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Introduction

The Park Futures project was initiated by the Park Bureau and Commissioner Lindberg’s office in June, 1986. The project was accomplished through the Parks Bureau’s Planning Section, with the active involvement of citizens, other agencies, Commissioner Lindberg’s office, and the Recreation and Operations Divisions of the Parks Bureau.

The purposes of the plan are to:

- Define an imaginative vision for the Bureau’s parks and facilities for the next 50 years;
- Identify the major issues and problems facing the Park Bureau now and in the future;
- Establish policies to guide the development and improvement of parks and facilities for the next 10-15 years; and
- Establish an “action plan” that lists specific projects over the next five years.

The plan is intended also to serve as a guide for the Bureau’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which is revised annually. Through Park Futures, capital projects can be used to implement and carry out the recommendations outlined in the plan. As with other master plans, Park Futures should be updated frequently to reflect changing conditions and needs.
A. Citizen Involvement

Citizen involvement was a critical part of the planning process and was encouraged wherever possible. Specific ways in which the city's residents participated were:

- **Interviews** - As the project's first task, 68 residents were interviewed on their attitudes and ideas for the park system. These residents included neighborhood leaders, concerned citizens, representatives of special interest groups, business people, and designers and planners. Results of the interviews were summarized in *Perceptions of Parks*.

- **Newsletters** - Beginning in May of 1986, Park Futures newsletters were published and mailed every three months. The newsletter described progress of the project and included articles on park history and the park system in general.

  In addition to the over 1,000 names on the mailing list, newsletters were distributed to libraries and all Park Bureau community centers.

- **Workshops** - Three rounds of workshops were held for the project. Each round consisted of eight meetings in neighborhoods throughout the city. Workshops were held in Fall, 1987, Spring, 1988, and Fall, 1988. Workshops were advertised through the newspaper, radio, and special flyers.

B. Documentation of the Process

A key part of the planning process involved doing extensive background research to establish a sound foundation for making decisions. The Bureau's inventory was updated, surveys were done with citizens and among staff, and an extensive citizen-participation program was prepared.

As a result of this work, several reports were prepared which represent the foundation for the plan. These reports were, in order of publication:

- *Perceptions of Parks* - A summary of interviews with 62 citizens;

- *Inventory of Parks* - A compilation of location maps and site plans for all of the City's parks;
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Inventory of Street Landscaped Areas—a collection of maps and plans for all of the smaller "beautification" sites maintained by the Parks Bureau;

Telephone Survey Results—summarizes the results of a scientific poll of 1,200 City residents on recreational attitudes and behavior;

Population Trends and Demographic Characteristics—identifies population patterns and trends, based on the 1980 Census and other studies;

Park Assessment—describes the condition of the City’s parks, which are grouped into different park types;

Facility Assessment—summarizes the condition of the City’s recreational facilities, from Operations buildings to specialized structures such as the Community Music Center.

Five working papers were also prepared on specific topics. These papers were:

Public Workshop Summary-Round 1, Fall 1987
Public Workshop Summary-Round 2, Spring 1988
Review of Recreational Surveys—a brief summary of recreational surveys in the country since 1980.
Community Schools Assessment—a review of the needs of the Community Schools Program, based on the comments of staff.

A newsletter was also published during the course of the project. Issues were printed about every three to six months during 1987-1989. The newsletters summarized findings from the research being conducted for the plan and included articles on park history, as well.
Imagine, for a moment, a bustling metropolitan city encircled by a network of walking paths, trails and boulevards that connect lush green meadows, forested hillsides, finely manicured gardens, spectacular vistas and vast lakes and rivers. Imagine a parkway along Willamette Boulevard, a park along the Columbia Slough, and Ross Island as a wildlife sanctuary. Imagine having the best of both worlds...a beautiful place to work and play.

This is what the Olmsted Brothers envisioned in 1903 when they visited Portland to prepare its parks master plan. The Olmsteds were the sons of Frederick Law Olmsted, who designed Central Park in New York City and park systems throughout the country. In preparing Portland's master plan, they exhibited tremendous foresight and creativity, which created the foundation for a park system that is nationally recognized for its abundant open spaces and distinctive character.

Their vision was remarkable. Consider that in 1903, when the Olmsted Brothers arrived, the West Hills were largely undeveloped and most of Portland's 120,000 residents lived east of the Willamette River. The lowlands south of the Columbia River, where the airport now stands, comprised sloughs, wetlands and several large lakes.

Yet, the Olmsteds saw beyond this undeveloped frontier and provided city leaders with a vision that is as contemporary today as it was 90 years ago. They wrote:

"The City is most fortunate, in comparison with the majority of American cities, in possessing such varied and wonderfully strong and interesting landscape features available to be utilized in the park system."

Their master plan recommended that parks and park purposes should be defined in advance, be well-balanced and should be connected and approached by boulevards and parkways. Many of their suggestions have been realized...Forest Park, the Terwilliger Parkway, and Sellwood and Mt. Tabor Parks. Other ideas in the plan that are still possible include a parkway along Willamette Boulevard, a park adjacent to the Columbia Slough and the use of Ross Island for recreation.
Since that time, the role of parks have grown beyond playgrounds and scenic boulevards. Parks and recreation have now assumed roles that would have astonished the Olmsted Brothers. Recreation programs now address the needs of "at-risk" youth and other children whose horizons extend no further than their street. "Self-esteem" has become a key ingredient in many programs, and the growing number of single-parent families has generated a need for activities that are inexpensive.

Growing urbanization has taken a toll on open spaces in the Portland region. Farmland and other open spaces are giving way to houses, shopping centers, and parking lots. Aside from their value for recreation, open spaces represent a key factor in the region's "quality of life".

Parks and open spaces are especially important in Portland. In a recent survey of 1,200 residents, half of the respondents said that they visit their neighborhood parks at least once a month and one-third visit their neighborhood parks at least once a week. The importance of the park system was expressed strongly in 1989 when the city’s voters passed a $7.3 million parks levy for a variety of park projects.

Portland's legacy of park development began in 1852 with the dedication of 23 blocks of land for the Park Blocks, which are shown as a linear progression of treed rectangles, extending from left-center to right-center.
The city’s identity and historical legacy are closely linked to its parks. Portland’s founders initiated the tradition in 1852 when they reserved 23 blocks of land--later to become the Park Blocks--for park use. Other parks were acquired and became, along with the Park Blocks, critical elements of the city. Many also are among the city’s most visible landmarks--Forest Park, Washington Park, Ira Keller Fountain, Rocky Butte, Waterfront Park, and Pioneer Square.

As Portland moves towards the 21st century, it is time to articulate a new vision for the City’s park system. The city’s boundaries on both the east and west are expanding and its population will be changing dramatically over the next two decades. If we are to maintain the quality of life that has become a source of pride and health in this changing world, it is imperative our park system grow as well. It will be the best legacy we can leave for generations to come.

Just imagine . . .
PORTLAND'S PARK SYSTEM WILL BE INNOVATIVE AND WILL CONTINUE TO EXPLORE NEW WAYS OF PROVIDING RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES...

A comprehensive system of parks will be provided—from mini-parks to larger natural areas—to meet a range of recreational needs and preferences. Innovative projects and programs will be explored to meet the challenges of a changing population.

"Magnet parks" will be developed in each quadrant of the city and will be landscaped and developed to reflect the identity of their neighborhoods. Designed in the tradition of Laurelhurst Park, these magnet parks will be for strolling, picnics, and other activities that benefit from more manicured surroundings.

Filled with a variety of flowering shrubs and trees, these parks will recall Portland's Olmsted legacy and its horticultural tradition. They also will be designed to incorporate the natural features and topography of their sites.
"Magnet parks" will include a variety of facilities such as a community center, sports fields, ponds, rose gardens, and courts, and will be designed to reflect the neighborhood's identity and history.
New kinds of parks will be built to meet specific needs and to expand the variety of recreational opportunities. A growing population of downtown and close-in residents will require more parks in urban areas. In some inner-city areas, streets will be closed or redesigned to develop mini-parks and neighborhood plazas.

More parks in industrial areas will be built to accommodate lunchtime recreational activities and to provide open space for eating and socializing. Residents from adjacent neighborhoods will be able to use these facilities on weekends.

