presented at Open House and Listening Sessions

PAC Attendees
- Nora Lee Potter, Community Advocate
- Nick Cianciusa, LaDonna Foster
- Kathleen Mayfield de Hueso, Sam Keel
- Nancy Charter, Shell Romero
- Emily Goldhar

Staff Attendees
- Sarah Coates Huggins, Project Manager, PPRR
- Keetsa Craven, PDC
- Brooke Evans, Project Staff, WM
- Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Public Involvement Manager, PPRR
- Colleen Wolfe, Project Manager, WM
- Mike Zalis, Principal, WM

Technical Advisory Committee Attendees
- Anfic Ashley (PPRR - Sports Management Supervisor)
- Bob Downing (PPRR - Pack District Supervisor)
- Rosanne Lee (Office of Neighborhood Involvement - Public Safety)
- Ali Rount (PPRR - Dog Off-Leash, Area Program Manager)
- Chris Scardifield (Bureau of Planning and Sustainability)
- Walker (Portland Police Bureau)

Decisions are in BOLD

I. Committee Business

Elisabeth Kennedy-Wong (EKKW)

II. Project Manager Update

Sarah Coates Huggins (SCH)

Events / Discussions since the PAC met in August:
- Open House #2 was held on August 20th. Approximately 50 people showed up to discuss and provide feedback on the three design concepts. Three hundred and thirty comment forms were received. The PAC did a great job convincing people to fill out the comment forms.
- Commissioner Fish met with PAC members Nick Cianciusa and Cora Potter to build his relationship with the Lents Neighborhood Association and Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area Committee.
- EKW, SCH, and Emily Hicks met with Friends of Lents Park delegates and Cora Potter on September 26th to discuss the Master Planning process. It was a productive discussion, and the outreach input plan for the new open house was modified as follows:
  - Combined two listening sessions in the week leading up to the Open House. Information from the listening sessions will be presented in the Open House, and will be part of the comment analysis.
  - Consolidated the comment period to 3 weeks.
  - Added formal office hours (PAC and visit hours at Lents Commons Coffee Shop)

SCH discussed the Input Process flow-chart handout noting that the PAC role is a crucial role in the process.

EKKW gave an overview of the 330 comments received on the 3 draft designs.

Committee members each briefly shared their thoughts on the process:
- Sam: Urges the planning process to remain more on the conceptual level instead of getting too focused on the details - discussions at the detail level have been to the detriment of discussing the plan on a larger, conceptual level.
- Sam: Concerns member of the public that the work through SE Works appreciate the work the PAC is doing.
- Lents Community members using Walker Stadium have let her know it’s “almost time” to start the new Master Plan was created for the park.
- Kathleen: Concerned with the process, she likes the idea of the listening sessions, but feels there is a lack of a clear route for how the input from the listening sessions will be able to modify the plan.
- Nancy: Comfortable with the process.
- Cora: Agrees with Sam that the discussions are too detailed, and the planning process should be more focused on the bigger picture.
- Emily: Also agree that the plan should be focused on the larger picture, and keep the details to later refinement processes. She believes the plan is starting to come together and responds to the comments heard thus far.
- Nick: While the process has not been perfect, he is optimistic that we are moving towards a good concept for the park.
- Shell: Nothing further to share.

The committee discussed the listening sessions. Consensus was that the listening sessions should remain as they are currently in the process, and be used to provide qualitative information for the committee to consider, in addition to the quantitative comment form results (8 green, 1 yellow).

III. Design Options Presentation

Mike Zalis (MZ)

Members reviewed and accepted the minutes from the August 5th PAC meeting (9 green, 1 yellow).
Members reviewed and accepted the agenda, with the exception that Public Comment was moved up the agenda to occur after the Design Option Presentation (9 green).
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MZ and CW presented a draft concept for Lents Park, based on all of the input received thus far and their professional opinions. They reviewed the project scope, vision and guiding principles, then described the draft concept and the rationale that went into the concept.

IV. Public Comment
- fenced dog area is important - area needs better
- need water for dogs
- security fencing is important for the community garden
- Existing garden space is currently not used to full potential
- Noisy features should be placed far away from surrounding residences
- Explore costs extensions for emergency
- Like the idea of restrooms by the ball fields.
- Should consider a small dog area
- Lents residents love the park and want input on the design
- How can the public use an existing field while it being vacated?
- Don't like that all the organized sports in the park are at the north end
- There should be new pathway connections to the north
- Input from license owners should occur in changes to the concept
- There is a share area close by at Ed Benedict, concern about placement next to the ball fields (field language from skate park impacting younger ball field users)
- Fix drainage issues on the little league (ball fields)
- Like a lot of the plan - Friends of Lents Park is an advocate for input from all
- Park should be more of a holistic and meditative space.

V. Committee Discussion
ERW / MZ/ CW

The committee voted on whether they wanted to send this draft plan to the public without changing anything (9 red).

The committee then agreed to discuss the features in largely the same order as on the comment summary; beginning with the features that received the most agreement on the comment form.

Discussion Items:

Dog off-leash area
- Support fencing, as long as containment/buffer, not necessarily chain link style fencing.
- Area needs to be clearly defined; not necessarily fenced.
- Opposed to barriers/fencing on the perimeter of the park.
- Master Plan should say that association, like a drinking fountain, should be included in more detailed design.
- The public should vote on fencing
- Opposed to fencing, though barriers are good; drinking fountain is a good idea.
- Agree with all that has been said
- Like the idea of an undefined perimeter.

- Ali Ryan, PP&R Dog Off Leash Area Coordinator, also commented on the pro's and con's of fenced vs. unfenced areas. The recommendation would be to not fence the area, but look at better demarcation options.

Agreement: Dog off-leash area remains in location as shown on draft concept; more delineation needed; more amenities needed (bench, drinking fountain, dog bags); with refinements further discussed with the community at the listening sessions (8 green, 1 yellow).

Primary / Grand Entrance Area
Agreement: remains as shown on draft concept (8 green).

Play Area
- Outline of location is fine, but quality of equipment needs to be upgraded.
- Spray play should be integrated into the park design (possibly in the community park water feature).
- Consider adding benches or other sound hurdles between the play area and the SE corner.
- Concerns about kids running into the street - consider picnic table or plant material buffer.

Agreement: Play area remains as shown on draft concept; quality and type of equipment needs to be upgraded; spray play should be an integrated feature; consider benches or other noise reduction measures between the play area and the SE low/maintain planting area (8 green).

Walker Stadium
Agreement: Improved facility with a synthetic field. For soccer games, PP&R would need to look at bringing in additional bleachers (8 green).

Central Fields
Proposal to write into the Master Plan that if future other field locations are found, then there would be no central soccer fields in Lents Park (4 red, 2 yellow, 2 green) - suggestion not recommended.

- More public input on this proposal needed
- Concern about losing field permitting funds for the park

Committee and TAC members had a discussion about the option to show one field in the central area, but write into the plan that when another field location is found, within 10 blocks from Lents Park, then the second field would be removed and the area reprogrammed. SCII noted that this was not in the project scope, and that PP&R's focus for this project is Lents Park, not other properties. Rob Dorning noted that PP&R does own property at Marshall High School (for example) and that removing the open space reserved for flipping the field location might be possible, but some permissible hours would be lost when PP&R would have to shut down the field.

- Important to show the option of native planting/pathways, to allow people to envision a park that isn't there currently.

Show the programmed field to the east, and the native planting area to the west (5 green, 4 red).
Show the programmed field to the west, and the native planting area to the east (4 green, 5 red).

Agreement: East field (Field 1) = programmed field; west field (Field 2) = plants/open space for events (3 green, 3 red). Permanent removal of the western field would occur when another field was built in the area (10 blocks from Lents Park).
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ERU asked committee members if they were comfortable moving to a vote, instead of consensus. Committee members agreed.

Gazebo/Event Space
- Leave where it is currently
- Concern about relocating the gazebo to the SW corner of the central bowl, and whether that would necessitate tree removal
- Tents could provide shade to event viewers
Agreement: Relocate to the SW area of the central area (surrounded by soft-surface path) (7 green, 1 red).

Varrick Field (Football field)
- Concern about redevelopment opportunities in Lent and making a multi-oriented entrance/gateway to the park at that NE corner location
- Fencing – will be refined at later stages of design development
- Don’t like the idea of fencing along the edge of the park – could it be used instead?
- Along 92nd there is room for fencing, but along Holgate there may not be enough room
- Look at removable fencing opportunities
Should the group continue discussing fencing at this time? (6 red) – suggestion not recommended. Agreement: Remains where it is as shown in the plan; remains as a natural-grass field. Future levels of design to look at fencing options. (7 green, 1 red).

Pathways
- Need to add a connection between the ball fields and the SE corner of the park for people who live in the NW corner of the park but want to access more picnic areas
- Soft-surface trails are good for pegging
- Concern about ADA access on pathways
Agreement: Remains as is on the draft concept, with the addition of a direct link as possible without removing trees between the ball field pathway and the SE area of the park (6 green, 3 red).

The meeting reached 9:00 PM, and some committee members could not stay later. Committee agreed they did not want to proceed with the consolidation without other committee members present.

The Committee agreed to each make a recommendation on one of the remaining features for discussion for $&W to compile and send out to the group. The group would reply by email; if necessary a second meeting would be convened to finish the discussion and agenda topics. Email correspondences indicated the need for a follow-up PAC meeting which was scheduled for October 19th, 2011.

Adjourn

Public Notes – submitted in writing after the meeting
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PAC MEETING #4 - SUMMARY - OCTOBER 19

Central Fields

SCOR confirmed that the recommendation to relocate one of the central fields completely was outside of the project scope. After the October 15th meeting, PPR staff went back and conferred with the Commission and Director. It was confirmed that any loss of programmable hours could not be supported. PPR shared this with the committee and suggested three alternatives:

1. One central natural grass field, one open unpainted area where the programmed field location could flip to when one field needed a resurface

2. A synthetic central field - allowing for native plantings/pathways, other uses in the rest of the central area - while some sort of barrier would be required for field protection, it wouldn’t have to be a close-fitting fence. A screen or other creative barrier could work as well.

3. Two natural grass central fields (as it is currently)

- One committee member expressed disappointment that this was outside the project scope.
- Concerns that sports fields and sports use takes up a disproportionate amount of the park
- Synthetic turf has many benefits
- Sports are important, but they don’t use up a lot of the park space
- There can be creative ways to design spaces around sports fields - there is a lot of space ‘between the lines’
- Sports are not the sports park use - “soccer” space is park space too
- This needs to be a discussion with the community
- The idea of a synthetic field isn’t just a discussion about aesthetic qualities. Synthetic fields aren’t as multi-use as natural grass fields. One PAC member takes her kids out to the open field areas when permitted activities aren’t going on just to play in the open space.
- One PAC member recommended re-aligning the synthetic central field on an east-west axis and placing it up at the northern portion of the central field area, closer to existing athletic fields, parking, restrooms, etc. In general, PAC members liked the proposal for the synthetic field.
- This may necessitate some tree removal - preservation of the large oaks in the east is important.
- It will be good to show on the concept existing vs. proposed new trees.

Five PAC members preferred option two - including a synthetic field allowing for native plantings/pathways, etc.

One PAC member preferred option one - flipping natural grass field locations.

Agreements:
- Share two designs (of the central area only) to the public at the Listening Session and Open House: (2 green, 1 yellow)

The two central field designs are:

1. Option 1, with one central natural grass field, one open unpainted area where the programmed field location could flip to when one field needed a resurface (as shown currently on the plan)

2. Option 2, a synthetic central field - routed along the east-west axis, moved to the northern area of the central loop, closest to Walker Stadium and the east field restrooms, etc.

