

# STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE

for

## North Clackamas Park

November 28, 2007

Milwaukie Center

---

### MEETING SUMMARY

---

#### PRESENT

**Representatives:** Eric Shawn (chair), Tony Clark, JoAnn Herrigel, Lisa Gibson, Sally Shook

**Alternates:** Rick Frank, Steve Berliner, Dave Somann

**Guests:** Dick Shook, Anne and Pat O'Donnell

**Staff** Dan Zinzer, Michelle Healy, Staci Hammond, Kevin Cayson

#### ABSENT

**Representatives:** Fr. Matthew Tate, John Denny

**Alternates:** Holly Denman, Jim Schuld, Beth Ragel, Susan Shawn

### Introductions and Minutes

Eric Shawn opened the meeting with a welcome and introductions. He then asked the committee to review the October meeting minutes. After some discussion about changes JoAnn motioned to approve. Rick seconded. Minutes approved with some minor changes.

*Action: The October minutes were approved with minor corrections*

### North Side Planning

Eric Shawn introduced the topic of North Side Planning

#### *Discussion:*

Michelle- we are getting close to the "final" decision making time. We had our third public meeting and got some great input. We have Mike Rose here from Alta Planning to answer some questions we might have and also to explain some minor changes.

Dan- I just wanted to let everyone know that I have a Clackamas River Issues Consortium meeting at 6pm. I did contact the sound engineer. He will be doing a job in Estacada in December. We are making arrangements for him to come out and take a look. I just wanted everyone to know that it is in the works.

Dave- does he need the ball fields in motion?

Dan- no I can tell him where the sound issues are.

Michelle- ok now Mike is going to show the new concept plan and explain some of the changes that have been made. We want to get feedback from the Stewardship Committee.

Mike- there are a few minimal changes that have been made. One significant change is the maintenance yard has been relocated to where the caretaker trailer is. We have moved some of the exercise stations. We have decided that the wildflower meadow area was not wide enough for good growth, so we have moved it to a smaller area around the path of the park. It will make it easier for maintenance. I had a meeting with Mart Hughes about the Oak/Ash forest land. We got to thinking about what the plan is for when the trees go away/die. We are planning on doing some native plantings around the base of the trees that can take over when the older trees go. I just want everyone to know that the orange trees on the concept plan are new plantings so when they mature and the older ones die we still have a forest. In the dog park we duplicated the outside dog area. The shade structure inside the dog park will help bridge the gap between the small dogs and large dogs. Also the riparian buffer was expanded per John Van Stavren of Pacific Habitat. He said that 70ft buffer was average. We were 60ft so we were close.

Dan- Dick brought up the point about having a wider buffer between the dog park and the trail. That way the dogs won't be barking at people using the trail.

Mike- I think that is definatly doable.

Dick- I don't think you need a neighborhood path because there are not enough people that will use it. I was also concerned about the locations of some of the exercise stations.

Mike- those locations are still very flexible. Right now we have some that will be in the shade and some in the sun. Some of them will probably have to move in the final plans.

JoAnn- what about the paths on the north and south side of the creek? Why do we have one to the north and south of the same creek? Can people not move around the north side of the ball fields? The Milwaukie Park Board had asked that one path be considered rather than one on both sides of the creek.

Dick- the reason we have that path is to give people a figure 8 to walk which in turn will give you longer mileage for walkers.

Mike- we are also proposing that the trail be asphalt instead of concrete. It's not as harsh as concrete and is better for people to walk on.

Sally- exactly how big is the dog park?

Mike- same as before 1.2 acres- it's just split now for the division between small and large dogs.

Michelle- I sent Alta an email about keeping the size the same. It just shifted over and looks smaller.

Mike- it's narrower and longer.

Michelle- is the buffer 70ft all the way around?

Mike- it's only 70ft around Mt. Scott. Camas Creek has a 50ft buffer because it is not as important to shade the whole creek.

JoAnn- does the placement of parking reflect consensus?

