

NEXT MEETING:
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2006
4:00 – 6:00 P.M.
MILWAUKIE CENTER

STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE

For

N. Clackamas Park

November 29, 2006

Milwaukie Center

Meeting Summary

Present:

Representatives:, Sally Shook, Eric Shawn (chair), JoAnn Herrigel (vice-chair), Tony Clark, Eleanor Johnson, John Denny

Alternates:

Steve Berliner, Rick Frank, Susan Shawn

Absent: Fr. Matthew Tate (rep), Lisa Gibson (rep.) Jim Schuld (alt.), Holly Denman (alt.)

Guests/Observers: Dick Shook, Pat and Anne O'Donnell

Staff:

Dan Zinzer, Michelle Healy, Clackamas County

Introductions/Opening Comments/Meeting Minutes

Eric Shawn welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the committee to quickly review the mission and ground rules. He also reminded the committee that they had agreed that all committee members would be allowed to speak once before additional comments would be collected.

Michelle Healy handed out the agenda, October meeting minutes, information on amplified sound and a planning process outline for the north side **of North Clackamas Park**.

Eric asked the group to review the minutes from the October meeting.

JoAnn Herrigel asked for clarification on page two, “commitments”. Dan Zinzer explained that these were commitments made during the negotiations for the ball field development.

Action: The committee approved the October minutes as presented.

North side Planning

Michelle presented a suggested process for planning the north side of the park. In preparation for the meeting Michelle e-mailed the committee an outline on the proposed process. The committee reviewed the document. Rick Frank suggested that an on-line “survey” tool be added as one of the ways to collect input on the plans. Michelle said she would look into whether that was possible.

The District has decided to use a consultant for the planning process. This would include a consultant with expertise in landscape architecture, wetland biology and natural resource management. Michelle will use the outline as the basis for the RFP (request for proposals).

Michelle asked the committee if they felt comfortable with the process as presented. If so, she will proceed with completing the RFP.

Action: Consensus that the process is acceptable.

Dog and Park Work Group Report

Tony Clark presented information from the work group. He explained that the working group was an informal committee – anyone/everyone who attended the meetings helped to draft the recommendations. These recommendations only reflect the opinions of the people who attended the meeting.

Recommendations:

- More dog parks in District to relieve pressure on NCP.
- Ideas for quality dog parks. The working group prioritized the qualities of good dog park design (shown below).

Priority 1

- 1) Double gate
- 2) 5 ft. fence
- 3) level- no holes, but nice terrain
- 4) Room
- 5) Plumbed water (close)
- 6) Tables
- 7) Shade
- 8) Restrooms (in vicinity)
- 9) Shelter
- 10) Parking

- 11) Safe Environment, feel secure
- 12) Trash service
- 13) Set of Rules

Priority 2

- 1) Structures for dogs to play
- 2) Lighting
- 3) Wash area
- 4) Small dog area
- 5) Training Area
- 6) Water feature

7) Timeout area for dogs

Discussion:

- Sally Shook commented that the dog parks could be spread out, since people come from all areas.
- John Denny said that finding locations for dog parks is hard because there is a lack of land to work with.
- Tony commented that if the existing dog run were switched with the horse arena, there might be more space for the dog run. We would need to add a shelter and water supply for the dog run.
- Dan asked about the momentum for switching the horse arena and dog run. Dan commented that the District is committed to ~~be~~ improving the arena by spring, but he'd hate to do something if the stewardship committee recommends moving the horse arena to the north side. In the meantime, Dan proposed taking down the existing fencing. The final decision about the arena would then be incorporated into the north side planning process.
- Committee agreed that Dan's suggestion made sense. Eric suggested that they put the idea out to stakeholders.
- Dan also commented that he's been talking to Lisa about possibly re-configuring the existing arena, which would provide more space for parking.
- Steve suggested that if the arena moves to the north side, the parking should be put where the old dumping area was. This would prevent further degradation of the north side and would also prevent conflicts between cars and people.
- JoAnn asked what south side neighbors thought of switching **ing** the dog run and arena.
- Pat O'Donnell said that they love the horses and would like the arena to stay in its current location. That is where they thought it would be during the planning for the south side.
- Tony commented that the working group ~~recommend~~ **recommended** that a dog park remain in NCP (in its current location) until an acceptable alternative is found.
- Eric asked what people thought of forwarding the working group's recommendations to the stakeholder groups.
- Susan said that the people on the south side need to be included in the discussion. She asked how to contact them.
- Michelle said she could help put together a mailing, if desired by the committee.
- JoAnn commented that she wants to hear from them also, but she suggests sending the recommendations to the stakeholder groups first, and then see if a mailing is necessary.
- Sally suggested looking at the area next to the church (Clackamas Christian) for a dog run.
- Dan said that no one has talked to the church specifically about that, it may be a possibility. A discussion could occur as part of the north side plan.
- Rick stated that there were two things to rectify before asking stakeholder groups to comment on the recommendations. 1) Horse arena swap, is it feasible?
-2) Is the church willing to let us use the field for a dog run? We should consider checking with the Church and horse people and then forward recommendations to stakeholders.
- Eric said that Lisa Gibson actually brought the suggestion to the working group, so she is aware of the idea.
- Eleanor Johnson commented that the working group hasn't talked about other off-leash dog issues in the park. Dogs are a bigger issue than just what to do about the dog run.