Regarding the remainder of features - the committee suggested the following with no discussion:

- Natural Desktop Areas (as green): 1. Support a natural botanical area to complement the Grand Entrance at 92nd and Steele, to enhance the natural slope above the play area and berm.
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2. Support a separated, moderate speed path along the Eastern side of the park, between 92nd Avenue and the central tennis area.

Large Covered Picnic Area: Large Covered Picnic Area (approx. 8 tables), located by the eastern edge of the central loop (green). In synthetic central field option, twelve would move south to accommodate new field location (green).

Trees: As much as possible, avoid the removal of trees. If tree removal is necessary, prioritize the retention of mature trees (green).

Basketball: Leave the basketball in the location indicated in the draft design (green).

Tennis: Leave the tennis courts in the location indicated in the draft design with improvements (green).

There were some questions and discussion regarding the skatepark and children’s garden.

Skatepark:
- Need to address community concerns about feasibility issues eg noise, inappropriate use and the need for the skatepark.
- EKW noted that all of the feedback for the comment forms indicated community support for the skatepark. The question shouldn’t be whether we want to see a skatepark at this point, it should be where to incorporate it in the design.
- Bryan Aptaker, TPP staff who worked on the Skapepark System Plan was on hand to provide context and answer questions. He noted that a 300’ minimum from surrounding residences is recommended, and that TPBRA has looked at noise implications for East Park.

Agreement: Leave the skatepark in the location indicated in the draft design (Green, yellow, red).

Community Garden:
- PAC members decided to let the question of whether there should be a designated children’s garden area be determined in later stages of design refinement.

Agreement (green):
1. Support upgraded fencing around the community garden.
2. Support a shelter in the community garden area.
3. Support expanding the community garden by at least the 50% shown on the concept map.

III. Listening Sessions / Outreach

The Committee discussed the Listening Sessions. EKW noted that the role of staff and of the PAC at the listening sessions is to explain the rationale behind what is shown in the design, to listen, but not to advocate for a particular position. PAC members also need to support the PAC recommendations, and not indicate where they may have disagreed with the overall PAC decisions.

Format: Committee discussed different formats. Listening Sessions will function as one larger conversation, with PAC members taking notes and having side conversations as necessary. PAC members will also be on hand to greet people as they arrive throughout the 2-hour period, let them know about the conversation, and encourage them to join the larger dialogue.
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PAC MEETING #5 - AGENDA

**Meeting Outcomes:**
- Review public feedback on concepts
- Make final recommendations on design concepts
- Understand next steps
- Celebrate!

### AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>Call to Order</th>
<th>Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong</th>
<th>6:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check in on decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Project Manager Update</td>
<td>Sarah Huggins</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Comment Results</td>
<td>EKW</td>
<td>6:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Design Update / Phasing</td>
<td>Mike Zilis</td>
<td>6:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
<td>EKW</td>
<td>7:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Committee Discussion Final Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Committee Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Sarah Huggins</td>
<td>7:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PAC MEETING #5 - SUMMARY

I. Introductions
   * Project Advisory Committee, Staff, and members of the Public introduced themselves and shared something they appreciated about the master plan process and something they would have changed about the process.

II. Project Manager Update
   * Sarah Huggins (SH)

III. Comment Results
    * EKW went over the results from the third comment period and listening sessions. She discussed her methodology in analyzing the comment results, and noted that they are not statistically generalizable, which is why projects have advisory committees, staff, and consultants to provide additional guidance.
    * SH noted that 74% of people generally liked the concept with their preferred treatment of the central fields. There was overwhelming support for the central field treatment shown in Option A. Over 60% of people felt that the plan was meeting every one of the guiding principles. The least liked item about the concept was the location of the skatepark – 14 of 71 respondents didn’t like the location. She also noted that the overall tone of the responses to this comment form was very positive and supportive.

IV. Design Update/Prioritization
    * Mike Zials (MZ) reviewed the input from the last comment form and the listening session notes, and determined that based on those comments Walker Macy would not recommend any changes to the concept as shown with central field alternate A. SH and MZ discussed the opportunity to document PAC thought on prioritization of master plan document. Not every master plan includes a prioritization of phasing guide. While PP&R’s intent is to implement the entire master plan, that implementation might occur in a variety of ways. The prioritization list will provide some documented aspirational thinking of community preference in the event that not all elements of the plan could be implemented at once. PP&R will, of course, also be responding to opportunities that arise, or maintenance that is necessary, in implementing the master plan.

V. Public Comment
    * Mike Zials (MZ) and SH
    * Three members of the public commented. Comments included:
      * Would like to see the gazebo moved (concern about noise)
      * Would like to see the skatepark moved (concern about noise, safety)
      * Think that the parking area, the dog-off leash area, and the SE corner are not priorities.
      * Like the native planting additions.
      * Would like to see the skatepark moved (concern about noise)
      * Concern about the proposed additional stairs at the SE corner, as stairs were removed from that location in the 2015's
      * Think there should be shelter for the picnic tables by the half fields/new play area on SE.
      * Like the gazebo as it is shown, with a sound barrier.

Meeting Summary

- Review public feedback on concepts
- Make final recommendations on design concepts
- Understand next steps
- Celebrate!
Don’t like that the gazebo has hosted noisy events in the past – significant concern from many neighbors about noise and that the new location would prove noisier for neighbors on 85th.

Would like to see the dog off-leash area improved.

VI. Committee Discussion/ Final Recommendations

Six committee members were present at this time.

EKN asked if PAC members wanted to recommend the concept without any modifications (4 yellow, 2 red).

PAC members brought up items they felt should be included in a discussion of potential modifications.

Restrooms: The new proposed restroom structure shown by the SE corner will be relocated to be closer to the new covered picnic shelter and gazebo (6 green).

Basketball: One more court will be added to the basketball courts (from 2 to 3) (6 green).

Parking: Though nothing changes on the concept, in the test of the master plan P&P will indicate that in future P&H will explore opportunities to increase the number of parking spaces without impacts to the park or the trees in the park (6 green).

Picnic Area: Add a small covered picnic shelter by the new small playground and little league fields (5 green). Nick Christiansen was absent from this discussion.

Central area (field):
- Leave the gazebo where it is currently, and shift the proposed synthetic field slightly to the south (where the SE field is currently) (6 red, 1 green). Concern from immediate neighbors that the new location might be noisier, some events in the past have been too noisy.
- Leave the synthetic field and gazebo where they are currently shown (5 green, 1 red).
- Leave the synthetic field and gazebo where they are currently shown and include a description of the need to mitigate noise impacts from events at the gazebo in the master plan document (5 green, 1 red).

Cora Potter joined the meeting at this point.

Kathleen Jaegers de Ponce requested a caucus with two constituents from Friends of Lents Park. They were not able to develop an alternative to the proposed design. Kathleen moved that the PAC shift from consensus to a vote. (7 green)

The committee moved to a vote:

- Leave the synthetic field and gazebo where they are currently shown and include a description of the need to mitigate noise impacts from events at the gazebo in the master plan document (6 yes, 1 no).

Central area (passive): Strategically design passive areas with improved native and climate adaptive plantings, pathways, and trees. Show fewer trees in the central area (do not list 60 new trees) (7 green).

Dog off-leash area:
- Fence the dog off-leash area (7 red)
- Provide better definition of the off-leash area using alternative barriers, such as low hedges, bollards, with emphasis on separating the dog off-leash area from traffic along 85th and Steele (7 green)

Grand entrance/SE lawn staircase:
- Eliminate the staircase for safety reasons (could be used by skateboarders) (3 red, 3 yellow, 1 green).
- Emphasize in the master plan that the staircase should be designed to deter skateboarding or other unintended uses, and leave the staircase as shown (6 green, 1 yellow).

Skatepark: PAC members heard some concern about noise and safety for the skatepark as shown on Holgate.
- Move the skatepark southeast of Walker Stadium (between the Stadium and the parking area on 92nd), with the understanding that some trees may need to be removed (6 green, 1 yellow). Also make clear in the master plan that the skatepark should be designed for younger or less advanced users (7 green).

PAC recommended the master plan concept with the alterations indicated above (6 green, 1 yellow).

Prioritization discussion:
PAC members moved to include the central area (interior to the central loop pathway), to the first priority list, along with Walker Stadium and the stadium synthetic field. All agreed; the items will be moved (7 green).

A PAC member motioned that the Dog off-leash area and the primary park entry point could be moved from a first to a second priority. The rest of the PAC did not agree, so they will stay at first priority.

VII. Committee Acknowledgement

SH

SH thanked committee members for their hard work and dedication to this project and process, and presented certificates of appreciation on behalf of Dawson Zarl, Stimson and Commissioner Nick Fish.

Adjourn 8:30
OPEN HOUSE #1

Prior to the first open house for Lents Park, a flyer was distributed throughout the community, among PAC members, and to stakeholders in an effort to educate the public about the event. In addition to creating a multi-language flyer, the survey distributed during the open house was available in several languages in an effort to reach a diversity of users.

The goal of the first open house was to bring traditional and non-traditional users into the park to understand current elements and explore potential future configurations and uses.
OPEN HOUSE #1 - SUMMARY

Overview
The goal of the Open House was to bring traditional and non-traditional users into the park to understand current park closures and explore potential future configurations and uses. By engaging the local community in a casual event, it was anticipated that we would reach elements of the community that may not typically attend a city sponsored event.

Comment forms were made available to all participants at the Open House. Approximately 124 comment forms were completed at the event. We received 125 comment forms in English, 3 in Spanish and 2 in Russian. A total of 132 comment forms were completed in all. The comment form was available online for one week after the event. An electronic link to the comment form was distributed to all current and community leaders.

Results
The following is a brief summary of key trends documented in the comment forms. When reading this information, it is important to remember that this information represents the opinions of 132 individuals. The data cannot be used to make generalizations about the entire community, but does provide a sense of how those who chose to attend the event and complete a comment form feel about the park.

Of respondents favorite things, only these items were identified by more than 10% of all respondents:
- Playground
- Green/ Open Areas and the
- Size and Location of the park

The following table shows how respondents rated a list of features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important or Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important or I don’t like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Areas</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Spaces</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/ Jogging</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponds</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Walking</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Ball</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Areas</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked what respondents would like to add to the park, again, only three items were mentioned by more than 10% of respondents:
- Other Recreation (this is a bit misleading as it included a number of types of recreation)
- Wood Feature
- Field

General Observations - Respondents:
- Don’t favor synthetic turf
- Think Walker Stadium is underutilized
- Like dog area
- Like community garden areas
- Like spray feature
- Like boat spot

Survey Results - Lents Park Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Items: 132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This sounds right - I share this vision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see changes to this vision statement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are your 3 favorite things about Lents Park?

![3 Favorite Things](image)

Please tell us how you feel about the following features at Lents Park:

**Basketball**
1. This is very important | 49% |
2. This is important | 40% |
3. This is not important | 6% |
4. Don’t know | 5% |
5. I don’t like it | 1% |
Total | 116 |

**Dog Walking**
1. This is very important | 47% |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gazebo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horseshoes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picnic Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Playground</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quiet Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking/Jogging Paths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wall Ball</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - This is very important</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - This is important</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - This is not important</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - I don't know</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like it</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Suggested improvements for the Dog Off-Leash Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fences</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Areas for Different Crops</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-locate</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do you have any ideas or suggestions for how the community garden area could be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep as is</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make improvements</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

- 126 respondents
- Walker Stadium will continue to be a feature of Lents Park in its current location. Do you have any ideas or suggestions about the stadium?
  - Redevelop field to accommodate multiple sports: 47 (45%)
  - Use facility for activities other than sports: 36 (35%)
  - Make stadium more accessible to park users: 21 (20%)
  - Total: 104

- Do you have any ideas or suggestions for how the Dog Off-Leash Area could be improved?
  - Keep as is: 75 (73%)
  - Make improvements: 28 (27%)
  - Total: 103

### Other Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Market</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tease</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fountain</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Path</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym/Recreation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Leash</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lents Park

Lents Park has three natural grass sports fields. PP&R has recently begun to replace some natural grass fields with synthetic turf. Synthetic turf can take heavier and longer use with less maintenance. This could increase the amount of time the fields are available. Some people believe that grass fields provide a better play surface.