Michelle- yes there is some concern about pedestrians crossing the parking lot though.

Mike- we could move the parking a little bit so it's not such a straight shot.

Michelle- the Milwaukie Center does not want speed bumps so maybe moving it over would be a good compromise.

Mike- the other thing is it is narrow so that would slow people down also.  
Dave- where does the picnic shelter go?  
Mike- well, long term it has structural issues. So we thought why not move it now and do something different, rather than having to repair problems as they come up.  
Dick- what about the caretaker location?  
Mike- that is the best spot to see everything. The utilities are all there and they will be able to see the whole park.  
Sally- can't we have maintenance over on the south side?  
Kevin- no, it's not big enough for all of the equipment.  
Michelle- actually majority of the storage is used by the Milwaukie Center. It has stuff in there for meals on wheels, quilt rack, etc.  
Sally- I just thought we could consolidate some areas.  
Steve- what is the traffic plan? Safety? Are there no problems now?  
Michelle- we haven't had any issues that I know about.  
Steve- could we change the direction of traffic from clockwise to counter clockwise?  
Dan- I raised the question with the Centers board and they preferred no change.  
Steve- well I think speed bumps would be very good.  
Dan- I am talking about raised concrete. It would be a very smooth transition.  
Steve- I think some kind of speed control should be considered. I personally like the ones at Oatfield and 34<sup>th</sup> towards Hwy 224. They serve a valuable purpose. I do have a question about the exercise areas, is there any sense to have them covered?  
Mike- we hadn't thought about a cover system. I do have some catalogs of shade covers that people can look at.  
Sally- wouldn't we just plant trees there instead of building another structure?  
Mike- yes, they could be added at a later date.  
Dave- the one issue that may arise from having them covered is that they may attract kids after the park is closed, which could cause some trouble.  
Michelle- Will there be any designated parking spaces for the Milwaukie Center buses?  
Eric- will vandalism be a problem?  
Mike- well, in the past, gas was being taken out of the buses but once the ball fields and the dog park became popular there have been no problems that we know of.  
Michelle- the Milwaukie Center doesn't want the buses behind the center because they take up too much useful space, for Meals on Wheels. Maybe we could meet with the center to figure something out.  
Dan- when we get the master plan we will only have funding for phase 1.  
Mike- we will have to make up some kind of phasing plan and figure out what can fit in where. Ultimately the whole cost will decide what happens.  
Michelle- the DAB brought up access to the creeks. I have heard both sides and the consensus is to protect the creek by limiting access. That also brings up permitting issues.  
Dave- we can protect the creek by educating, if you can't get to the creek you can't educate.  
Michelle- the problem is when you get people down there the banks start to wear away from all the usage.  
Steve- there should be no swimming, no dogs. It needs to be overly policed. The vision of the creek should be healthy. Don't make it a water feature for the park.

Michelle- the Park is very popular and we don't want to fence it off.

Sally- why do you need a fence?

Ann- the neighbors feel that it will deter people. We wanted it to keep people out of private property and keep out garbage and messes.

Sally- also, how do you lock the park with no fence?

Michelle- we have to figure a type of fencing that will not prevent the wildlife because we want to keep the wildlife.

Dave- other parks have put in "doors" in the fence for animals to go through.

Michelle- these are all the things that we need to figure out. Where does it go in relation to the creek? We will need to put it in the plans.

Mike- you still want a split rail fence along the north side and a full fence on the other side?

Sally- right that way people can still get into the park at night.

Dave- the thing is fences will keep honest people out. It is the people that are looking for trouble that the fences won't keep out.

Eric- where does the fence line sit?

Mike- it will be near the top of the bank if not on the top of the bank.

Kevin- we need to see where the existing fence lays.

JoAnn- the concerns that I am hearing from this group are to keep people out of the creek and private property. This is not in sync with the DAB (which has expressed interest in increasing access to the creeks). If people have access to the water they don't do good things. Maybe we should keep it a way back so there are no problems.