Neighborhood parks and community centers, the traditional cornerstone of park systems, will continue to function as the centers of their neighborhoods. Through a combination of programs, special events, and traditional features, parks and community centers will be woven into the social fabric of their neighborhoods.

Programs will be held in neighborhood parks to attract children, families, and other adults. Summer recreation programs, weekend events, and evening concerts will all help to maintain parks as vital ingredients in the community’s livability.

Citizens will also be actively involved in planning and maintaining their parks. Close ties will be forged between neighborhoods and the Parks Bureau along with other public agencies such as the school districts.

Athletic field complexes will be built to provide a centralized facility for organized leagues and tournaments. In addition to the fields, these facilities will include concessions and other attractions that can be used by adults and children.
Hilltop parks will serve as major viewpoints that attract visitors from throughout the metropolitan area. Portland's hills and buttes such as Rocky Butte, Council Crest, and Mt. Tabor will become viewpoints from which the breadth of the city can be seen. These will be linked to other parks in the system through boulevards, bikepaths, and through the 40 Mile Loop.

Artwork will be integrated into all parks. Sculpture, fountains, and some site furnishings will be designed by artists as a way of making public art more accessible to neighborhood residents.

A Freeway Park will be built over I-405 to provide an open-space link between the downtown and the Goose Hollow or Northwest neighborhoods. Like its namesake in Seattle, Portland's Freeway Park will provide spaces for passive recreation in addition to strengthening the pedestrian linkage between the two areas.
NATURAL AREAS WILL FOSTER AN APPRECIATION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, AND ALLOW RESIDENTS TO VIEW WILDLIFE IN THEIR NATIVE HABITAT...

The City’s natural areas such as Oaks Bottom, Forest Park, Smith and Bybee Lakes, and Powell Butte will be improved with trails, signs, and interpretive centers. These sites will also be carefully managed to preserve their environmental integrity while allowing access for education and recreation.

An "Urban Wildlife Refuge System" will be established. As envisioned by Portland Audubon Society, the system would include a network of trails, interpretive facilities, signs and exhibits to educate visitors. The management of these natural areas will be coordinated with other jurisdictions. Improvements, such as trails and interpretive exhibits, also will be developed in a consistent manner in the region.

A system of interpretive centers will be developed. These centers will be used by the Outdoor Education Program for classes and other programs. The centers will located around the city at larger natural area sites.

An Outdoor Education Program will be developed to teach children and adults about Portland’s natural areas, wildlife, and other environmental resources. Through programs and a system of interpretive centers, environmental education will be an integral part of the Parks Bureau’s offerings.

By coordinating the program with the school districts, children from the first grade through high school will learn about the natural environment and about Portland’s special resources.

The program will be dovetailed with other programs as well such as programs for "at-risk" youth and employment training programs. Students from these programs will be used for trail building and to serve as park rangers.
Trails, interpretive centers, educational exhibits, and observation blinds will be built in natural areas. These will be used for the city's outdoor education program and field trips.
A NETWORK OF INDOOR POOLS WILL OFFER YEAR-ROUND SWIMMING IN EACH PART OF THE CITY...

A system of indoor swimming pools will provide opportunities for recreational swimming, hydrotherapy, and instruction for all residents. In addition, swim meets can be accommodated when needed. The aquatics network will comprise several different types of facilities.

A network of community multi-use pools will be built throughout the city and will include pools for the disabled, a sauna, whirlpool, classrooms, and other facilities;

A 50-meter multi-use aquatics complex will be centrally located in the city. The complex will include a 50 meter pool, whirlpool and sauna, locker rooms, fitness facilities, classrooms, daycare room, recreation area, and concessions.

A multi-use wave pool will have a waterslide, play pool for children, whirlpool, and a waterfall. The facility will be centrally located and will be used by both residents and visitors.

RECREATION CENTERS AND PROGRAMS WILL OFFER A VARIETY OF YEAR-ROUND ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS...

Recreation programs will be an integral part of the city's neighborhood parks. Programs for children of all ages will be held throughout the summer with evening events for adults and older children. All of the city's citizens will be able to participate in recreational programs, which will be accessible to everyone, regardless of income.

Programs will be developed to respond to changing needs and preferences. Experimental and innovative programs will be provided to identify trends and to introduce new activities. Recreational needs will be defined through frequent questionnaires distributed to the general public and specific population groups.

"Mobile" programs and classes will be provided by vans and staff that travel from park to park for special events and performances. With the van, all of the city's parks will have access to unique events and activities.

Partnerships with other providers will be used to expand the variety in programs. Special interests and needs will be addressed through cooperative partnerships with other providers such as non-profit groups, health clubs, and schools. Through this approach, a coordinated network of programs and recreation provider can be established.

A computerized information system will enable people to view program selections from a library or a personal computer. The system will also be used for registration in classes and programs. As a result, signing up for a Park Bureau class will be as easy as calling up the PARCS (Park And Recreation Class Schedule) Program and entering the appropriate information.

Information on activities and programs will be distributed through a variety of ways. To supplement the Program Guide, other methods such as cable television, special mailings, and radio spots will be used. Special techniques will be used to dispense information to specific population groups that are difficult to reach through conventional channels.
Mobile recreational vans will travel around the city to provide special programs and events for park users.
New community centers will be built to have high visibility and will be located on bus lines and on main roads. In addition, the centers will include off-street parking, playgrounds, sports fields, court facilities, and swimming pools. All centers will be designed to accommodate the physically disabled.
THE WILLAMETTE RIVERFRONT WILL SERVE AS THE RECREATIONAL "HEART" FOR THE CITY OF PORTLAND...

The Willamette riverfront will be developed to establish it as the city’s recreational center and as a seam that binds the east and west sides of the city. A major focus will be on developing the area between the downtown and Sellwood Bridge as a recreational corridor, including Ross and Toe Islands.

Recreational facilities along the river will offer residents and visitors a chance to enjoy the river through canoeing, sailing, and fishing. A light watercraft center on the river will rent canoes and kayaks as well as offer classes for novices and experts.

Viewpoints, historical sites, and habitat areas will be featured with exhibits and site furnishings. Fishing piers will provide greater access to the river and will include support facilities such as cleaning tables, sinks, and benches.

A major recreational corridor will be developed between the Fremont Bridge and the Sellwood Bridge. The corridor will include riverfront parks, paved trails, and connections with adjoining neighborhoods.

Natural areas such as Ross Island, Elk Rock Island, and Oaks Bottom will be part of this corridor but will have limited access. They also will be used primarily for environmental educational activities.

Pedestrian bridges will link both sides of the Willamette River—one in the downtown and the other in the lower Albina area. The downtown bridge will benefit employees, commuters who park on the east side, bicyclists, and joggers. It will also be used as the site for festivals and other events along the waterfront.

The Lower Albina crossing will provide direct access to the Willamette Greenway from adjacent neighborhoods in the inner-Northeast, which now have poor access to the river. The crossing will also include waterfront recreational facilities such as a fishing pier, park, and trails connecting it to the neighborhood.

Pedestrian connections from adjacent neighborhoods will allow nearby residents to walk or bicycle to the riverfront. These connections will be marked with signs and highlighted with street trees and special paving. Neighborhood parks, other open spaces, and urban plazas in the downtown will all be linked through these pedestrian paths.
The Columbia River riverfront will be developed as a recreational corridor with boat ramps, wayside parks, bikepaths, and viewpoints. As with the Willamette River, the riverfront will be linked with the adjacent residential and commercial areas and with the Columbia Slough. Parks will be built along the river to serve picnickers, bicyclists, joggers, and employees from nearby businesses.
A TRAIL SYSTEM WILL ENCIRCLE THE CITY AND WILL BE INTEGRATED WITH BICYCLE PATHS, THE PARK SYSTEM, AND OTHER PUBLIC ATTRACTIONS...

A network of trails will be developed to connect all of the city’s neighborhoods with bicycle routes, parks, the riverfront, and other major destinations. By using a variety of trail types—paved, soft-surface, and on-street—the system will be able to fulfill a range of needs and preferences.

The 40 Mile Loop will encircle the city and provide over 140 miles of recreational trails through wetlands, forests, along lakes, rivers, and sloughs and through neighborhoods. Recreational corridors will be developed in areas such as the South Shore where trails will link such attractions as Kelley Point Park, the Columbia Slough, and Smith and Bybee Lakes.