- Keep open natural grass fields: 81 (68%)
- Convert natural grass fields to fenced synthetic turf: 26 (21%)
- Convert natural grass fields to synthetic turf and reduce the number of fields from 3 to 2: 13 (11%)

- Total: 122 respondents
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The following park features are in planning documents for future development. How do you feel about them?

**Spray Play (interactive water feature to replace the wading pool which was closed due to state law)**
- Still a good idea: 90 (73%)
- Good but not a priority: 16 (13%)
- Don't know: 11 (9%)
- Don't want it: 6 (5%)

**Total:** 123

**Skate Spot**
- Still a good idea: 71 (58%)
- Good but not a priority: 23 (19%)
- Don't want it: 19 (15%)
- Don't know: 10 (8%)

**Total:** 123

Is there anything else you would like the Lents Park Advisory Committee to know?

**Just a little bit more...**

**Did you attend the Open House on June 23?**
- Yes: 93 (67%)
- No: 41 (33%)

**Total:** 124

**How did you hear about the Open House?**
- Flyer: 45 (52%)
- Neighborhood Association: 16 (19%)
- Poster: 15 (17%)
- Online: 6 (7%)
- Email Announcement: 5 (6%)

**Total:** 87

**How do you typically get to the park? (check each that applies)**
- Bike: 18 (11%)
- Bus/MAX: 8 (5%)
- Drive: 61 (38%)
- Walk: 72 (45%)

**Total:** 159

**What is your gender?**
- Female: 69 (56%)
- Male: 54 (44%)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is your age group?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What best describes your race or ethnicity? (check all that apply) (Individual Values)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 126 |
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OPEN HOUSE #2

Prior to the second open house for Lents Park, a flyer was distributed throughout the community, among PAC members, and to stakeholders in an effort to educate the public about the event.

The aim of the second open house was to bring traditional and non-traditional users together to comment on 3 draft concepts for Lents Park in a workshop-style format.
OPEN HOUSE #2

Lents Open House #2
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OPEN HOUSE #2
OPEN HOUSE #2 - SUMMARY

Assumptions:
- If respondent said “I like A” I did not track comment – it was captured in the circled comment
- Multiple thoughts in comments were separated – I am concerned about maintenance but like size = 2 comments
- Comments were generalized and grouped
- Rhetorical questions and “digs” were not tracked
- Features that people liked the most and least are highlighted

Features in order of number of comments:
- Skate Spot
- Pathways
- Dog Area
- Performance
- Events
- Natural Areas
- Community Garden
- Central Fields
- Entrance
- Play Area
- Tennis
- Walker Stadium
- Vavrek Field
- Covered Picnic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
<th>Concept C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Off-Leash Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change to off-leash area location.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Off-leash area moved to east side of park. Must be fenced in this location.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
<td>3 - I don’t have an opinion</td>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence this - 11</td>
<td>Fence - 4</td>
<td>Too close to 92nd - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase park access - 1</td>
<td>Encroaches on heritage trees - 1</td>
<td>Breaks up park - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like L shape - 1</td>
<td>Increase park access - 1</td>
<td>Too close to picnic - 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 2. Entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like fence - 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like fence</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't change</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fence</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small dog area</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fence along</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bench</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too big</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash cans</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bigger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picnic table</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compost facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comments:</strong></th>
<th>1 like/a lot</th>
<th>1 I don't have an opinion</th>
<th>5 I don't like/dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand entrance at SE 92nd and Steele, creating a connection to Lents Town Center.</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like proximity to gazebo - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too close to residential - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - I like/a lot</th>
<th>52.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - I like/a lot</th>
<th>41.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connect to light rail - 2
No parking - 2
More visible - 4
More welcoming - 1
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#### 3. Skatespot (5,000-6,000 SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1 - I like a lot</th>
<th>3 - I don't have an opinion</th>
<th>5 - I don't like/dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skatespot north of Little League, closer to 88th Ave.</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skatespot on east side of park, north of parking lot.</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skatespot in NE corner of park.</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- Good for park - 42
- Allow BMX - 29
- No - 16
- Close to 92nd & Holgate - 9
- Lighting - 7
- Inappropriate activity - 5
- Separate skill levels - 4
- Don't separate skills - 4
- Not by baseball - 3
- Flat skate area - 3
- Integrate with other activities - 2
- Close to parking - 1
- Safety - 1
- Away from parking - 1
- In center of park - 1
- Bigger - 1
- Not near entrance - 1
- Near dog park - 1
- Spread out activities - 1

**General Comments:**
- Good use of space - 1
- Conflict between basketball & skatespot - 2
- Not pretty - 1
- Keep away from children - 1
### 4. Natural/Botanic Areas – Interpretive Walk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - I like/a lot</th>
<th>54.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don’t have an opinion</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don’t like/dislike</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Like trees – 2
- Visibility – 2
- Nice break from 92nd – 1
- Too close to 92nd – 12
- Noisy but good – 1

#### Comments:
- yes: 25
- no: 9
- no tree loss: 6
- native plants: 5
- maintenance: 5
- safety: 3
- pond: 2
- interpretive features: 2
- south of little league: 1
- no field loss: 1
- combine B & C: 1
- landscape slope: 1
- plants by ballfields: 1
- ADA: 1

### 5. Play Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The play area stays where it is.</th>
<th>The play area is moved out of the bowl, closer to the central area of the park.</th>
<th>The play area remains generally the same.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don’t have an opinion</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3 - I don’t have an opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 = I don't like/dislike</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>5 = I don't like/dislike</th>
<th>42.2</th>
<th>5 = I don't like/dislike</th>
<th>22.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate basketball and skate - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too far from store - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skatedot good - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good size - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not visible - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make bigger - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like skatedot - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too much - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't remove tennis - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closer to activity - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Away from traffic - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- no change: 16
- like spray: 6
- bigger: 6
- maintenance: 3
- like little league features: 3
- no skatedot: 3
- no tree loss: 3
- combine skate features: 2
- no kid basketball: 2
- shade: 1
- away from adult activities: 1
- benches: 1
- use horseshoe area: 1
- safety: 1
- more challenging structures: 1

**Should an additional play area be added next to the Little League fields? (circle one)**
- Yes: 62.2%
- No: 37.8%

**Should we include (circle one): A Junior basketball area?**
- Yes: 53.1%
- No: 46.9%

**Skatedot?**
- Yes: 54.0%
- No: 46.0%

#### Walker Stadium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No change, baseball only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Install synthetic field to increase amount and type of play (baseball, soccer, football)</th>
<th>Install synthetic field to increase amount and type of play (baseball, soccer, football)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like a lot</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1 - I like a lot</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
### Appendix C: Open House Summaries

#### 7. Central Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two programmed fields. One synthetic, fenced with lighting for extended play. One natural grass.</th>
<th>One programmed field. One grassy field left open for community use. Informal play. Field location “flips” every few years for maintenance.</th>
<th>Two programmed fields. One serves both soccer and football.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 - I like/a lot</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 - I like/a lot</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 - I like/a lot</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 - I don’t have an opinion</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 - I don’t have an opinion</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 - I don’t have an opinion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 - I don’t like/dislike</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 - I don’t like/dislike</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 - I don’t like/dislike</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Like more use – 4**

**No fence – 9**

**Comments:**

- Grass: 8
- No tree loss: 3
- Maintenance: 2
- All synthetic: 5
- No synthetic: 4
- Consider rugby: 3
- Don’t lose Vavrek: 1
- More lights: 4
- No change: 5
- No lights: 1
- Combine A & C: 2
- Less sports: 1
- Use Marshall: 2
- Landscaping: 1
### 8. Performance / Event Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - I like/a lot</th>
<th>2 - I don't have an opinion</th>
<th>3 - I don't like/dislike</th>
<th>1 - I like/a lot</th>
<th>2 - I don't have an opinion</th>
<th>3 - I don't like/dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Good acoustics - 4
- Too close to homes - 5
- Too near 92" - 1
- Less traffic noise - 1
- Terraced seating - 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserved - 72.9%</th>
<th>Replaced - 22.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y es - 55.2%</td>
<td>N o - 44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y es - 28.4%</td>
<td>N o - 71.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like the gazebo to be (circle one)
I would like to see a larger acoustically designed band shell (circle one)
I would like a pave plaza area (circle one)

**Comments:**
- no change: 23
- no more pavement: 6
- paved plaza: 5
- take advantage of topography: 4
- lower roof: 3
- increase programming: 2
- keep gazebo features: 2
- good investment: 2
- two spaces and a plaza: 1
- preservation of gazebo too $: 1
- get rid of gazebo: 1
- more use: 1
- no field loss: 1
- no more programs: 1
- shade: 1
### 9. Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
<th>Concept C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less change</td>
<td>Cover more ground</td>
<td>Preserves open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like path through center</td>
<td>Position/flow makes sense</td>
<td>Pretty/nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like path through center</td>
<td>More in trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- no change | 13 |
- like loop | 4 |
- more natural paths | 3 |
- don’t cut trees | 2 |
- lighting | 1 |
- provide way through park | 1 |
- all poor | 1 |
- like continuity between play and paths | 1 |
- paved | 1 |
- like path around diamond | 1 |

Should a soft-surface walking loop remain in the central area of the park, or move to circle the Walker Stadium area? (check one)

- 73.1% Central area of park
- 11.4% Walker Stadium area
- 15.5% Do not feel there needs to be a soft-surface path loop

### 10. Football Field (Vavrek Field)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remains at current location</th>
<th>Remains at current location</th>
<th>Football field is replaced with basketball and/or skate spot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like a lot</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1 - I like a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don’t have an opinion</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3 - I don’t have an opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don’t like/dislike</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5 - I don’t like/dislike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- No lighting | 1 |
- No synthetic | 2 |
- Basketball too close to 82nd |  |
- More use | 1 |
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### 11. Community Garden

Community garden space is expanded and a facility is added for storage and meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Put storage on east side - 2
- Increase size - 1
- Too big - 3
- Ugly - 3
- Entrance to park - 1
- Better sunlight - 1
- Access to parking - 1

### No change to size. Facility is added for storage and meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Too close to Steele - 1
- Ugly - 1

### Garden is relocated and terraced in bowl area. Facility is added for storage and meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - I like/a lot</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Loss of space - 1
- Accessibility - 2
- Lovely - 4
- Erosion - 1
- Maintenance - 2
- Sunlight concerns - 5

### Comments:

- too big/underutilized - 12
- more space - 10
- like gardens - 9
- no change - 6
- no tree loss - 7
- storage - yes - 5
- storage - no - 5
- meeting space - no - 5
- private use - 3
- meeting space - yes - 2
- bulletin board - 2
- add grapes/fruit etc. - 1
- extend roof for dog area - 1
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12. Large Covered Picnic Area (approximately 8 tables) (Note: additional open picnic areas are also included in all concepts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Like a lot</th>
<th>Don't have an opinion</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural area, recreational fields, and walker stadium</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of recreational fields, next to children's play area and natural area</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located between bowl, play area and natural area</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't move gazebo – 2
Covered area closer to picnic area – 1
Good for games – 1