- Tony commented that the working group will continue to look at dog issues in the park.
- Eric suggested that committee members bring these recommendations to their constituents to discuss. Do they work? Have ~~there~~**their** constituents rank and bring back for discussion at the next meeting.
- Steve asked for an aerial clarification of the south side. He said they have a cleared natural area where the dog run is currently located. Moving the dog run to the south could possibly impact more trees and wet areas.

Action: Consensus to forward recommendations to stakeholders for comment.

Desired Features for North Side Planning

In preparation for the north side plan the committee decided to brainstorm about possible features for the Park. This information will give the consultant something to work with and to encourage the stakeholders to think “outside the box”.

The committee determined that there was consensus on some of the desired features, but they still need to be given to stakeholders for discussion. Additionally, public input is necessary.

Brainstorm:

- Group picnic areas with shelters, electricity, and water.
- Remove caretaker house?
- Storage area- will the new building be big enough?
- Sally suggested a Labyrinth.
- Susan explained that there are examples at the Franciscan Spiritual Center (Hwy 224 and Webster) and also one at the Episcopal Cathedral located at 18th & Everett.
- JoAnn commented that we don’t want to have **the dog run** issue take up all of the planning meetings. Need to be sure that we resolve the question **outside the master planning process**. She suggested that the dog run remain in its current location until a decision is made.
- **Dick Shook suggested a** Tai Chi area
- Amphitheater- classroom sized area
- Croquet area
- Protect northwest corner of park. Possibly have boardwalk to access for interpretive education (e.g. Wildwood Recreation Area on the way to Mt. Hood)
- Dan commented that it sounds like it might be premature to work on the story boards ahead of the north side plan.
- Susan said yes, it probably is. She won’t be upset if they are moved during the planning. They need to be done well.
- Dan will tell Jon Mantay that the committee is will work on the boards as part of the north side planning.

Amplified Sound Policy

At the October meeting the stewardship committee recommended to the District Advisory Board the adoption of a modified amplified sound policy for North Clackamas Park. The DAB did not take action on the recommendation. The committee decided that more discussion was needed

regarding the plan for the amplified sound policy for the ball fields. The committee was given additional information on sound levels.

Discussion:

- Eric explained that the DAB wants to adopt the existing draft policy without the suggested changes by the stewardship committee. He thought that more discussion was needed before the DAB takes any action.
- Dan said that DAB is not in a rush to adopt a policy. They are interested in the stewardship committee taking a comprehensive look at all the uses in the park.
- Rick asked how the existing policy might impact weddings. He said he would recommend **going** back to 70 using the new sound information handed out.
- JoAnn stated that the committee needs more information to make a good decision about the decibel level.
- Susan commented that she didn't think the sound levels on the chart handed out by Michelle were correct.
- John suggested that someone get out during games and see if 70 is too loud and then make a recommendation.
- Steve liked John's idea, see if 70 is a problem then act.
- Eric measured the noise of the fan in the room to give everyone a sense of what decibel levels are like. The fan was about 60 decibels.

Action: Staff will do more research on amplified sound **and bring that back to the Stewardship Committee**. Dan will let the DAB know that the stewardship committee will come back to them with more information at a later date.

Ombuds Activity

Progress Report: Ball field Construction:

Dan provided a brief update on the ball field project

- The District is looking into a contract for field maintenance
- There was a lot of rain, but the fields are holding up
- Work has been slowed by the weather, but still on schedule.
- Bulletin board in dog run seems to be working ok.
- Question was asked about private property access to the south. Dan responded that he thought it was worked out, but will double check with contractor.

Committee Comments

The next meeting falls during the week between Christmas and New Years. The committee discussed changing the meeting date to either the week before or after. There was consensus to change the meeting to December 20, 2006. Michelle will reserve the room with Rose.

Next meeting – December 20, 2006, Milwaukie Center, 4-6 p.m.