When completed, the Loop will connect parks along the Columbia, Sandy, and Willamette Rivers in a continuous trail. There will be activities for everyone such as hiking, bicycling, jogging, walking, canoeing, and nature study.

The Loop will also provide trail access for the physically disabled and nature trails for children. It also will be accessible by Tri-Met at many points, and will be close to office workers interested in noon-time walking and jogging.
The Urban Trail System in Inner-City Neighborhoods

- Bikepaths and trails to connect mid-County neighborhoods to the I-205 Bikepath, Bellrose Trail, and Marine Dr. Bikepath
- The "Banfield Greenway"-- connects Rocky Butte with the Willamette Greenway
- Trails and bikepaths to connect close-in neighborhoods with the riverfront
- I-205 Bikepath-- provides a north-south linkage between the Marine Dr. Bikepath and the Bellrose Trail
- Springwater Trail connects Portland with Gresham to provide recreational and bicycle commuting opportunities
An Urban Trail System will be developed to connect parks with each other, with their neighborhoods, and with other public attractions such as the riverfront. The Trail will be marked through signs, special paving, and street trees.

The network will enable residents to find the most attractive and interesting routes for recreational walking or cycling to work and to parks. Wherever possible, the Trail will also include historical sites, viewpoints, and other areas of general interest.

The trail will be linked to "gateway parks," that will highlight the entrances to the city. These parks will serve as beacons and landmarks, will be landscaped for seasonal beauty, and will reflect the character of their neighborhoods.
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Paved trails will be built along the river to link the downtown with the parks along the river. Bicyclists, joggers, and walkers will be able to view the river and its activities from trails that meander through woods and along the Willamette River's shoreline. Central City employees will be able to stroll through wooded areas and bicycle to Willamette Park during their lunchtime or after work.
The Banfield Greenway will be improved with a pedestrian and bicycle trail that links Rocky Butte with the downtown, and the 40 Mile Loop. The trail will be paved and will be wide enough to accommodate bicyclists, joggers, and walkers. Benches, drinking fountains, lighting, and other improvements will be provided to increase the use of the trail.

The Greenway will be linked to adjoining residential and business areas and the bicycle trail along the I-205 freeway. As a result, the trail will provide lunchtime as well as weekend recreational opportunities.
The "Banfield Greenway" will be developed along the existing MAX line and will accommodate bicyclists, joggers, pedestrians, walkers, and others out for a stroll. The trail will be linked, along its route, with adjacent neighborhoods and the city's Urban Trail System.
Realizing the Vision:  
A Blueprint for the Future

The previous section painted a picture of Portland’s park system in the future. To realize that vision, several key issues will have to be addressed in a systematic way over the next 10-15 years. This section outlines the first basic steps that are needed.

A. The Basic Objectives of the Plan

The principal goal of the Park Futures Plan is to rebuild Portland’s park system to meet current needs as well as demands projected for the 21st century. As described in Chapter Five, many of the city’s parks and facilities are either in disrepair or inefficient. As a result, it is extremely unlikely that the Parks Bureau will be able to adequately meet future recreational needs unless the existing system is extensively renewed.

In addition to this basic goal, the plan also focuses on four other objectives that collectively establish the foundation for the Futures Plan. These objectives are to:

0 Make better use of existing resources through a variety of measures.

These include park redevelopment, more programs in parks, park safety improvements, better marketing and promotion, and improvements at facilities that can accommodate greater use.

Natural areas, in particular, have been neglected and will require greater attention to their management, planning, and physical improvements. This is important if the environmental integrity of these sites is to be protected.
Initiate a major park and facility renovation program.

This will reduce maintenance and operational costs, replace infrastructure and equipment that is in disrepair, and correct problems that limit recreational opportunities and jeopardize the safety of parks.

In many parts of Portland, the Parks Bureau will be extensively renovating parks to replace outdated and inefficient facilities. Renovation at community centers and other structures, however, will be limited to facilities that have the potential for multiple use over the long term.

Develop new recreational facilities to meet existing needs and to ensure that future recreational demands can be met.

New pools and community centers will have to be built to replace those that are now inadequate, have outlived their usefulness, and continue to become increasingly inefficient and expensive to maintain.

In a few areas around the city, parkland will have to be acquired and parks developed to correct long-standing deficiencies that will worsen as population and population density increases.

Establish an integrated network of parks, natural areas, trails, and recreational corridors.

The Olmsteds' concept of the 40 Mile Loop will be expanded to include other parks and the city's neighborhoods. It would also focus on the Willamette and Columbia Rivers as major recreational corridors capable of accommodating a range of uses and activities.

B. Organization of the Master Plan

Specific actions are proposed in the context of both a Short-Term (1990-1995) and Long Term strategy (beyond 1995). The actions should be viewed as an outline which can be revised as more information becomes available, as conditions change, and as the proposals are carried out. The recommendations in this plan also are intended to guide the Parks Bureau's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which will be an important funding source for many of the projects.
C. Funding

Implementation of Park Future's recommendations depend largely on an adequate level of funding over the next 20 years. This is especially critical for large projects, such as land acquisition or the development of new community centers and pools, that require a greater financial commitment than now exists. In short, the funding for City parks and recreational facilities will have to be restructured significantly if current and future needs are to be met.

An Historical Overview of Park Funding

Previous funding efforts reflected a deep sense of civic and financial commitment on the part of Portland's leaders. From the City's incorporation in 1851 to the beginning of the 20th century, most of the land for Portland's parks was donated by park patrons. These donations included the Park Blocks, Chapman and Lownsdale Squares (the Plaza Blocks), and Macleay Park.

This pattern changed in the first half of the 20th century as Portland's population and geographic area expanded. The park system grew with it, funded by tax levies and bond measures for acquisition and development. Among the parks purchased and built this way include Peninsula Park and Community Center, Laurelhurst Park, Mt. Tabor Park, and Sellwood Park.

The last levy expired in 1958, and for 31 years, the city was forced to look to other funding sources for capital investment in the park system. One of these funding sources re-established in the past few years is a General Fund appropriation for capital. In the last three years, the General Fund has allocated approximately $500,000/year for parks capital projects.

Over the last 30 years, several funding sources and methods have been and continue to be used. In the 1960s, 70s, and part of the 80s, the Federal
Government proved to be a beneficial, if temporary, source of funding. Through a variety of programs\(^1\), the City received millions of dollars that were funneled into park acquisition and development.

By the mid-1980's, however, these funding sources had declined or disappeared altogether. But during their life, these programs funded or helped to finance development or redevelopment at Cathedral Park, Sellwood Riverfront Park, Multnomah Arts Center, King School-Park, Creston Park, Leach Botanical Garden, and Lents Park.

The Portland Development Commission's (PDC) Urban Renewal program is another major funding source that has helped to create some of Portland's finest parks. Within renewal districts, the program has funded park improvement projects as part of the downtown revitalization effort.

As examples, Waterfront Park was designed and built with PDC's tax increment financing. PDC also participated in the redevelopment of six of the South Park Blocks, the redevelopment of Ankeny Park, and funded the development of Pettygrove Park and Ira Keller Fountain.

PDC continues to play a prominent role in the City's park program. In the near future, PDC and the Parks Bureau will jointly plan and PDC will fund the redevelopment of the North Park Blocks, the Eastside Esplanade, and will participate in funding at Holladay Park.

Creative packaging of projects has been another method the Park Bureau has used to acquire land and develop parks. Through grants, donations, and land exchanges, the Park Bureau has been able to develop several wonderful parks. While these programs take years to piece together, the results are often dramatic. Parks that were developed almost entirely this way include Sellwood Riverfront Park, Marquam Nature Park, Powell Butte Nature Park, and the Springwater Line, which is the southern leg of the 40 Mile Loop.

---

\(^1\) Such as the Economic Development Administration, Urban Demonstration Program, Urban Park and Recreation Program, Land and Water Conservation Fund, and Housing and Urban Development's Community Block Program.
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"Friends" groups, as well, have played vital roles in funding park acquisition and development. As one example, the Friends of Marquam Nature Park received land donations and money worth hundreds of thousands of dollars which made it possible to develop this 71-acre park in the Southwest Hills.

Also, the Forest Park Association has continued to raise money to implement the land acquisition strategy outlined in its plan for Forest Park. Another Friends group, the Friends of Leach Botanical Garden, has raised money for additional land acquisition and development at the garden. Furthermore, its operation of the garden has made the facility almost totally self-supporting.