Comments:
- Like picnic/play
- Proximity – 12
- No large area – 5
- No tree loss – 5
- More tables – 5
- Good – 5
- Access from street – 2
- Trash/maintenance – 2
- Inappropriate use – 1
- Keep horseshoes – 1
- Connect to businesses – 1
- Near perennial garden – 1

13. Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved tennis area</th>
<th>Like a lot</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis removed</td>
<td>Like a lot</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Improved tennis area – 50
- Tennis removed – 50
- Tennis removed – 50

Comments:
- Like picnic/play
- Proximity – 12
- No large area – 5
- No tree loss – 5
- More tables – 5
- Good – 5
- Access from street – 2
- Trash/maintenance – 2
- Inappropriate use – 1
- Keep horseshoes – 1
- Connect to businesses – 1
- Near perennial garden – 1
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#### 14. Basketball

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>don't remove</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaller</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move (to north)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use courts for something else</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good fit with kids area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14. Basketball Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball on east side of park, north of parking lot.</td>
<td>1 - I like/a lot 44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion 37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball on east side of park, just south of parking lot.</td>
<td>1 - I like/a lot 33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion 41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike 25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball in NE corner of park.</td>
<td>1 - I like/a lot 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - I don't have an opinion 34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - I don't like/dislike 44.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments:
- 1. Away from play area – 1
- 2. Good use of space – 1
- 3. Not by parking – 1
- 4. Like parking - 2

#### 15. Each of these three concepts may require some tree removal. PP&R will plant additional trees to compensate for the loss of trees. (check one)

- 65.4% It is important to me to preserve as many existing trees as possible.
- 31.2% If PP&R re-plants trees elsewhere, I am OK with removing existing trees as necessary.
- 3.3% I am not concerned about the trees.
16. Would you like to see any of these concepts modified in any way and if so, how?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
<th>Concept C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make center fields like B – 2</td>
<td>Add tennis – 3</td>
<td>Preserve Vavrek – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one comment each –</td>
<td>Like spray – 2</td>
<td>Like center – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t light soccer</td>
<td>One comment each –</td>
<td>Keep community gardens where they are and expand – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make walker synthetic</td>
<td>Play area closer to residences</td>
<td>Improve Vavrek with synthetic and lights – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate basketball like B</td>
<td>Like picnic area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand off-leash</td>
<td>Like restrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter on east side of garden</td>
<td>Eliminate horseshoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like tennis</td>
<td>Extend nature walk along bowl edge to se corner where topography hits 92nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like kids basketball</td>
<td>Too much sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like kids skate</td>
<td>Add fields from A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No synthetic center</td>
<td>Add skate spot from A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add basketball and skate spot in C</td>
<td>Like play area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put primary entrance at 92nd &amp; Holgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No walkway between fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments:**
- keep trees: 22
- no change: 10
- fenced dog area: 10
- maintenance: 7
- big skate park: 5
- bulletin boards: 5
- native plants: 5
- emphasize nature: 4
- less sport fields: 4
- open restrooms: 3
- add sand volleyball: 3
- keep tennis: 3
- bmx trails: 2
- fix NW corner plantings: 1
- like little league play: 1
- don’t move basketball: 1
- connect to transit: 1
- create space for food carts: 1
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#### 17. Please indicate your preference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Tennis court improvements + Expansion of the community gardens. I don’t think there needs to be two skate areas, but I like the idea of using the slope in tennis form. Although I like any improvement. A has a feeling of less “busy-ness.” Change for change sake is not always an improvement. A seems to retain more trees (mature trees). A keeps the interpretive area more “secluded.” As a tennis enthusiast, I only have one choice. Tennis provides a nice addition to the park because it is a competitive sport that can be played by 2-4 players. The soccer and baseball and football field are more team oriented and require more people. Best organized, best use of space. Keeps holgate as the main artery. Best placement of active areas and passive areas. Playground stays in an accessible area. Community garden is in a more quiet area and is enlarged. Fields are maximized for active use. Big gardens, big playground, big spray, all parts easy to use and use lots. Concept A has much improved little kids play area and much better performance space, along with preserving the off leash area, not eliminating tennis, and improving playing fields all-around — while also adding 2 skate spots! Great job! Concept A offers more variety and I’d like to keep the tennis court. It’s also a better layout. Concept A would need small things. Drinking fountain - restrooms - paths. The addition of parking areas in southeast (92nd Ave) and southwest (88th Ave in current dog run area). The children play on the main level of the park. Parents could watch their kids and other activities in the park. Dog park isn’t on 92nd, more trees seemed preserved, multi-sports area, keeps the tennis court. Really like interpretive walk idea. Everything about concept A appeals to me. I like to see tennis courts incorporated into the park design. Skateparks are innovative and this particular design provides a good location, and overall, it seems that this design is improving what is already here the most. Flow’s better. Kind of keeps park the way it is situated. That’s the way I like it. Some changes, but not totally different. I also like concept B, but noted above why I prefer concept A. I don’t believe in change for change sake. I especially want to see the football field, tennis, dog area, kids play area, and community gardens to stay the same. I feel that it important to keep an open area for the dogs so they can run freely without being caged in. I also really like the idea of two skate parks, one for the kids and one for adults. It allows for the kids to develop their skills without being intimidated by the older teenagers and adults. Keeping the tennis courts is important for the many people that are constantly using the park. I look forward to seeing the park being improved! Can’t wait, Lents is in a great deal of need compared to many other parks around Portland. I like A and B for different reasons. I don’t like C at all. I prefer the soccer fields to stay in the same location. I prefer the tennis court stay. The synthetic fields seem like they would be helpful and Walker field should be changed so multiple sports can use the space.</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like A because it makes more sense to update what we have than make a lot of changes that may not create more use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like concept A because it looks less drastic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like concept A because it looks less drastic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the locations of the skatespot and basketball courts, and the expanded gardens make sense on this plan. The other plans for the gardens worry me quite a bit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the plan that allows for the most soccer fields as possible. These soccer fields are some of the most used in the city and would see more use if they were in good shape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer Concept A because it preserves the current play area. The best and shadiest part of the park should be used for kids.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really like the idea of a skate park and I love the idea of a larger community garden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to keep the tennis courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves upon existing things, least drastic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It appears to retain the current use of the park, the trees, and the natural peacefulness and beauty of the surroundings. Many families come here to enjoy this park and for me I would like to preserve as much of the natural beauty and trees it has to offer. The many children and families that come to this park to engage in sports activities are such good strong building blocks to help our children grow into successful adults. Having family activities help form stronger bonds between parents, children and other family members. We need Lentz Park to remain as natural, useful, and beautiful as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps to remain with much of the original concept but with updates needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the most practical for cost, accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It pretty much leaves it the same, won’t cost as much to move everything. Cost less, saves more of our trees, and still gives more use of the park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not so much of a change to different areas and hopefully won’t cost as much. Don’t like the dog park idea on 92nd, feel it might interfere with traffic, and dogs getting hurt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just looks a lot more organized and better looking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger garden space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least change and most comfortable for us that use it regularly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least dramatic change. Most improvement to existing services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less changes to the park as it is, but would like to see Walker Stadium changed to multi-use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like location of gazebo and picnic shelter. Skate could go to where basketball is and basketball to old location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain tennis courts Performance area more centrally located for noise south of park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining 3 fields outside the stadium, including one synthetic field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutual respect for all, nice flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New features with out having to take too many trees/ space away...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see skatespot review post up above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see modified comment above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skatespot is a necessary part of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The changes in concept A are the least dramatic in all three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least changes – it works great now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least damaging of the three. Change skateboard park to east side of stadium. Better area for noise created by boarders. No new restroom by the existing basketball court is needed on any of your plans. The building already there is a restroom and could be updated. A water fountain is needed in the dog area. A bench or table is also needed. Fence needed along side 88th. Also along Steele so dogs can’t run into street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a great park. I do not think a ton of work is required to keep this park great and make it better. There are definitely things that need attention, but I do not think the park needs to be completely rearranged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the addition of the synthetic field in Walker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B – 14.8%

Concept B seems to best utilize the space available and still provide all of the amenities desired by the public. I love the idea of having a synthetic surface within Walker Stadium. This would dramatically improve the playability of the field and reduce the number of baseball runouts. I also like how the play area is more centralized within the park vs. its current location. The current location isolates the play area from all of the other activities making it hard on a parent to be able to keep track of their children on the playground vs. being in the picnic or sports areas. Concept B seems to take that into consideration and makes the most sense from a parent’s perspective.

good combination of natural walking areas and recreation. Gazebo/entertainment in a better location.

Hate artificial turf - there's already too much space given over to just sports.

I actually like most of Plan B. Especially the gazebo location. But I like the double-use synthetic central field in Plan C.

I like having the skate/inline spot away from the other activities.

I like plan B as it seems to offer the most for a park. I wouldn't mind if the dog off-leash area in plan B was moved to the East side.

I like the primary entrance and gazebo on the south side of the park, things are spaced out nicely and offer a nice variety of recreational options.

I want as much nature as possible period. And the 92nd/steele side feels more intimate already so I would like the entrance and nature there versus the side where corner stores are and barren landscape are. Save those for sports

If I have to choose - that's my choice. I'm not happy with the sports-centric focus on the redesigns.

It has the least amount of synthetic fields.

It looks thought through. Looks like things were just stuck so they fit.

It seems like it is making the most of the parks space without taking out too many trees or removing existing services as the facilities are all well used.

It seems to retain most of what makes Lents Park a good place to visit, whereas the other two don’t come as close. I found Concept C particularly disturbing because of the location of the off-leash area. But then I do not believe dogs should ever be off-leash in public places.

It's not true that I STRONGLY prefer one concept, but they are NOT all great and I DO prefer 2 out of 3, so I just went with a preference of Concept B due to the poor wording of the preference question. I like some things about A, but overall, I lean more towards B. I like that B does not have the skate park in the corner near the field. I like that B has tennis removed. I am not sure what I am looking at, but if Concept B is taking out all those fir trees, I HATE IT! I do NOT support removing Douglas Fir trees. Why can't we respect that they were here first?! On Concept C I like that the area for people who can’t maintain their own house pets is fenced, but I don’t like the terraced community garden. I also don’t care for the gazebo up in the corner.

Many avenues of travel within the park, lots of activities to indulge, more fields for variety of ball games.

Open field/rotation Relocated gazebo But more play area up closer to fields Put skate spot in NE corner Move basketball to skate spot Results in expanded natural areas no loss of trees

Path routing and interpretive garden location are best but try to preserve the gazebo.

The grand entry at Steele leading into the gazebo space would be a nice introduction to the park, and would connect to the rest of Lents. The multi-use synthetic fields seem like a great use of space, and the open space leaves room for emergent use of the center of the park. It pains me to see tennis go, but I haven't used the courts so far this summer, so maybe I like them more in theory than in practice.

The overall layout and balance of Concept B is most appealing to me.