Steve- what people don't understand is conflict of uses. A person playing in the streams is not good for the habitat.

Sally- I don't think it's good for kids to play in until the streams are clean. Right now they are not.

Steve- it's not good for the fish either.

Mike- we will have two educational signs to tell people why we are not letting them in the creek.

Eric- Is this an issue that needs to go on the agenda? Should we make a recommendation? Maybe a consensus vote?

Michelle- I just think if we get a consensus I can go to the DAB and say that this is what we think.

Rick- I think you are going to have a couple idiots that will climb over the fence because people still need to go to the creek. I prefer no access but, giving them a limited spot to do so properly may be better. They are going to get in there whether we say they can or not.

Eric- may I make a proposal? How about we say, visual access not physical access to the creek and not provide a specific way to get into the water.

Dave- if a school comes to do water work, how do they get to the water?

Eric- through the foliage

JoAnn- so no physical access but visual? Or no public access, or no uncontrolled public access?

Steve- If we have access to the creek at all the banks and foliage wont have time to recover. It will get better with time if people/dogs are not walking through it.

Eric- lets check consensus on: no uncontrolled public access to the creeks in the north side of North Clackamas Park.

\*\*\*It was unanimous all the way around that we don't allow uncontrolled public access\*\*\*

Michelle- we heard people want the dog park but some don't.  
Sally- I felt that we do need a dog park in the area. We don't need to build one that is so wonderful, bigger and better that everyone wants to come here. A nicer park equals more dogs/noise. We need another dog park.  
Tony- what do you mean wonderful? We are just revamping, no mud, new benches and new shelters.  
Sally- well people say it's nice now and we are thinking it's going to be a busy park.  
Tony- It just won't be a mud hole anymore.  
Eric- what if the dog park isn't in phase 1? That will give more time for another dog park to open. That would take pressure off NCP. The new park could have new great features that people like better.  
Michelle- what could we do to the dog run in phase 1? The fence?  
Dick- when can we get a caretaker in to take care of noisy dogs?  
Kevin- let's make sure that is in phase 1.  
Tony- what would you not put in?  
Rick- It's the most used thing in the park, we need more dog parks. To ignore it in phase 1 is not accomplishing what we want. I don't think it's smart to hold off on a major portion of North Side Planning.  
Michelle- where are other areas for dog parks?  
Ann- Harmony?  
Michelle- It's still in the idea phase  
Rick- I think it's critical in the 3 creeks area  
Eric- what is the timing for developing phase 1?  
Dan- we have \$400,000 from Metro Green Spaces local share bond funds for parts of this in eligible areas. I don't think the dog park is eligible. We can hopefully start to make the first improvements this summer.  
Michelle- Dog Park and skate parks are in every call we take on new properties. People want them; it is just finding the space to do them. Safety is an issue in the 3 Creeks area. Trail walkers don't expect trails like they do in parks. People say they don't feel comfortable going down to 3 Creeks.  
Eric- if funding is not available for the dog park, it might stay at first.  
Dan- we have to look at money and balance what the phases can and can't be.  
Michelle- what do we think of this master plan as shown today?  
Eric- I generally support it  
JoAnn- generally support  
Steve- generally support  
Lisa- generally support  
Rick- generally support  
Sally- generally support with a little more clarification on fencing  
Michelle- let's talk separately about that  
Dave- generally support – move the traffic flow

*Action: The committee will make a recommendation to the DAB for final approval with some small changes to the driveway and the neighborhood fence.*

## **Interpretive Program**

Eric introduced the topic of the Interpretive Program.

*Discussion:*

Michelle- we have had lots of interest in interpretive signage. Are there specific things we want educational signage about?

Mike- there are 3 different types of signage.