**Limitations of Current Funding**

Although a variety of funding sources are used, the current methods of financing parks and facilities have proven to be insufficient to meet the public's recreational needs, especially in neighborhoods and for facilities such as pools and community centers. These funding constraints will be evident even more when the development of new recreational facilities is being considered.

Most of the General Fund dollars are distributed among a variety of major maintenance projects such as replacing boilers, removing asbestos, or replacing deteriorating play equipment. As a result, it has been difficult for the Parks Bureau to address land acquisition needs for neighborhood parks and to develop new recreational facilities in some neighborhoods.

Most significantly, the program has not necessarily encouraged systematic planning and management of park resources. As an example, most of the Federal Government's grant programs, which were used extensively during the 1970's, focussed on national goals more than local needs. Similarly, PDC-financed park improvements have concentrated on the downtown.
Prospects for the Future

The existing funding system is inadequate to meet projected needs as well as current facility needs caused by old buildings, worn-out infrastructure, and functional obsolescence. It is clear that the cost of restoring the system, let alone expanding it to meet the needs of a growing city, is considerable. In the process of preparing Park Futures, the Parks Bureau identified at least $90 million (in 1988 dollars) of capital projects that are needed to meet current and future needs.

Although existing funding sources are limited, the Parks Bureau nevertheless will have to rely on these sources until new strategies are developed. Although it is unclear what the long-term strategy might be, at least two options can be outlined.

- **General Obligation bonds** can also be used for park improvements. A benefit of GO Bonds is that funds are provided in a lump sum after the bonds are sold. As a result, projects can be initiated quickly.

- **Revenue bonds** are another alternative. Such bonds can, however, be used only if a facility can generate sufficient revenues to retire the bond. These are rarely used because most public recreation facilities are priced to serve all segments of the community and are usually not self-supporting.

A Short-Term Strategy for Funding

Although the 1989 levy addressed some of the park system's most serious needs, it represents only the first step in meeting future needs, which, as noted earlier, has been determined to be more than $90 million.

---

2 An exception to the rule of self-support, although not the only program to be self-supporting, is golf. The City's golf program has a history of providing outstanding facilities at reasonable prices from revenues the program generates.
If the needs identified in the Park Futures Plan are to be satisfied, if the City is to systematically rebuild an old and deteriorated park system, and if City services are to meet both unserviced and newly annexing areas within Portland, the Parks Bureau will likely have to rely primarily on general obligation bonds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARKS</strong></th>
<th>o</th>
<th>Renovate parks with paths, lighting, irrigation systems in poor condition and which require excessive maintenance, especially in areas of high demand and in neighborhoods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Maintain the current distribution and location of facilities and initiate a limited renovation program for the short-term, focusing on the most serious problems and facilities with the potential for multiple use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major renovation will be postponed pending the completion of a Facilities Plan for all Parks Bureau facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARK &amp; FACILITY DISTRIBUTION</strong></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Acquire and develop neighborhood or community park-deficient areas of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL AREAS</strong></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Emphasize the renovation of existing trails and the development of new trails in existing or potential high-use areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the public awareness of recreational opportunities in natural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Foster an attitude of &quot;active stewardship&quot; towards the management of natural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate a planning program for all natural areas where needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARK SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Utilize a variety of measures to increase the attractiveness of parks, emphasizing those that are positive and result in greater use of parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review and modify parks to encourage crime prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Continue the use of private security patrols for the short-term at parks with serious security problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>athletic fields</th>
<th>Investigate ways to increase field availability and generate revenues that can be used for the development and maintenance of athletic fields.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renovate athletic fields and stadiums that are in the most serious condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information &amp; marketing</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a comprehensive strategic marketing plan for all of the Bureau's services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a data collection process to identify participation trends for programs and classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use existing neighborhood and business networks for dispensing information and working with the community, especially with underserved groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizen involvement</td>
<td>Continue the existing system for using volunteers and expand the number and variety of opportunities where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and evaluate a variety of ways in which citizens can be involved in the planning and designing of parks and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aquatics</td>
<td>Renovate pools in poor condition and begin the development of a citywide aquatics system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare an Aquatics Master Plan to outline the development program for aquatics facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riverfront</td>
<td>Define the long-term plan for the recreational use of the Willamette riverfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with other agencies to acquire additional riverfront land and develop riverfront improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on developing the Eastside Esplanade as a first step in establishing a recreational corridor on the Willamette River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARK AND FACILITY DISTRIBUTION

Issues:

Certain sections of the city are deficient in neighborhood and community parks, recreational facilities, and other open spaces.

There also is a deficiency specifically for usable park land that can accommodate active recreational uses and facilities.

There are very limited funds available for the acquisition and development of parks and facilities.

Short-Term Strategy:

Acquire land and develop as neighborhood parks in the Cully-Parkrose neighborhood, southwest Portland, and inner Southeast Portland.

Limit improvements at facilities to those that are the most immediate, endanger the health and safety of staff and visitors, and are needed to meet critical recreation needs.

Increase the use of partnerships with other providers.

Prepare a Facilities Master Plan to define the development program for all Parks Bureau recreational facilities, including aquatic facilities.

Long-Term Strategy:

Develop new community centers and other facilities in deficient areas and replace buildings that are inefficient and in poor condition.
Proposed Actions

Park Deficiencies

1. Acquire land for future neighborhood parks in the Cully-Parkrose neighborhood, southwest Portland, and in the area north of Mt. Tabor.

2. Work with the school districts to develop school-parks in areas where acquisition or development for new parks is difficult.

3. Utilize innovative techniques to provide open space where no vacant land is available.

4. Investigate the use of a park dedication fee, development service charge, or other techniques to help fund the acquisition and development of neighborhood parks.

Facility Deficiencies

1. Establish Community School programs in deficient areas deficient areas or where suitable sites are not available, such as Whitaker, Scott, and Alameda.

2. Prepare a Facilities Master Plan for all Parks Bureau facilities, including community centers and pools, that identifies potential sites and uses.

3. Continue to develop partnerships with other providers for recreation programs such as the Community Schools Program.
NATURAL AREAS

Issues:

Natural areas are among the city’s major resources but are now underutilized.

The existing and long-term potential of natural areas has not been defined. As a result, many of the natural areas need to be protected from incompatible uses and activities.

Short-Term Strategy:

Emphasize the renovation of existing trails and the development of new trails in existing or potential high-use areas.

Initiate a planning program for all natural areas where needed.

Improve awareness of trails and other opportunities in natural areas through new or improved maps, brochures, and other measures.

Foster an attitude of "active stewardship" towards the management of natural areas.

Continue to work with other groups and agencies on capital projects and planning efforts.

Encourage the formation of "Friends" groups to work with the Parks Bureau in managing natural areas.

Long-Term Strategy:

Develop an extensive network of trails, interpretive centers, and other improvements at the city’s natural areas.

Establish an environmental education program for school-age children and adults, in cooperation with the school districts and other providers.
Proposed Actions

1. Continue to participate in efforts to coordinate the management of metropolitan natural areas and in the creation of a "Urban Wildlife Refuge System" (see description in Chapter 2) and the Metropolitan Greenspaces program.

2. Continue implementation of the Powell Butte Master Plan.

3. Prepare and implement master plans for all of the city’s natural areas, focusing initially on Forest Park, Elk Rock Island (Peter Kerr Park), and Smith-Bybee Lakes.

   Master plans should subsequently be prepared for other natural areas such as Kelly Butte and Woods Park.

4. Renovate and develop trails, and provide informational signs at Forest Park, Marquam Nature Park, Oaks Bottom.

5. Develop new trails and informational signs at Smith-Bybee Lakes and Powell Butte.

6. Prepare promotional materials such as maps and brochures for the Park Bureau’s natural areas.

7. Increase staffing and other resources needed to adequately plan and manage the Parks Bureau’s natural areas.
About 40 percent of the city's developed parks have facilities such as plumbing, play equipment, lighting, paving, or mechanical systems that are in disrepair or require extensive maintenance.

Improvements at some City parks are being done on an incremental basis, with no master plan to guide their long-term development.

The Park Bureau has many "problem" sites that have limited potential for park use due to poor access, extreme topography, or poor configuration.