With gazebo in the central field
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C - 13.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best overall plan, it considers/accounts for traffic on 92nd and Holgate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best use of NE Corner, most constructive use of field spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog area is fenced. Terrace community garden like restroom locations Soccer in the stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions as stated: play area, skate, basketball, football from Plan B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenced dog area, terraced gardens, play area on same side of park, natural/interpretive walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just like the placement and spatial arrangement more. Little more spread with some green space in between each area and I think a little more innovative with the terraced gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the combined fields. I don’t see all fields filled all the time, so it seems a waste to have so many. Having them combined looks fantastic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the development and added facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the fenced dog area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the location of the botanic area and the overall design best in Concept C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer fenced dog areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the fenced off-leash area. I love the concert area. The terraced community garden is nice. I wish there was more open play space that wasn’t dedicated to fields. I’m not convinced that synthetic fields are a good investment, but I really don’t know about these things. I hate to see tennis areas gone, but I haven’t personally played tennis in years. I do like the noisy basketball distractions and skate areas in the corner at Holgate and 92nd. That should be kept far away from homes. I really believe skateboards are louder than jets. I can’t hear my books on tape when the skateboarders are on my sidewalk, but I can hear the books when jets are overhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has everything but tennis courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has the biggest skate park design, and provides a feeling inside of me that would bring me out there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It leaves more flexibility and space for future needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall layout and positioning of skate spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall layout, terraced garden seems like a great plan, fenced dog park is a good idea also. Like this overall flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan C has the best use/organization for the sports activities and puts them nearer parking and/or louder street areas while moving the quieter activities (garden and gazebo) to the more residential side of the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The look and feel of terraced community gardens and football off of Holgate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a few modifications gazebo at SE corner of park where a natural bowl already exists. Garden doubled or tripled. Tennis court northwest of soccer fields and southwest of Walker Stadium parking lot/north of north baseball field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are all great! – 13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they would all benefit the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t see where A was much different from B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like aspects of B and C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that an effort is being put forward to change the park, and that is good enough. I’d also love for the Tennis courts to be kept and the Skatespot to definitely be added. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m more attracted to A and B, but really like the natural area in Concept C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They all have great ideas and will benefit the community in many ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They all suit my interests and serve their purpose of improving the parks for community use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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They are all just ok. But...........I don't want the gazebo moved. I don't want skate areas for skate boards. I "want" a fenced in dog area. I don't want a childrens basketball area. I am not in favor of enlarging the garden area or making a facility for meetings and storage. These are just a few of my likes and dislikes.

I don't prefer any of them. - 26.2%

Above it was stated that "each of these concepts may require some tree removal" and that PP&R would plant additional trees. This is a park we’re talking about! Many of these trees have been in this park since I first set foot in the park in the 1970's. These concepts should be required to be creative enough to leave the trees where they are. The "additional trees" to be planted to compensate for the loss of trees are often a poor excuse for the tree that was originally growing there. Where is the common sense in all this I ask you?

As my ratings indicate, a combination as they all have good attributes.

Concept B is strong contender except for synthetic and lighted football field - this is wasteful and will not prove beneficial in 10 years time. All Concepts are lacking a yard debris/compost facility to manage debris and neighborhood kitchen scraps locally. This should be integral to any park of this size and location (near a town center). Where is the foresight and attempt at sustainable? Community Gardens should be expanded.

do you know what a camel is?.............. It's a horse designed by a committee.

Each has its strong points as well as its stupid points. I don't strongly prefer any of them, but A seems to focus the most on improvements.

Every plan tried to change the park dramatically instead of enhancing the park with its present character that people love. People already love Lents parks. Let's try not to make a completely different park.

I don't believe this is a good time to make big changes to our park. Given the current economy and the fact that there are few signs of it improving anytime soon, I believe the least costly and the least invasive changes are the best. The most important change would be to take better care of what we presently have - better lighting, better litter control, better facilities, better and or more drinking fountains. A bathroom perhaps?

I don't LIKE any of them. I prefer that we improve what we have now, and not add a skate spot at all. I think that the impact on the surrounding homeowners isn’t being considered enough. I do not understand why living close to the park has to be a detriment instead of a benefit.

I hope that the comments about each proposed change will be considered so as to create new concepts incorporating what people say about each of the proposed changes. I know it is a difficult job but some of these concepts really are a good package. Overall, Lents park is an excellent park as is and I think the funds should be used to maintain it and make a few minor upgrades to the fields and playgrounds. Adding a natural/botanic area would be a plus, especially if there is a pond or water element added. It IS VERY IMPORTANT to keep the trees as the trees definitely create the aesthetic of the park and make it a great place to relax and spend time with one’s family.

I like many of these plans. No single plan has all my favorites.

I like some aspects of each of the concepts.

I like some parts of each - but they seem boring and don’t really add enough paths or new things to the park. Too much sports in all of them. We need more space for the neighborhood and people who don’t play sports.

I like the look of plan B, but don’t STRONGLY prefer any of them. The park is really nice with the Large Trees we have now. Please don’t kill such old timers.

I like the paths in B (but HATE the play area location.) A is okay. I like the fenced dog area in C, but not the terracing of the garden or the paths (lack thereof).

I like the paths in option C but I am staunchly against a fenced in dog area. Option B - bad idea to have skate spot immediately follow main entry. Option A - hate the idea of skate spot rubbing up against diagonal of ball fields. If I had to choose, option B or Option C is my favorite, but only if we figure out a natural way to keep the dogs away from the kids play area or avoid whatever the concern is about the dogs needing a fence. NO FENCE!

I see little need for change.

I tend to prefer A and C. All of them have features that I like and features that I dislike.

I think the best ideas in each concept should be looked at and considered. And not just go with a packaged plan. Keep an open mind and keep the park public friendly.
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I think we need to quit spending. People can rally together for their interests to make things happen. Put money towards Gates Park that is vacant of anything right now. Find creative ways to make parks pay for themselves by rallying with existing business and organizations that want to be involved. Quit spending. Keep it up mostly how it is now, find willing supporters, save money for other parks in need.

I think you can do better.

I want a fenced off-leash area AND centralized childrens play area AND entrance on 92nd/Steele.

I'm really opposed to too many elements to approve of any completely. More placemaking, more contemplative opportunity, less revenue generation, catering to people from outside of the neighborhood.

I've lived here for 30 years, just across the street, and I have put up with several changes. I was the one that contacted the Mayor's office and asked for something for "seniors", like a horseshoe pit. The city put the pits almost directly across from me, but unlike every other horseshoe pit in the city, they hired a contractor that had never seen an actual horseshoe pit. What IDIOT makes a chain link backstop for horseshoes?

Keep the park like it is. Improve restroom facilities, Tennis court and basketball courts if needed. The park is being used at its maximum now.

Leave it alone, Semi's stealing water bureau for bike paths, we can not pay for schools & the roads are in bad shape. Why spend money on something that is fine the way it is?

Lents lost a good opportunity for the city and community when semi-pro ball was taken off the table for Walker Stadium. Comm. Leonard called on the only tax generation plan that made sense.

Like A because it has least changes, like B for the open space location, but not much else. Like C terraced gardens.

Lived across the street for 10 years. Enjoy the way the park is. Don't enjoy construction in my neighborhood or park. Beautify not rebuild. Clean up people trash first, then maybe.

Lots of good ideas - no perfect combination.

Mixed feelings. Entry should be at town center connection. Add top ratings together.

No strong preference. Least disruptive looks best to me.

None of the above - If these plans involve cutting down trees to make room for sports fields. The park is fine as it is. Leave Lents Park as the neighbors have it now.

None of them are ideal. Elements of each are OK, but none work holistically. Address problems, don't ignore negative impacts of sports fields.

Play area & kids skate & B Ball area and the big kids skate area away from little kids

Please repair or improve the existing park as it is. The park is suppose to be a natural area for people and families to use and enjoyed for pick-nicks and family gatherings. Not for a select few. The more sports or entertainment facilities added reduces the areas needed for the families to enjoy and play in. It then becomes an area for a select few and no longer than a park. Please quit trying to change it into a sports facility.

Porque me gusta tal y como esta.

Portland Parks has a responsibility to maintain Lents Park and for the past 6 years you have done a very poor job. Not mowing the lawns on a regular basis not picking up the trash generated by weekend sports participants, Tearing out trees and not replacing them. Every decision for enhancement centers around increasing usage (optimizing) of the sports fields and the improving revenue at the expense of the neighborhood and especially the neighbors closest to the park. Thus your plans and decisions are destroying the livability of our neighborhood and our health. The the Parks department is suffocating a small park cramming more people, traffic noise and pollution our way. We currently struggle with traffic noise and pollution, grid lock provided by the sports participants and spectators blocking our driveways and trash our streets with litter, and totally disregard the that Lents is our home. For 6 years I have shared our park with many sports participants in fact I use to play softball here so I appreciate the opportunities that parks provide. However our homes are too close the the park boundaries the streets are too narrow for sports field enhancements optimize their use. (Guiding principal #4) Is their one person that is in charge of this plan who lives in Lents? How about across the street from the park? I bet not. Would you like your neighborhood park turned into a full time sports facility? I am certain you would not.

The majority of the neighborhood that live around and use the park do not want it torn up and rearranged, and most of all want the TREES left alone, overwhelmingly. Can we be any clearer that this.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are good and bad elements in each.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These plans do not reflect the values of the Lents Urban Renewal and Eco District. We want a park, not a sporting complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they all seem a decent enough concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are all awful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don't reflect the community's needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too many changes! too many trees cutting and it is fine the way it is and has been for over 50 years!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much field sport space. Need to lose one field and use as passive space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th>259</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I identify as (check all that apply) (Individual Values)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/SE Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (please specify)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what happened to WHITE!!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian is not an ethnic group and I will not identify my self using that term</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanbeing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullato</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugese</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some indian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difference does the above make?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>156 53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135 46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>71 24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>69 24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>66 23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>60 21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>19 6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 or over</td>
<td>1 0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regarding residence, I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>214 75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>61 21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many children under the age of 18 do you have living with you?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>60 38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>18 11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>1 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero</td>
<td>2 1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### What are their ages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 mo, 7 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 7, 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| 12, 10, 6 | 1 | 1.3% |
| 12, 13   | 1 | 1.3% |
| 12, 16   | 1 | 1.3% |
| 12, 8    | 1 | 1.3% |
| 13       | 1 | 1.3% |
| 14 12 12 | 1 | 1.3% |
| 14 and 15| 1 | 1.3% |
| 14, 2, 1 | 1 | 1.3% |
| 15, 16   | 1 | 1.3% |
| 16       | 1 | 1.3% |
| 16, 17   | 1 | 1.3% |
| 16,15,13,11,10 | 1 | 1.3% |
| 17       | 1 | 1.3% |
| 17 and 11| 1 | 1.3% |
| 17 and 13| 1 | 1.3% |
| 17, 5, 3 | 1 | 1.3% |
| 2 years  | 1 | 1.3% |
| 2+       | 1 | 1.3% |
| 2, 4     | 1 | 1.3% |
| 2, 5, 7  | 1 | 1.3% |
| 2.5 years old and 2 months old | 1 | 1.3% |
| 26, 27   | 1 | 1.3% |
| 3 and 6  | 1 | 1.3% |
| 3 mo     | 1 | 1.3% |
| 3 months | 1 | 1.3% |
| 3, 11    | 1 | 1.3% |
| 4        | 1 | 1.3% |
| 4 and 6  | 1 | 1.3% |
| 5 and 3  | 1 | 1.3% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 and 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 15, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 5, 4, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 and 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hand-i capped mental ages are 3 years old
NA
six

**Total**
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PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

Lents Park Master Plan Comment Summary
October 8, 2010

High Level of Agreement

1. Off-Leash Area - 54% of respondents liked the locations where it was. Equally significant is that a high level of respondents really did not like moving the off-leash area.

37 respondents wanted fencing.

2. Entrance - 52-58% of respondents liked having a grand entrance at 92nd & Steele and creating a connection to Lents Town Center. There was no real majority or opposition to an entrance at NE 92nd & Holgate.