1. Informational – Rules, do's and don'ts – entrances
2. Educational – At overlooks, bridge areas and by the creek - buffer issues and/or wildlife.
3. Exercise stations – How to use and benefits of your workout

We need to figure out how we want them to look. What specific issues with lots of information. The general interpretive signs have 3 classifications: 3 to 5 second which is just them taking a quick look. 30 seconds, this would have a paragraph to glance at. And, 3 to 5 minutes to read whole thing. What do we think we want? We need to make sure we choose regulatory signs and we have to make sure we don't overload the park with signs.

Eric- have we thought of anything but location?

Mike- no; we want to know what should happen on the signs- minimal or complex signage.

Dan- has everyone looked at Mt. Talbert? We could go with recycled plastic but I think they look good.

Eric- how do we want to approach this?

JoAnn- this signage project is close to Susan's heart and I feel bad about not having her here to add to this conversation.

Sally- maybe when we get further along we will know what to say and all that

Michelle- Mike, give us a ball park figure on signage prices.

Mike- well stop signs on the trail is about \$200-\$300. Signs can be very expensive. You can spend up to \$20,000 on just one sign. That is why there is usually a lot of time and money put into research to make sure we have what we want on the signs and that the information is correct. We are more looking at \$3000-\$7000 per sign. If we go with pre-manufactured signs our money will go farther, probably looking at about the \$1000-\$3000 per sign range.

Eric- what if we reconvene a group that will look at signs and information to go on them?

Steve- I can write up what I would like to see on the signs.

JoAnn- can Mike write a list of criteria of what to consider when developing signs?

Steve- what about quick preference type of signs? Not a Crystal Springs type board. Color pictures of birds and ducks you might see. I would like to see a black outline/silhouette of vertebrates and invertebrates (snake, ants or spiders). Very brief, just to tell what they are and to look for them on the trails and in the park.

Michelle- these are some very good ideas and suggestions

Eric- we can refine and bring back ideas to the committee

JoAnn- I do like the general locations of the signs

Michelle- we have 9 locations?

Mike- yes, but we can have as many as we want. I do think that having them at the creek overlooks is a must.

Michelle- we were thinking 5-7 signs. More than that is a lot of money

Eric- can we get signage grants?

Michelle- I think so but I would have to check on that. I think we could make a case that they are educational pieces.

Mike- I will see if I can find some information on that. I think it's out there. Grand Ronde does it.

JoAnn- can Mike write up some information on what we need to go over in the sign committee?

Kevin- go to Mather road and look at Mt. Talbert signage.

Eric- We are getting close to 6pm.

*Action: A sign committee will reconvene to go over Mike's recommended criteria and get back to the full group with ideas for sign format and type.*

## **Ombuds Activity & Reports**

Eric introduced the topic.

### *Discussion:*

Eric- I got an email from Victor Tushner about whom to contact on dog noise. I think that any member of the committee could be contacted.

JoAnn- I would suggest they contact the city. We have a code enforcement coordinator. Tim Salyers at 503-786-7409 is the guy for the City of Milwaukie. The problem is it is very hard to prove who is barking.

Kevin- we are trying to find a park host so if you know of anyone.

Steve- does it pay?

Kevin- no, it's volunteer

Eric- Do we want a December meeting or skip it and come back in January?

*General Consensus is to reconvene on January 23, 2008*

Eric- I will put the information on the Friends website. It's up and running and all our work is posted there.

Michelle- ok back to signs for a moment; if the committee is doing stuff, get it back to me so we can start work on the signs

*Action: Committee agreed to skip December meeting and reconvene on January 23.*

## **Committee Member Comments**

Eric introduced the topic of Committee Member Comments.

### *Discussion:*

Eric- any committee member comments?

Rick- Merry Christmas

JoAnn- is there an update on Jim Schuld?

Eric- right now it's on hold. I need to get an update.

## **Citizen Comments**

Eric introduced the topic of Citizen Comments.

*Discussion:*

NONE

-----

JoAnn made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Sally seconded the motion.

**Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.**

**Next meeting will be held on January 23, from 4 to 6 pm at the Milwaukie Center.**