Less than 10 percent of all parks are completely accessible to disabled visitors.

Renovate parks that have a variety of critical needs and which can accommodate large numbers of activities and visitors.

Emphasize renovation at sites where it would increase use of the park for programs or other opportunities.

Ensure that the improvement of access for disabled visitors is integrated into all park and facility renovation where appropriate.

Continue the renovation of other parks through the CIP process and as other funds allow.
Proposed Actions

1. Prepare master plans for parks that: (a) will be extensively renovated (see list below) or, (b) are not developed to meet current or projected needs.

2. Initiate extensive renovation at the following parks, which have a variety of critical needs and which accommodate large numbers of activities and visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloomington</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
<th>Gabriel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lair Hill</td>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Lair Hill</td>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>Pier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Correct specific deficiencies or problems at the following parks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Berrydale</th>
<th>Duniway</th>
<th>Flavel</th>
<th>Glenfair</th>
<th>Harrison</th>
<th>Laurelwood</th>
<th>Lillis-Albina</th>
<th>Merrifield</th>
<th>Overlook House</th>
<th>Powell</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Woodstock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Review the accessibility of parks for disabled visitors and prepare a Capital Improvements Program to address deficiencies.

5. Investigate the future use of "problem" sites and opportunities to sell or trade them.
ATHLETIC FIELDS AND FACILITIES

**Issues:**

There is an insufficient number of athletic fields under present conditions, especially for softball and soccer.

Athletic fields are in relatively poor condition because they are overused and are not designed for current levels of use.

**Short-Term Strategy:**

Investigate ways to increase field availability and generate revenues that can be used for the development and maintenance of athletic fields.

Improve existing fields through an expanded maintenance program.

Renovate athletic fields and stadiums that are most in need of renovation.

**Long-Term Strategy:**

Develop sports fields complexes to accommodate large number of athletic fields and facilities.

Continue the renovation of fields throughout the city.
Proposed Actions

1. Expand the Field Maintenance Program.

2. Review current scheduling methods and existing parks to determine if the availability of fields can be improved through:
   - working with other providers to allow the use of their fields,
   - developing more fields in existing and unimproved parks,
   - better scheduling, and
   - installing lighting to increase field use.

3. Explore the establishment of an enterprise fund to funnel league fees into field development and maintenance.

4. Meet with the school districts to discuss the joint use of fields for organized sports.

5. Explore the development of an athletic field complex and remove fields from neighborhood parks where appropriate.


7. Work with the school districts to assist in the maintenance of fields.

8. Construct and install additional goal posts for soccer fields.

9. Renovate stadiums that are in poor condition.

10. Investigate the use of artificial turf and other non-grass surfaces at high-use facilities.

11. Develop a sports field complex at Delta Park.

12. Develop new athletic fields at Mt. Hood Park and Harney Park.
FACILITY CONDITION & ADEQUACY

Issues: Many of the Parks Bureau's recreational facilities have serious deficiencies that now limits their ability to meet current and future program needs.

Almost all of the Parks Bureau facilities are inaccessible to disabled visitors.

Short-Term Strategy: Maintain the current distribution and location of facilities but initiate a limited renovation program for the short-term, focusing on the most serious problems and facilities with the potential for multiple use.

Long-Term Strategy: Develop a system of new community centers and other facilities to replace buildings that are inefficient and in poor condition.
Proposed Actions

1. Limit renovation at Parks Bureau facilities which will likely be replaced over the long-term. Improvement projects at these facilities will be limited to those that correct specific problems and deficiencies.

These centers include Woodstock, Fulton, and Sellwood Community Centers.

2. Initiate extensive renovation and redevelopment at centers that: (a) suffer from a range of problems that make it difficult to meet current or projected recreational needs, and (b) have the potential to meet recreational demands over the long-term.

These centers include Montavilla, Hillside, Mt. Scott, Dishman, Peninsula, and St. Johns Community Centers.

3. Prepare a Facilities Master Plan that defines the development program for all Parks Bureau recreational facilities, including pools.

4. Explore the feasibility of building a new community center next to Columbia Pool.

5. Improve signage and access to the Disabled/Senior Services Building.

6. Install security systems at all Park Bureau facilities.

7. Renovate access to parks and facilities that are currently inaccessible to disabled visitors.

8. Investigate the feasibility of establishing a downtown center for disabled and elderly residents, and opening the community centers on weekends.

9. Install a TTY system in the Parks Bureau's Portland Building office for those to serve hearing impaired callers.
PARK SAFETY AND VANDALISM

**Issues:**

The behavior of other users frequently affects the public's enjoyment of parks and has generated an "insecurity" about the safety of city parks.

Many of the city's most popular parks are vandalized and misused frequently.

**Short-Term Strategy:**

Utilize a variety of measures to increase the attractiveness of parks, emphasizing those that are positive and result in greater use of parks.

Review and modify parks and facilities to improve crime prevention.

Continue the use of private security patrols for the short-term at parks with serious security problems.

Encourage neighborhood involvement to foster greater positive use of parks.

**Long-Term Strategy:**

Explore, design, and implement vandalism reduction strategies to mitigate and minimize vandalism at Park Bureau facilities.

Restore the infrastructure of parks to full capacity to ensure that parks are attractive and accessible and thus, encourage their use.

Initiate an anti-vandalism campaign and review the use of patrols, education programs in schools, cooperation from police, curfews, "park watches", and prosecution of vandals.
Proposed Actions

1. Continue the current use of private security patrols.

2. Expand program offerings to encourage the greater use of parks, especially on weekends and evenings.

3. Establish "Park Watches" or other similar programs that involve neighbors and businesses in maintaining the safety and positive use of parks.

4. Establish a Parks Bureau "ranger team" to provide year round coverage of problem parks and facilities.

5. Develop a program of year-round recreation, cultural, and entertainment opportunities (especially during the evenings and weekends) for youth.

6. Evaluate all parks to ensure that design, landscaping, and lighting contribute to park safety and vandalism.

7. Increase the presence of Parks Bureau staff in parks on weekends and in the evenings.

8. Establish a system to identify specific rates and patterns of vandalism and to evaluate the effectiveness of whatever anti-vandalism strategy is used.

9. Develop an educational program, aimed at all park users, to inform them about vandalism and to encourage them to take care of parks.

10. Initiate an extensive anti-vandalism campaign that may include patrols, education programs in schools, cooperation from police, curfews, "park watches", and the active identification and prosecution of vandals.
Informati0n and Marketing

**Issues:**

The Parks Bureau lacks detailed information on participation trends, which makes it difficult to prepare a marketing plan.

The Bureau does not have adequate procedures or staff to collect and evaluate information on recreation participation and trends.

Awareness of recreational opportunities and participation in activities appears to be lower among certain population groups.

Population projections indicate a dramatic change in the demographic profile of the city’s residents (see note below), which will affect recreational needs and preferences for both facilities and programs.

*Note:* These changes include an increase in older age groups, a decrease in younger age groups. The proportion of 0-19 year olds will drop from 31 percent in 1980 to 23 percent in 2005. Conversely, the 45-64 age group will increase from 18 percent to 28 percent in the same period.

**Short-Term Strategy:**

Develop and maintain a comprehensive strategic marketing plan for all of the Bureau’s services.

Develop a data collection process to identify participation trends for programs and classes.

Use existing neighborhood and business networks for dispensing information and working with the community, especially with underserved groups.

**Long-Term Strategy:**

Continue to monitor participation trends and implement the marketing plan.
Proposed Actions

1. Develop a system for all Parks Bureau programs that can be used to identify program and participation trends, define recreation needs, and facilitate program registration.

2. Develop a uniform signage, logo, and graphics system to identify all Park Bureau facilities and staff.

3. Prepare a strategic marketing plan for all of the Bureau’s services and programs.

4. Conduct surveys of low-income and underserved populations to determine specific needs and preferences.

5. Develop programs and promotional efforts that respond to the needs of different population groups.

6. Promote the scholarship program through existing publications and direct mail to identified low-income areas and populations.

8. Develop programs and promotional efforts that respond to the specific needs of the elderly and disabled. These efforts may include:

   - expanding the operating hours of community center on the weekends;
   - increasing the use of interpreters for deaf residents;
   - increasing the number of part-time hours to allow more individual assistance in programs, as funding allows;
   - increasing the number of introductory classes to allow greater integration of elderly/disabled users in programs; and
   - using cable TV and radio in publicizing Parks Bureau programs, as the medium permits.
CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

**Issues:**

There is considerable public interest in park improvements that can be directed into a variety of volunteer projects and programs.