4. Natural/Botanic Areas - Interpretive Walk - All of the design options received more than 55% support. Also important is that dislike of the features was less than 25%. Respondents favored this feature regardless of locations and want it, perhaps more.

5. Play Area - Clear community support for keeping the play area where it is - 66%

Significant opposition to moving it into the center of the park (42%)

Clear community support for adding an additional play area by little league - 62%

6. Walker Stadium - respondents supported the installation of synthetic turf in Walker Stadium by more than 52%. Respondents liked increasing the functionality of the stadium.

7. Central Fields - Almost 50% respondent support for "flipping" fields.

8. Performance / Event Spaces - people want to keep the gazebo - 30%, but from the comments, it is the sense that it could be modified. People do not want a paved plaza area - 72%.

9. Pathways - Respondents clearly wanted a pathway in the central portion of the park - 73%

10. Football Field (Vawreck Field) - Clear support for keeping Vawreck Field as is - 50-60%

Strong opposition to changing it to basketball or a skatepark - 53%

11. Community Garden - keep it where it is and make it bigger - 65%

Do not terrace it - 52%

12. Large Covered Picnic Area (approximately 8 tables) - Located between natural area, recreational fields and Walker Stadium - 35%

13. Tennis - More than 50% of respondents want to keep and improve tennis. More than 50% respondents opposed removing tennis.

15. Trees - Preserve trees as much as possible - 65%

No Clear Direction

3. Skatepark - Based on the first comment form there is significant interest in having a skatepark in the park. This comment form indicates that there is no strong preference about where it is located based on the designs presented. Based on comments some things to consider would be proximity to neighbors and adjoining uses.

42 comments in favor of skatepark.

Play area - no clear support or opposition to a junior basketball area or skatepark.

8. Performance / Event Spaces - more respondents liked the gazebo in the central field, but not more than 50%. Additionally, there was a high percentage of respondents, almost 30% who did not like that location.

9. Pathways - there was no majority support for any of the path systems shown.

11. Community Garden - respondents demonstrated no strong direction about the location of the garden.

Summary

There was general support and strong support for elements for each of the designs. Respondents preferred Options A - 22% more than Options B and C - both less than 15%. Most respondents like elements of each of the designs.

There was a lot of positive feedback on the elements of the designs, and suggestions for how to incorporate them into a final design - which is a positive reflection of the exercise — it is what we asked them to do.
OPEN HOUSE #3

Prior to the third open house for Lents Park, a flyer was distributed throughout the community, among PAC members, and to stakeholders in an effort to educate the public about the event.

The goal of the third open house was to bring traditional and non-traditional users together to comment on the two refined draft concepts for Lents.
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**OPEN HOUSE #3 - SUMMARY**

---

**Overview**
In response to community inquiries, the traditional Open House model was modified to include three additional, informal "Listening Sessions." The goals were to:
- Help participants understand the Master Plan Process and where we are in this process
- Engage participants in discussion of specific topics
- Allow free exchange of information and ideas
- Use information to inform Open House participants

The three listening sessions all took place at Lents Community Center and were attended by 5-35 people. The feedback from the sessions was recorded and presented at the Final Open House.

The Open House was attended by approximately 25 residents (including advisory committee members). After the Open House, the comment form was online for 6 weeks. Instead, the comment period for this part of the project extended to almost 6 weeks.

**Results**
71 individuals completed the comment forms.

- More than 74% of respondents indicated support or strong support for the design.
- More than 70% of respondents preferred the Central Field treatment in Design A.
- Participants indicated that all elements of the Guiding Principles were achieved. More than 60% of respondents indicated that the designs achieved the principles well or very well.

---

**Survey Results: Lents Park Master Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your general reaction to the draft concept for Lents Park?</th>
<th>Total Items: 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>28 41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>23 35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0 12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>3 10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly dislike</td>
<td>2 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which central field area treatment do you prefer?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Total Items: 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>47 71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19 28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guiding Principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AdHoc Committee developed the following principles to stand as the measure of what they wanted to accomplish with this design. How well did we achieve each of the following?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create good circulation systems and pathways into and within the park</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design the park to be economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable (“economically sustainable” means that FPPA is financially able to maintain it.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve maintenance, programming, and development of athletic facilities to optimize their use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honor the visual character of the park</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve access for all park users</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Public Input Survey Results

**Total:** 68

#### Enhance Community and Neighborhood Integration with the Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Create a Welcoming Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Celebrate History, Culture, Architecture, and Botanical Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### How Well was Public Input Incorporated into the Design Concept?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - very well</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - well</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - no opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - not well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Favorite Elements

**Total:** 68

**What are your three favorite elements of the design? Why?**

1. Blue – 48 responses
2. Red – 46 responses
3. Yellow – 44 responses

### Least Liked Elements

**Total:** 68

**What are the three elements you care the least? Why?**

1. Blue – 50 responses
2. Red – 35 responses
3. Yellow – 25 responses
What else would you like to share with us?

1. I'd like to see the dog off-leash area get some sort of physical barrier. It makes it safer for the people / reduced chance of running away / etc.
2. Also help other park users avoid the wind and sun so people can work.

For the fun filling activities:

- I'd like to see a volleyball court, a basketball court, and a frisbee golf course.
Example of open lawn area
LISTENING SESSIONS OUTLINE

PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

LISTENING SESSIONS OUTLINE

Objectives:
- Help participants understand the Master Plan process and where we are in that process
- Encourage participants in discussion of specific topics
- Allow free exchange of information and ideas
- Use information to inform Open House participants

Materials:
- Desk Design
- Comment Forms
- Project Overview Handout
- Facilitator Notes
- Sign-In Sheets

Outline

Introduction: At the October 19th meeting, the Advisory Committee agreed that their preference would be to encourage a one-on-one discussion in which participants would be encouraged to discuss and listen to a variety of ideas.

Staff and committee members would be available to greet participants and introduce newcomers into the conversation. Additionally, if there are participants who would prefer a one-on-one conversation, staff and committee members could help with those discussions.

1. Intro to Listening Sessions
   a. What happens with information gathered from listening sessions
   b. Describe area of discussion

2. Allow participants to ask questions and discuss, draw, etc.

Committee and staff role:
- Represent the goals and agreements of the Advisory Committee - we are presenting your work
- Ask questions for clarification
- Listen and take notes

Appendix D: Listening Session Summaries

Active Recreation:
Leisure Park currently hosts multiple recreational facilities. How do you feel about the balance of sports vs. other activities in the park?

How do you feel about the two different options for the central soccer fields, shown on the Preferred Design maps? (Turf soccer fields, with the permitted field “dipping” or, reducing to one field to make space for gardens and pathways.)

Do you have a preference for one of these designs? Why?

How do you see yourself using these spaces? Would you use them?

How do you feel about one of the soccer fields converting to synthetic turf?

What do you like about the recreation spaces?

What would you change?
LISTENING SESSION NOTES - ACTIVE RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SPACES

Active Recreation Listening Session
10.25.2010

Notes:

- Parking is an issue—particularly with Lents Little League events and sports field being used at the same time. Suggestions included:
  - Offering incentives to users to use alternate parking locations/park and ride lots
  - Changing the SW parking area (along 88th) to angled, rather than parallel parking (SCII checked into this with PHYOT — may be possible with removal of the median — though City Engineer would have to approve. Would need 7 more than exists there between median/sidewalk — 20’ currently, need 27’)
  - Removing Veveck Field and turning it into parking (suggestion from one person — P&R would not be supportive of this suggestion)
  - Putting signage up letting people know about other parking opportunities in the area.

- Is Lents Park too sports heavy? Central field treatments are intended to open up more area of the park for non-active recreation uses.
  - If basketball moves north of the parking area, some concern about the loss of the grassy area currently used for volleyball.
  - Some users of the gazebo are too loud.
  - P&R can regulate use of amplification, but cannot determine which groups can use a feature — a free speech issue. Example, recent church use of the park on Labor Day was offensive to some neighbors.

- Skateboarders at the meeting liked the current location — Holgate is already a busy area. But, they were open to other locations as well.

- Concern about noise/language with respect to skate spot near the ball fields and homes across Holgate. Suggestion to design a skate spot that could fit around trees — and locate it in the NE central bowl area east of the field. Could be possible — may be an issue with trees-shedding leaves into the skate spot in the fall. Best location is north and east of trees for shadows. Also, want to make sure area is visible/safe enough from CPTED standpoint.

- Discussion of skate spot vs. skatepark — and that skate spot would be a more locally-serving feature. Most skateboarders would not be driven to the park to use the feature.

- It will be important to maintain and monitor the improvements built in the park.
- Could Marshall HS be a location for a field? No, P&R doesn’t own or control what might happen with Marshall HS. The scope of this project is to create a plan for the park we have now, with what we can control now.

- How does this MP fit in with plans for upgrades to Walker Stadium? MP is looking at the stadium as part of the entire park—nothing in the MP precludes the upgrades planned for Walker Stadium — further levels of detail refinement will be included, as will an overall MP implementation planning plan. Improvements to Walker were originally planned alongside the I.I.I. improvements; funding was not available at the time to implement them.

- In general, group seemed to prefer central field option A.

Community Spaces Listening Session
10.25.2010

Notes:

- Discussion of the idea of fencing (formal), vs. better delineation (which could take the form of more hollands, plantings, etc). Some preference for keeping it as a more open space — people use the space for playing Frisbee (not just with dogs), and as SE RI is proposed by PHYOT as a Bicycle Boulevard, fencing or barriers on RI might be especially important.

- Amenities (drinking fountain, benches, etc.) continue to be important in the DOLA.

- Access to parking and restrooms is important.

- Concern about noise projection from the gazebo — discussion of opportunities for better managing the gazebo, and from a design standpoint, adding an acoustic baffle to help direct noise appropriately.

- Question about synthetic fields, and if they have to be closed off to other uses? No. For example, the symphony could still reserve a synthetic field as part of their area — do have to be more careful with them (no tent stakes, etc).

- Discussion about the SE corner — some liked the re-introduction of a staircase in that area (there used to be one), some concern that it might attract skateboarders.

- Concern (from one person) about synthetic fields allowing for more late-night use, extending parking issues later into the evening.

- Wonder how to lower speed limits around the park (lobby State).

- One person suggested that the playground area could use a covered picnic shelter as well.
LISTENING SESSION NOTES - STAINABILITY

Sustainability Listening Session
10.30.2010

Notes:

- One person indicated that if wall-ball was removed, it would be important to have a feature that kids could decorate— to help stop graffiti.
- Concern about gazebo noise projection— is there a way to shut electricity off so people cannot use it for amplification if they aren’t authorized to? P&R: Yes— that could be done like the lighting shut-off.
- The park needs more lighting in the SE corner.
- SE corner has some flooding issues, so stormwater treatments could be a good idea.
- P&R Urban Forester indicated some concern with adding swales into parking strips where there are existing elder trees— they don’t adjust well.
- More support for permeable pavers than asphalt paved parking area
- Community Garden: Consider expansion of the garden to the west, instead of to the east — the fencing could be used as part of the DOLA delineation
- Portable toilets aren’t a sustainable restroom option — like the idea of looking at more sustainable, safe, open toilet type for the additional proposed restrooms.
- Suggest having restroom doorways face the surrounding residences— for safety and extra visibility.
- If fruit trees were added, they would be part of the community garden.
- Consider adding nut trees in the park instead of fruit trees (P&R wouldn’t have the concern about rotting fruit).
- Trees in the park are very important— improve air quality in the neighborhood, and buffer sound from the freeway.
- The hill by the DOLA is used for sledding when it snows— fencing the DOLA would change that.
- Discussed opportunities for some pollinator plantings in the native planting areas, trees as habitat connections for birds, and biovole opportunities in existing parking areas.
- Like additional trees in the central field area 60 might be a bit much (also like having some open space).
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EXISTING SITE STRUCTURES TOUR

Example of playing field
EXISTING SITE STRUCTURES TOUR

Notes from 6.21.10 Lents Park Structures Tour

Walker:
- Could use a larger press box
- Central seating area is dry-rotted, needs re-built. Should be aluminum seating, or other material that will not require as much maintenance as wood.
- Stadium seats approx. 500. That size is sufficient.
- Dugouts: Are too low (head height), and field drains into them. Would be more ideal to raise the dugouts.
- Field could be larger – move out towards the parking area.
- A tear-down and re-built may be a more effective option.
- The warm-up area by the parking lot (currently fenced in) does not need to be so large.
- It would be more ideal if the stadium restrooms were enclosed as part of the overall stadium fencing. However, this would mean the central soccer/sport fields would need a restroom option.
- If the concession area were moved to the south side (from the east side), it could more easily serve both stadium attendees, and central soccer field users.
- Bleachers could be safer – ideally there would be no gaps at the back where someone could fall through.
- Stadium restrooms were re-done approx 2 years ago – now they are locked except during games.
- The storage area between the restrooms is for ballfield maintenance – it is the right size (approx 400-500 SF).
- The maintenance shop (for the rest of the park) to the west of the restrooms should be approx 2 x larger.

General:
- Lents Park currently just has trash cans – not recycling and trash combination cans – there are recycling receptacles in Walker Stadium.
- The Gazebo is not ADA accessible.
- LLL is using a shipping container for storage (PP&R may not want another permanent structure for them).
- Wall-Ball and horseshoe features are in fairly good shape.
- The two southern storage/restroom facilities recently (2 months) acquired new roofs.
- The storage (former restroom) area by the tennis courts is needed for storage – or, another storage area is needed at the southern end of the park.
- The summer playground storage area (playground restroom building) needs to be larger – needs refrigerators ideally, and could use a place for the 200 kids / day in the lunch program to wash their hands.
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OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE MEETING #1 - AGENDA

PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

Lents Park Master Plan
Operations & Maintenance Meeting
June 8, 2010 - 2pm to 3:30 pm

AGENDA

- Introductions

- Briefly walk through project scope/ process

- Specific Walker Macy Questions (see below)

- Other Input

Buildings:
- What is the long term plan for the structures/restrooms, the 25 year plan?
- What type of restroom model (other than portables) do you feel might be successful?
- Can you provide a status report of all buildings at Lents which includes: structural, electrical, mechanical, and roof information?
- Are there reports on the existing structures regarding ADA compliance, structural integrity or seismic upgrades?
- What improvements to the existing structures would you like to see?
- What structures are underutilized?

Parking:
- Do you feel there is adequate parking at Lents?
- What are the maintenance/operational issues in the parking areas?

Turf:
- What are the major turf issues that we should be aware of?
- What are the drainage problems?
- The area near the playground appears to hold a large amount of water during wet periods, what is your experience with this area?
- What operational/maintenance irrigation issues exist?
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE MEETING #1 - SUMMARY

Lents Park Master Plan

Operations & Maintenance Meeting
June 8, 2010 – 2 pm to 3:30 pm

Attendees:
- Andre Ashley (P&P – Sports Management)
- Don Athey (P&P – Structures)
- Doug Brenner (P&P – East Zone Manager)
- Mike Carr (P&P – Irrigation / Turf)
- Sarah Coates Huggins (P&P Project Manager)
- Bob Downing (P&P – District Services Manager)
- Bob Grummel (Grummel Engineering)
- Louie Guererro (P&P – East Zone Maintenance Supervisor)
- Gary Johnson (P&P – Sports Fields Manager)
- PJ McGuire (P&P – Electrical/Lighting)
- Leslie Poli-Kosbau (P&P – Community Gardens)
- Brooke Raila (WM)
- Shavon Rogers (P&P – Permitting)
- Ali Ryan (P&P – Off-Leash Dog Area)
- John Sargent (Sargent Designworks)
- Colleen Wolfe (WM)
- Mike Zilis (WM)

AGENDA
- Introductions
- Sarah and Colleen briefly walked through the project scope / process.
- Discussion Notes:

Buildings:
- What is the long term plan for the structures/restrooms, the 25 year plan?
- What type of restroom model (other than portables) do you feel might be successful?
  - A restroom like the restroom/structure at McCoy Park may be worth considering, so would something like the Portland Leo's.
  - The park is large – needs multiple restroom locations (currently has four, though 1 is not operational – restrooms by Walker Stadium, by ball fields (porta potties), by tennis court (non-operational), and by playgrounds.

- LRP: If looking at new restrooms, they should be located away from parking lots to minimize unintended activities.
- BD: In addition to the restrooms at Walker and the ball fields, there should be a restroom by the play area, and a restroom by the sports fields.
- BS: Currently, porta potties are used for the ball fields and outside Walker Stadium – it would be preferable to eliminate the porta potties.

- Can you provide a status report of all buildings at Lents which includes: structural, electrical, mechanical, and roof information?
  - BD: P&P will look into whether this information is available, does not believe so.
  - DA: Roof replacements were just done for the two southern structures (restroom by playground, and former restroom by tennis courts).

- Are there reports on the existing structures regarding ADA compliance, structural integrity or seismic upgrades?
  - BS: P&P will look into whether this information is available; does not believe so.
  - Structures are not historic.
  - Tour of structures to take place on June 26th.

- What improvements to the existing structures would you like to see?
- What Structures are unidentified?

- Other
  - BD: Walker Stadium could use approximately 3x the existing storage.
  - DE: The Summer Playground program could use a larger storage area – their storage is currently attached to the restroom by the playgrounds. They could use a larger space (400SF) with refrigerators for the summer free lunch program.
  - Electrical upgrades needed for the restroom building at the playground area.

Parking:
- Do you feel there is adequate parking at Lents?
  - LRP: There is enough parking by the community garden and playground areas.
  - BS: When there are multiple events going on, parking lots are packed.

- What are the maintenance/operational issues in the Parking areas?
  - BS: NW parking lot is closed outside of ball field seasons, to prevent unintended activities (meatball sampling, etc.)

Turf:
- What are the major turf issues that we should be aware of?
  - SB: From Thanksgiving through February 1, the natural grass fields are not booked. They still receive non-permitted use, if they were synthetic turf, they could be booked.
  - BS: If fields are synthetic, they need to be fenced, and should be lit.
  - Synthetic fields should have a concrete apron (a concrete band surrounding the field – providing protection from surrounding dirt/glass).
  - All: If Walker Stadium was synthetic, and a central field was synthetic, there might be a possibility to remove one of the natural grass fields.

- What are the drainage problems?
  - BS: No major drainage issues - curb rubber field (11) does have some issues, but they should be alleviated when the curb rubber is addressed.
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- The area near the playground appears to hold a large amount of water during wet periods. What is your experience with this area?
  - BD: The area needs a drainage system.
- What operational/maintenance irrigation issues exist?
  - MC: The sports/ball fields and playground areas are irrigated. The rest of the park is not.
  - MC: Aside from the recent irrigation put in with the new ball fields, the other park irrigation went in approximately 12 years ago (1999).
  - MC: The existing 350' well by the horseshoe area (east side of park) has sufficient capacity for irrigation needs, and could handle more capacity. It does, however, have an issue with rust and will need to be re-lined.
  - LPLC: The community gardens hook up hoses to a 5/8" meter, sufficient for their current needs.

Recreation:
- What unscheduled ball / sports field use occurs?
  - Fields are currently heavily permitted from February to November.
  - Little-League runs from February to June.
- How is a ball / sports field reserved?
  - http://www.portlandoregon.gov/openparks/hc=38626
- What alternative uses do you feel would be appropriate for Walker Stadium? PP&R has considered/proposed:
  - Synthetic turf, allowing for multi-sport use. Other uses?
    - All: Yes, synthetic turf, allowing for multi-sport use would be very beneficial.
    - AI: Walker Stadium currently could seat approximately 500 people.
    - SR: It would be better if one set of bleachers could work for both baseball and soccer/field sports - it costs time and money to move bleachers out to the field and in from figure.
- How well does the Walker Stadium facility function? What improvements would you like to see?
  - G1: The dugouts are currently unusable (bad drainage, safety issues with a low entrance ceiling).
  - G1: The central bleachers are unsafe and unusable currently.
  - G1: The entire stadium area is not ADA accessible.
- Other:
  - AI: Sports fields should be 360 x 220 ideally.
  - SR: There are some trees very close (too close) to the borders of the central sports fields currently.
  - SR: Field #1 ("Football Field") north of Walker-stadium works for soccer, as it’s very close to traffic, and soccer kids visit the fields more frequently than baseball do.

Passive Use:
- How much unoccupied picnic area use is there?
- Is there a need for covered picnic areas?
  - LPLC: Gardens and perhaps playground users need a covered picnic area between the two areas, but not close to the street.
- Are there areas with security concerns?
  - LPLC: Dumping of trash and stolen property.

Electrical:
- Are there any issues with the lighting at Lents Park?
- How would you improve the lighting at Lents Park?
  - LPLC: There is a need for lighting by the community garden.
- DB: Lights could be added to the Walker Stadium parking area.

- Is electrical service sufficient in the Park?
  - Microwave lighting is standard.
  -LM: Lights along paths.
  - Utility drawings are available for review.
- Other:
  - The (previous) restroom structure by the tennis courts houses the lighting boxes for the pathways and approximately the lower 1/3 of the park. This was put in approximately 6-7 years ago.
  - The playground restroom structure houses the lighting boxes for the play area and the lighting towards the community gardens.

Maintenance:
- What are the most challenging maintenance issues for Lents Park?
  - The park could use more garbage cans.
  - The turf fields are in very poor condition.
  - Every flat surface is a target for graffiti.

Dog Area:
- What is the amount of use and demand?
  - It is moderately well-used.
  - There is not too much conflict - other than some conflict with community gardens.
  - If it were a fenced area, the surface would have to be wood chip, not turf - fencing would encourage some higher intensity use, and possibly less well-behaved dogs.
  - Could some additional buffer - landscaping, etc. between DOA and adjacent uses.
  - Should be close to parking.
  - Could benefit from some additional amenities (drinking fountain for humans/ pets, benches).
  - Some dog owners feel the dog area boundary is not clearly defined.

- What are the operational/maintenance issues?
  - LPLC: There can be ice and conflict (dogs biting the gardener) running after the children in the playground.

Community Garden:
- What is the amount of use and demand for the garden?
  - LPLC: The gardens are fully subscribed, and used year-round.
  - If it were to be expanded on-site, expansion would be best towards the west.
  - Is there a waiting list?
  - LPLC: A waiting list of between 15-25 families. The garden could be expanded to include more plots and a community area for sitting/ picnicking.

- What are the operational/maintenance issues?
  - LPLC: This is the best soil in the park and has been gardened for 85 years. Most of the rest of the park in rocky, The parking is good, and there are hoops nearby. The proximity to the playground and restrooms is good.
  - Could benefit from a new stop.
  - Currently, there are no ADA accessible gardening spaces available.