**Short-Term Strategy:**

Continue the existing system for using volunteers and expand the number and variety of opportunities where possible. Identify and evaluate a variety of ways in which citizens can be involved in the planning and designing of parks and facilities.

**Long-Term Strategy:**

Expand volunteer opportunities and staff to allow a greater range of projects.
Proposed Actions

1. Develop a list of volunteer projects that neighbors can get involved in on an annual basis. Coordinate with neighborhood boards and the development of Neighborhood Park Watches.

2. Explore the development of park committees in each district office to act as a liaison between the neighborhoods and the Parks Bureau.

   The committees could be responsible for coordinating neighborhood needs requests, assisting the Park Bureau in planning and development projects, and act as a conduit for information from neighborhood groups.

3. Develop a process in which citizens can be involved in the selection of classes and programs at community centers.

4. Investigate the establishment of a Parks Commission to act as an advisory body to the Parks Bureau.

5. Investigate the potential for changing staff hours to accommodate volunteers in the late afternoon and on weekends.

6. Increase staff training on how to recruit and manage volunteers.

7. Increase administrative staff to handle, coordinate, and manage volunteer projects.

8. Expand outreach efforts to encourage more neighborhood involvement in their local parks.
AQUATICS

Issues: The City is deficient in the number of indoor swimming pools.

Pools also are in poor condition and are inadequate to meet current and projected program needs.

Short-Term Strategy: Renovate pools that are in poor condition.

Begin the development of a citywide distribution of aquatics facilities.

Long-Term Strategy: Develop a network of aquatics facilities throughout the city, the city, consisting of a minimum of five multi-use community pools, preferably near community centers or high schools where pools are not available or would not be upgraded.
Proposed Actions

1. Cover Dishman Pool as part of an overall renovation of Dishman Community Center and to meet the recreational needs of Inner Northeast Portland.

2. Prepare a long-term plan that outlines the development program for aquatics facilities in Portland. The plan should be done in conjunction with the Facilities Master Plan, which addresses all Parks Bureau recreational facilities.

The aquatics component of this plan should explore, but not be limited to:

- the cost of renovating Parks Bureau pools;

- siting criteria for the distribution of existing pools and new facilities;

- the feasibility of building a multi-use wave facility consisting of a wave pool and other features such as a waterslide, small waterfall, play area for small children, whirlpool, and sunbathing decks;

- the feasibility of building a multi-use aquatics facility that is centrally located and includes a 50 meter pool, seating, therapeutic instructional pool; whirlpool/sauna, classroom, daycare room, recreation area, concessions, and other features.
RIVERFRONT

Issues:
The riverfront has tremendous potential as a recreational and multi-use resource, especially between the Steel Bridge and southern city limits.

There is no long-range plan to capitalize on and realize the recreational potential of the Willamette and Columbia Rivers.

The development of recreational trails and other improvements in the Willamette Greenway has not been a citywide priority.

Several critical linkages are missing in the Greenway Trail and access from some neighborhoods to the river is poor.

Short-Term Strategy:
Define the long-term plan for the recreational use of the riverfront.

Work with other agencies to acquire additional riverfront land and develop riverfront improvements.

Focus on developing the Eastside Esplanade as a first step in establishing a recreational corridor on the Willamette River.

Long-Term Strategy:
Develop the Willamette River as a metropolitan recreational resource and a focus for the city of Portland.

Develop the south shore of the Columbia River as a recreational area that complements other improvements planned between Kelley Point Park and Blue Lake Park.
Proposed Actions

1. Prepare a master plan for the development of a recreational corridor along the Willamette River. The plan should address the need for additional acquisition, the feasibility of developing water-related facilities, and the potential for water-related recreation programs.

2. Work with the State Land Board in reviewing and revising the Lower Willamette River Management Plan.

3. Develop the Eastside Esplanade from OMSI to the Steel Bridges.

4. Build new restrooms and expand parking at Willamette Park to accommodate the park’s large number of visitors.
F. CITYWIDE RESOURCES

Resources defined in this section are considered to have regional significance because of their existing or potential use by residents throughout the Portland metropolitan area. In addition, they offer recreational opportunities that are not commonly available at other metropolitan facilities.

Parks Bureau Operations facilities also are included in this section. Like the recreational sites described in this section, Operations facilities are in poor condition and require the same level of improvements as the City's parks.

The parks and facilities described in this section are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Parks</th>
<th>Washington Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Tabor Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky Butte Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelley Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Crest Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The 40 Mile Loop</th>
<th>Community Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leach Botanical Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoyt Arboretum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crystal Springs Rhododendron Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Park</th>
<th>Children's Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Music Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firehouse Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Dance Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multnomah Art Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scene and Costume Shop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Gardens</th>
<th>Tennis Courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittock Mansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland International Raceway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Arts Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues: These parks provide some of the city’s best viewpoints or are among its most important resources. Many, however, have not been improved to accommodate their potential use. In some parks, even existing use is limited by their condition or lack of facilities.

Strategy: Continue interim improvements to address critical needs.

Prepare updated or new master plans to establish a clear direction and implementation schedule for these parks.

Actions: Washington Park

1. Prepare a revised master plan for the park.
2. Renovate steps from Tichner to Burnside Streets.
3. Renovate the irrigation system.
4. Improve the amphitheater.

Rocky Butte

1. Prepare a master plan for the park.
2. Continue improvements to address critical needs.

Mt. Tabor Park

1. Prepare a master plan for the park.
2. Continue improvements to address critical needs.

Kelley Point Park

1. Prepare a management plan for the park.
2. Continue interim improvements to address critical needs, such as controlling after-hours access.

Council Crest Park

1. Renovate restrooms.
2. Renovate irrigation system.
THE 40 MILE LOOP

Issues:

Major portions of the Loop are unimproved and consequently, cannot be used as a pedestrian trail.

The Loop lacks a consistent signage program, even along developed trails.

Some of the developed trails are difficult to use because they lack trailheads and access points.

The Park Bureau does not have a comprehensive maintenance policy for the Loop.

There is considerable potential to integrate an Urban Trail System with the 40 Mile Loop.

Strategy:

Continue to develop the trail where current development regulations require trail construction as a condition of development.

Explore the use of alternative techniques to develop and acquire right-of-way for trails.

Work with other agencies to assist with trail development, especially for on-street trails.

Actions:

1. Develop the Springwater railline into an 8-mile hiking and bicycle trail from Sellwood to Gresham. Trailheads and directional signs also will be provided.

2. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail from Pier Park to Kelley Point Park along the Columbia Slough.

3. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail from the Wildwood Trail to St. John's Bridge.
4. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail along Marine Drive from NE 33rd to I-5.

5. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail along the dike at N. Denver and Schmeer Road.

6. Acquire the 20-acre Maletis property along the Terwilliger Parkway.

7. Develop a comprehensive signage program for the entire Loop.

8. Continue to fill in gaps along the Willamette Greenway where there are no trails.

9. Investigate the development of a citywide Urban Trails Network.

10. Acquire the 150 acre Maletis property (east of Terwilliger Boulevard).
FOREST PARK

Issues: Urban development around the park threatens the park's viability as a wildlife preserve.

The park has never had a master plan to guide future improvements.

Acquisition of inholdings and other adjacent parcels is needed but is hampered by a lack of funds.

Although the park has substantial potential for educational and interpretive programs, no programs are now being provided by the Parks Bureau.

Strategy: Continue improvement projects that maintain and protect the environmental integrity of the park.

Coordinate programs and volunteer efforts for maintenance, hikes, and environmental education.

Actions: 1. Prepare a master plan for Forest Park.

2. Replace the Macleay Park water line.

3. Develop a new brochure on trails.

4. Improve and identify trailheads.

5. Develop a self-guided nature trail.
PUBLIC GARDENS

Rose Gardens at Washington Park, Peninsula Park, &
Ladd's Addition

Issues:

Washington, Ladd's, and Peninsula Rose Gardens do not have
plans or policies to guide the development of rose collections,
garden improvements, landscape style, and preservation.

All three rose gardens have features that are visually inconsistent
with the overall design of the garden.

Public information for all three gardens is non-existent or
inadequate.