Other:
- Security/Storm:
  - Other than the wet areas by the play areas, drainage for the park seems to be alright.
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OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE MEETING #2 - AGENDA

- **PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION**
  Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

  **Lents Park Master Plan**
  **Operations & Maintenance Meeting #2**
  **August 5, 2010 - 2:00 to 3:30 pm**

  **Meeting Outcomes:**
  - Preview design concepts
  - Provide O&M input on the options

  **AGENDA:**

  1. **Introductions**
  2. **Project Manager Update**
     a. Process Steps / Types of Input Received
     b. Vision and Guiding Principles
  3. **Lents Park Master Plan Vision and Guiding Principles**
     a. Public Feedback Summary
     b. Design Goals
     c. Presentation of concepts (main, strengths, challenges)
     d. Opportunities and Constraints
  4. **O&M Discussion and Input**
  5. **Next Steps**
     a. Public Input on 3 concepts
     b. Refine into one preferred concept

- **PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION**
  Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

  **Lents Park Master Plan Vision and Guiding Principles**

  **Vision**
  Lents Park is a signature park, celebrated for its wide variety of activities and users, and as an important community gathering place. The park's distinct areas are connected by a system of pathways, and there are many opportunities to enjoy the natural environment, gardens, and landscaping.

  People of all ages and backgrounds come to the park to relax, visit, attend neighborhood scale events, and use the sports fields and Walker Stadium in this safe, welcoming community green.

  **Guiding Principles**
  1. Provide a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities.
  2. Create good circulation systems and pathways into and within the park.
  3. Design the park to be economically sustainable, environmentally and socially sustainable.
  4. Improve maintenance, programming, and development of athletic facilities to optimize their use.
  5. Honor the visual character of the park.
  6. Improve access for all park users.
  7. Enhance community and neighborhood integration with the park.
  8. Create a welcoming environment.
  9. Celebrate history, culture, architecture, and botanical features.

  *Economic sustainability is defined as a project that Portland Parks & Recreation can afford to build AND maintain.*
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OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE MEETING #2 - SUMMARY

PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

Lents Park Master Plan
Operations & Maintenance Meeting #2
August 3, 2010 - 2:00 to 3:30 pm

Meeting Outcomes:
- Preview design concepts
- Provide O&M input on the options

ATTENDEES
Andro Ashley (PP&R – Sports Management)
Doug Brenner (PP&R – East Zone Manager)
Sarah Costes Huggins (PP&R Project Manager)
Kevin Cronin (Portland Development Commission)
Bob Downing (PP&R – District Services Manager)
Louie Gutierrez (PP&R – East Zone Maintenance Supervisor)
Gary Johnson (PP&R – Sports Fields Manager)
Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong (PP&R – Community Outreach and Involvement Program Manager)
Leslie Poh-Kosbau (PP&R – Community Gardens)
Shawn Rogers (PP&R – Permitting)
All Ryan (PP&R – Off-Leash Dog Area)
John Sarangi (Sarangi Designworks)
Erica Thatcher (WM)
Colleen Wolfe (WM)
Mike Ziks (WM)

AGENDA

1. Introductions

2. Project Manager Update: Sandy Counts Ungard provided a brief overview of the process steps taken to date, the methods used to obtain project input, and next steps for the project. The project vision and guiding principles have been established, and will be our guide as we refine to a final preferred concept.

3. Walker Macy Presentation: Mike Ziks gave a very broad overview of the type of themes that have emerged from the input received:
   a. The park is highly valued by the community
   b. The park could benefit from some more distinct community spaces that more active, more passive areas, or more flexible-use spaces
   c. The Master Plan needs to consider safety, and keep the park feeling safe
   d. There is a perception that the park doesn’t have enough unprogrammed or intentionally passive areas

Mike presented the design goals, each of the three concepts, and discussed opportunities and constraints.

4. O&M Discussion summary:
   - WM received confirmation from O&M staff that any synthetic field has to be fenced. It should also be cut to optimize the benefits of having a synthetic field.
   - LPS noted that if the community garden were to expand, an expansion towards the east would be more ideal.
   - There is a benefit from PP&R’s perspective of separating the two basketball courts. They should remain as one solid surface.
   - A synthetic Walker Stadium with exception of the pitcher’s mound and home plate would be a very favorable scenario, allowing multiple uses, in everyone’s view.
     - The scenario of adding the sports field onto the existing footprint of Walker was preferable.
     - The scenario of moving the football field and extending a field out of the northeast corner of Walker was not (would be like losing a field).
     - If Walker Stadium were to become a synthetic, multi-use field, additional lighting would also need to be installed to properly illuminate the soccer field.
   - The football field (Sports Field D) really should have fencing on the street frontages 6927 and 6931. In one scheme, show the field as synthetic, with lights, and a fence.
   - Crumia (FPDC) liked the concept of a significant entryway in the SE corner, welcoming people to and from the Lents Town Center.
   - Sports fields: If there is one natural grass field in the central area, the other space should be reserved as open/unprogrammed space with the intent of “flipping” field locations as necessary to keep the natural grass fields in good condition.
   - Scheme B: The DOLA is too close to the play areas – dogs and kids next to each other creates too many conflicts.
   - Scheme C: The DOLA would need to be fences if it were relocated closer to the sports fields other active uses. Currently, the slope, street, and fenced community garden provide natural barriers.
   - Fencing OLDA’s generally results in more extreme wear and tear, some owners drop dogs off for extended periods of time and often, waste trash accumulates within the OLDA.
   - Community Gardens:
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- Scheme C: The terraced community gardens may be problematic. The less than ideal terraced community gardens at Buckman was mentioned. If a terraced solution was pursued, it would still need to accommodate the same 6' ofasha, be fenced, and ADA accessible. It would also need a 10' asphalt access way for vehicular delivery of mail, etc.
- It is recommendable to keep the overall garden site the same, but proposed different sized plots within the garden (some of the current size, for example)
- Allowing an area for accessible mixed gardening beds would be very beneficial – we'd want to increase the size of the garden for at least two, with a 6 foot clearance all around, with either a flat crushed gravel surface or a concrete surface, and an area for the shed and community space with a gazebo or trellis. This would increase the garden space by a minimum of 800 square feet.

- Consider spaces for continued bros volleyball use and the possibility of continued interest in horseshoes (although the latter was not an activity that ranked highly on the comment cards).
- Restrooms: A single-occupancy stall is fine.

A discussion regarding the restrooms and storage structures yielded the following:

- LG stated that the central restroom that was vandalized would serve better as a storage structure rather than a combined storage/restroom structure. If the storage space isn't needed, consider removing it.
- Overall it was agreed that the exiting two restrooms for the tennis courts and the play area would work better for storage on a use other than as a restroom, unless they are intentionally designed to be only for seasonal use (like the one currently by the play area). Otherwise, a different style of restroom structure, one that would discourage vandalism and inappropriate use, would be preferable for the long-term.
- A year-round restroom would need to be located in an observable, identifiable location. The Portland Loos were mentioned and agreed upon as a good model.
- Current recreational storage requires an approximate space of 80x18'. This will need to continue to be accommodated.
- The Federal Free Lunch Program requires refrigeration storage for 260 lunches, store (minimal) counter space, and a sink for hand washing.

- John Sargent led a discussion of different scenarios with Walker Stadium
  - In one scenario there might be a separate structure for maintenance. O&M staff noted that a separate maintenance structure would be a problem for increased vandalism, and an additional structure in the park would not be ideal.
  - The group discussed the possibility of moving the connection to the southern side of Walker, so it could better serve sports field, and Walker Stadium users. Sargent will follow up with a list of specific questions regarding potential configurations for Walker Stadium, and detailed square footage for each of the areas (ticket sales, concessions, park maintenance, turf maintenance).
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Example of synthetic turf sports field
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#### COST ESTIMATE - PREFERRED PLAN

### DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>$ / SF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREFERRED PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST</td>
<td>1,416,000 sf</td>
<td>$37.26 / sf</td>
<td>$53,270,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT COSTS</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$1,646,147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT COST</td>
<td>1,416,000 sf</td>
<td>37.55 / sf</td>
<td>$54,916,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates include allowances for spray and equipment ant play equipment.

This direct construction cost does not include furnishings & equipment, architectural and engineer design fees, consultant fees, inspection and testing fees, fire sprinkler, raceway, automatic sprinkler system, and associated costs not otherwise associated development costs. These items are in the soft cost allowance.

This estimate assumes a complete set of plans, full use and operation of the project, rubber of the project, and no other changes or modifications to the plans or specifications.

This is an estimate based on the plans and specifications provided by the architect. The actual cost will vary depending on the final design, materials, and conditions at the site.

### 62 | EXISTING CONDITIONS

- **Site Condition**
  - Site preparation, grading, and footings: 1,000 sf, $90,000
  - Concrete: $5,000
- **Additional fill & grading**
  - Sub-total: $47,020

- **Balanced Buki Field Foundation**
  - Trenching and digging of the new rubber: $30,000
  - Additional fill & grading: $20,000

- **Sub-total: $54,020**

### 63 | CONCRETE

- **Gunite Field Concrete**
  - Volume: 13,000 cu. ft.
  - Cost: $320,000

- **Concrete Costs**
  - 4" slab on grade @ $5.00/cu. ft.: 800 cu. ft.
  - Access control: $7,500
  - Stairs @ $5.00/stair: 150 sq. ft.

- **Poured-In-Place Concrete**
  - Cost: $16,025

#### 52 | EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS

- **Asphalt Paving**
  - 10' x 10' at 7'9" level and access pavement: 156 sq. ft.
  - Sub-total: $1,482,000

- **Curbs & Driveways**
  - Concrete: 1,000 sf, $2,500
  - Concrete: 1,500 sf, $2,775
  - Concrete: 3,000 sf, $3,150

- **Parking Specialties**
  - Painted: 2800 sq. ft.
  - Sub-total: $1,042,000

**Portland Parks & Recreation**
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#### 32. EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS - Continued

**Lents Park Master Plan**

**Architectural Cost Consultants, LLC**

Portland, OR

4919 SW Flanders Street, Suite 110

Tigard, OR 97223-8489

Phone (503) 718-0887. Fax (503) 718-5877

**Lents Park Master Plan**

Portland, OR

6035 SW Pilkington Street, Suite 10

Tigard, OR 97223-8489

Phone (503) 718-0887. Fax (503) 718-5877

**Prefered Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>replace as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 32. EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS - Continued

**Refurbish East Park Buildings / Shelters - continued**

**Prefered Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>approx. 500 seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 32. EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS - Continued

**Play Areas**

**Prefered Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>for signage, entry, seating, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>for signage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 32. EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS - Continued

**Parks**

**Prefered Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>allowance (south play area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architectural Cost Consultants, LLC**

Portland, OR

4919 SW Flanders Street, Suite 110

Tigard, OR 97223-8489

Phone (503) 718-0887. Fax (503) 718-5877

**Prefered Option**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>allowance (south play area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Lents Park Master Plan**

**Architectural Cost Consultants, LLC**

Portland, OR

5200 NE Hancock Street, Suite 110
Portland, OR 97213

**Selected Date:**

12-Mar-11

**Development Date:**

25-Oct-10

**Project Name:**

Lents Park

**Print Date:**

12-Jan-11

** Completion Date:**

spring 2011

**Contact:**

(503) 799-9515

**Fax:**

(503) 799-9517

### Appendix G: Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>32. EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS - Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>73,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new treeline</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowance for landscaping upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Irrigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL 32. EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$918,073</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33. UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Utilities allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage Utilities allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage Utilities allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Utilities service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL 33. UTILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$365,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,604,103</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Excluding Concessions:**
  - **Project Description:**
    - Spring 2011
  - **Cost:**
    - 25.00%
    - 1,004,642
  - **General Contractor CH & Profit:**
    - 12.50%
    - 1,001,900
    - 4.65%
    - 3,611,854
  - **TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST:**
    - 1,450,000
    - 7.05
    - **$10,210,022**

- **Mark-up percentages per PPM:**

---
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