Irrigation systems at the Peninsula and Ladd's gardens are in
poor condition.

Strategy:

Define the long-term plan for the development and maintenance
of the three rose gardens.

Focus on protecting the rose gardens from inappropriate
development until the master plans are completed.

Actions:

1. Prepare master plans for all three rose gardens. The plans
should identify goals and define the direction for rose collections
and the period or landscape style for each garden.

2. Investigate the potential for Historic Landmark status for the
three gardens.

3. Renovate to repair inadequate irrigation systems and other
support facilities.
PUBLIC GARDENS-Community Gardens

Issues:

Community gardens tend to be in poor to fair condition because of the minimal amount of maintenance that they receive and the constraints of existing locations.

Major deficiencies focus on the lack of disabled access, fencing, tool storage, and composting facilities. In addition, almost half of the garden locations have a significant shortage of space.

The long-term future of some garden sites is unknown because of year-to-year agreements and pressures for urban development.

The program lacks a permanent and easily accessible central office for activities such as a library, tool bank, cold frame, and gift shop (for fund-raising purposes).

Strategy:

Ensure and establish community gardens as a permanent program in the City.

Increase administrative and maintenance support.

Improve condition of existing gardens specifically for fencing, irrigation, signs, and equipment.

Actions:

1. Develop new community gardens in Inner Northeast, Inner Southeast, and Inner Northwest Portland.

2. Establish the Coordinator position as a permanent part-time position and increase other part-time staff hours.

3. Develop a land bank of garden sites to increase the certainty of continued use and to facilitate relocation when needed. If possible, garden sites should be located in proximity to schools and neighborhoods.

4. Update the master plan for the Community Gardens program.
5. Improve signage and watering systems at the garden sites.

6. Purchase equipment for composting and maintenance.

7. Develop a headquarters site for the program.

8. Investigate the potential to have Master Gardeners assist with the maintenance of parks.
PUBLIC GARDENS-Hoyt Arboretum

**Issues:**

The lack of a master plan makes it difficult to guide future improvements and to identify projects and priorities.

Maintenance staffing is inadequate; the 175-acre site is now maintained by one park attendant, one utility worker, and one supervisor who are also responsible for Forest Park. In addition, much of the maintenance equipment is in poor condition.

The arboretum suffers from a variety of inadequate facilities to meet current and future visitor levels. Parking, interpretative and educational facilities, and restrooms are all inadequate.

Irrigation of the arboretum is inadequate—20 acres out of the site's 200 acres are irrigated.

The plant accessions program is now inadequate to address replacement and expansion of the arboretum's collection.

**Strategy:**

Define the long-term vision for the Arboretum.

Focus on short-term capital improvements to address current deficiencies.

Increase public awareness of the Arboretum.

**Actions:**

1. Prepare a master plan for the Arboretum.

2. Revise and update brochures and maps for self-guided tours.

3. Improve the exhibits in the Visitor's Center.

4. Improve directional signs within and around the Arboretum.
5. Develop one or more satellite exhibits that can be used in different parts of the site.


The following actions are proposed after the Arboretum’s master plan is prepared.

7. Accelerate the acquisition of plant materials to enhance the Arboretum’s collection.

8. Increase Arboretum staff for grounds maintenance, gardening, plant collection, and volunteer coordination.

9. Establish the Director as a full-time position.

10. Install irrigation throughout the Arboretum.

11. Expand the Visitor’s Center.

12. Increase parking and signage.
Issues:

The park does not have a current master plan to guide future improvements.

Maintenance of the gardens is encumbered by an outdated irrigation system and poor access for equipment into the garden.

The garden is vandalized frequently, especially during spring and summer evenings.

The garden's ponds are overpopulated with ducks and geese, which has created serious management problems.

The garden's exhibit hall is inadequate because it is unusable for many garden and park events; has limited public access, and is not visually compatible with the garden.

Parking is inadequate during the season of peak visitation and is barely adequate for special events such as weddings.

Strategy:

Establish the long-term plan for the garden.

Focus on improvements that address waterfowl management, vandalism, and irrigation.

Actions:

1. Prepare a master plan for the garden.

2. Renovate the irrigation system per the recommendations of the new master plan.

3. Improve security to deter unauthorized access. Improvements should include:
   - an alarm system;
   - telephone facilities;
   - lighting;
   - an attendant to open and close the gates;
   - an outward only turnstile at the gate;
   - support from the Police Bureau.
4. Rebuild and widen the upper and lower bridges.
5. Replace the major gravel paths with asphalt.
6. Increase the number of garbage cans throughout the site.
7. Improve the entrance to make it more attractive.
PUBLIC GARDENS--Leach Botanical Gardens

**Issues:**

The current entry is too narrow for fire trucks, which has been a problem during the two instances when there have been fires.

An improved entry is needed also to enable the garden to begin charging for admission. The existing entry precludes the possibility of doing so.

The existing driveway is a liability problem because it is cracked and uneven.

**Strategy:**

Continue to implement the recommendations of the Leach Gardens Master Plan.

Improve the garden’s plant inventory by establishing special collections, labelling, and developing a computer-based plant inventory.

**Actions:**

1. Improve entry to allow fire trucks to enter site.
2. Improve driveway paving which is now cracked and uneven.
3. Increase staffing to include a full-time gardener.
4. Replace fencing in disrepair along the garden’s property line.
5. Prepare a master plan for the upper property.
6. Renovate kitchen to meet the Building Code.
SPECIAL FACILITIES-Tennis Courts

Issues: Tennis courts and facilities are generally in good condition. Basic maintenance, such as resurfacing, remains the most important action to meet recreational needs.

Strategy: Continue the regular maintenance program.

No major expansion in the number of courts is expected over the short term.

Actions:

1. Cover the courts at Clinton and Glenhaven Parks. The costs should be shared with the Portland School District because of its extensive use of the courts.

2. Resurface existing concrete courts with plexipave paving. Courts to be resurfaced include Willamette (4), Fernhill (2), Gabriel (lower 4), Berkeley (2), and Hamilton (2).

3. Investigate the relocation of the courts at Washington Park due to instability of the hillside.

4. Replace or install outdoor court lights at Portland Tennis Center, Laurelhurst Park, and Grant Park.
SPECIAL FACILITIES-Golf Courses

**Issues:**

Golf is becoming increasingly popular but the current supply of courses is inadequate to meet current and projected demands.

Clubhouse facilities at City golf courses are outdated and require substantial renovation.

The quality of the City’s golf courses is not consistent with contemporary standards. As a result, it is and will continue to be more difficult to maintain acceptable levels of use.

**Strategy:**

Utilize revenues generated from the sale of golf revenue bonds for the expansion of the City’s golf system.

Initiate a program of clubhouse and golf course renovation to meet current and projected needs.

Continue to improve maintenance practices and techniques.

Continue to support golf facilities as an enterprise fund to ensure a consistent level of funding.

**Actions:**

1. Expand the Heron Lakes Course with an additional 9 holes and the development of a new clubhouse.

2. Rebuild the dike surrounding Delta Park to minimize the potential for flooding.

3. Develop a 9-hole Par 3 course at Progress Downs for both beginners and junior golfers.

4. Redesign and build the sand bunkers, where needed, at Eastmoreland Golf Course.

5. Improve maintenance through the acquisition of updated equipment, more efficient practices, and continued training for golf course staff.
6. Continue to explore development opportunities with the Portland Development Commission and other agencies in the growth of Portland’s golf system.
SPECIAL FACILITIES—Portland International Raceway

**Issues:**

Substantial improvements in the course’s utilities are needed to attract major races and maintain its ability to compete nationally with other tracks.

Development of the track has occurred incrementally and basic utilities—sewer, water, and electricity—are insufficient to handle current and projected demands.

**Strategy:**

Continue the improvement program which is aimed at providing a permanent, long-term facility.

Focus on the improvement of basic utilities such as sewer, water, and electricity.

Continue to cooperate with other agencies and organizations in funding improvements and activities.

**Actions:**

1. Revise the existing master plan to reflect current issues and projected needs.

3. Repave east end turns.

4. Build gravel pit barriers.

5. Provide guardrail and fencing to open interior of track and secure exterior for pedestrian traffic.

6. Extend water main for fire protection.

7. Repave main straight.

8. Replace siding on tower.


10. Repave old pits and all service roads.
11. Replace Denver Avenue fence.
12. Build additional restrooms.
13. Grade and level all grass areas.

Actions Proposed with Sponsorship

1. Build additional bridge over raceway.
2. Expand pit and paddock areas.
3. Provide permanent hospitality areas.
4. Construct timing and scoring building.
5. Build press facilities.
SPECIAL FACILITIES-Pittock Mansion

Issues:  
Staff support is now insufficient due to budget reductions.

Maintenance and restoration work now occurs without proper guidance because of a lack of historical information.

A portion of the entry road is too narrow and includes a corner with poor visibility.

Strategy:  
Define the City’s expectations for the Mansion.

Increase funding for staffing and programs.

Support the Mansion’s staff in working with interested citizen groups.

Actions:  
1. Renovate the access road.

2. Seek foundation or grantor support to fund a study of the building’s architectural history.

3. Support current long-range planning for the Mansion.

4. Increase staffing to meet current and projected needs.
CITY ARTS FACILITIES

Issues: Many of the City Arts facilities are in poor condition and have inadequate space, which limits current program offerings and future growth.

Strategy: Maintain the current distribution and location of facilities and initiate a limited renovation program for the short-term, focusing on the most serious problems, facilities owned by the Parks Bureau, and those with the potential for multiple use.

Major renovation will be deferred pending the completion of a Facilities Master Plan for all Parks Bureau facilities.

Actions:

Theater Workshop
1. Renovate rooms to improve efficiency and use for current activities.
2. Increase storage area for sets and other equipment.

Firehouse Theater
1. Install cooling system and renovate upper floor to improve use of the space.

Pittock Mansion
1. Repave entrance road and renovate irrigation system.

Community Music Center
1. Renovate gas furnace in basement.
2. Improve phonograph and recording system.
4. Develop covered outdoor area for use by students and parents.
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**Multnomah Art Center**

1. Develop paved parking lot at rear of building.
2. Improve dust collection system in shop.
3. Renovate and update stage to make it suitable for performances.
4. Improve drawing room with ceiling spotlight, model bar, and mobile mirrors.
5. Build student lounge and storage building.
6. Provide permanent speakers in dance room.
7. Expand weaving room.
8. Expand office and library; add window on west side of wheel room; and provide kiln, in pottery room.

**Metro Dance Center**

1. Metro Dance Center: Renovate to provide more usable space. This project is contingent on having the full use of building restored to the Parks Bureau.

**Children's Museum**

1. Renovate heating system and install alarm system.
   This project and other improvement projects are contingent on resolving the long-term future of the building and the Children's Museum.

**Scene and Costume Shop**

1. Renovate shop to provide separate buildings for Scenes and Costumes.
2. Expand tool inventory.
OPERATIONS FACILITIES

**Issues:**
The Bureau's maintenance facilities are inadequate in size for staff, equipment, and vehicles, and have code violations and safety problems.

**Strategy:**
Renovate support facilities with the most serious problems and with code deficiencies over the short term.

Prepare and implement an improvement plan for all maintenance facilities for the long term.

**Actions:**
1. Renovate maintenance facilities to correct code violations, safety problems, and space deficiencies for staff, equipment and vehicles.

   Facilities to be renovated are:

   **Priority 1**
   - Portland Center District Headquarters
   - Washington Park District Headquarters

   **Priority 2**
   - Pier Park District Headquarters
   - Westmoreland Park District Headquarters
   - NYC Building
   - Forestry Headquarters

2. Prepare a Master Plan for all Operations facilities. If appropriate, this should be coordinated with the master plans for the City's Bureau of Maintenance.

3. Develop a maintenance/tool storage building at Waterfront Park.

4. Prepare a long-term master plan for the Mt. Tabor Operations Yard (after the overall Operations Master Plan described in no. 2 is completed).
C. SUB-AREA ISSUES AND STRATEGIES

The following section identifies the major issues and improvement strategies for the eight sub-areas in the city. The recommendations are coordinated with the Citywide strategy but focus on the particular issues, conditions, and opportunities of each area.
CENTRAL CITY SUB-AREA

**Issues:**

Many of the area’s parks are in poor condition and require extensive renovation.

Additional riverfront parks and open spaces are needed, especially on the eastside and in the Lower Albina area.

Connections are needed between the area’s parks and open spaces and to adjoining neighborhoods.

There is a need for a riverfront park that can accommodate large gatherings such as the Rose Festival Fun Center.

**Strategy:**

Develop a network of open spaces to meet the needs of downtown workers and residents.

Work with other agencies and the private sector in developing open spaces around Lloyd Center, Union Station, and other areas undergoing redevelopment.

Renovate existing parks that are in poor condition or are inadequate for current and projected needs.

**Actions:**

1. Undertake extensive renovation at the following parks:
   - Lair Hill
   - Plaza Blocks (Chapman and Lownsdale Squares)

2. Improve the following parks which have a few critical needs and require renovation of specific items:
   - Duniway
   - Ira Keller Fun.
   - Lillis-Albina
   - Buckman Field

3. Continue the Parks Bureau’s involvement in redevelopment plans for Union Station and the Lloyd Center areas.
4. Develop the Eastside Esplanade and continue to work on expanding the riverfront open space network.

5. Investigate ways in which a large urban park can be developed in the Central City.

6. Update the master plan for Waterfront Park.
EAST SUB-AREA

**Issues:**
Almost 75 percent of the area's neighborhood and community parks are undeveloped, underdeveloped, or need extensive renovation.

In addition, about one-third of the area's neighborhood and community parks are "problem sites" that have site conditions that limit the potential uses and activities that can be accommodated.

There are no public recreational programs or facilities in the area.

**Strategy:**
Initiate an extensive redevelopment program to improve the areas's neighborhood parks as described below.

Improve access and use of the district's natural areas to broaden recreational opportunities.

Review the recreational potential and long-term future of the area's problem sites.

**Actions:**
1. Undertake extensive renovation at the following parks:
   - Bloomington
   - Mt. Hood Park
   - Lincoln
   - Gilbert Hts.
   - West Powellhurst

2. Improve the following parks which have a few critical needs and require renovation of specific items.
   - Midland*
   - Merrifield
   - Parklane
   - Glenfair
   - Knott
   - Ventura

* Coordinate the improvement at Midland Park with the Library Association's plans for the adjacent library.
3. Explore the need for a community center as part of the long-term plan for all Parks Bureau facilities.

4. Develop trails and other improvements as outlined in the Powell Butte Nature Park Master Plan.

5. Investigate the possibility of trading or selling the area’s problem sites.

6. Explore the feasibility of providing recreational programs through a community school or in partnership with other providers.
NORTH SUB-AREA

Issues:

Many of the areas's parks have infrastructure that is in poor condition.

Better access is needed to connect neighborhoods with the Smith-Bybee Lakes area, the Columbia Slough, and the Willamette River.

Riverfront access and recreational opportunities are limited, especially for residents in the Lower Albina area.

There is a need for programs that are low-cost and address the particular social and economic problems of the area.

Park safety and security in neighborhood parks is a concern of many residents.

Strategy:

Initiate an extensive redevelopment program to improve the areas's neighborhood parks.

Cooperate with other agencies and programs that address youth-at-risk and other social problems in the area.

Encourage the use of parks by improving park safety, providing programs and events in parks, and other appropriate measures.

Work with community groups and leaders to ensure that Parks Bureau parks and facilities are a focus for the neighborhoods.

Actions:

1. Initiate extensive renovation at the following parks:

   Columbia Pier  Columbia Annex  Gammans
   Portsmouth  Kenton

(Continued on next page)
2. Improve the following parks which have a few critical needs and require renovation of specific items.

   Arbor Lodge    Patton    Northgate
   Trenton

3. Correct specific deficiencies and problems at the following facilities.

   Overlook House
   St. John's Community Center
   University Community Center

4. Initiate an extensive improvement program at Columbia Pool to expand and upgrade facilities and correct mechanical problems.

5. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail from Pier Park to Kelley Point Park along the Columbia Slough.

6. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail from the Wildwood Trail to St. John's Bridge.

7. Develop a pedestrian/bicycle trail along the dike at North Denver and Schmeer Road.

8. Investigate the development of pedestrian and bicycle access from North Portland neighborhoods to Smith-Bybee Lakes and the 40 Mile Loop.
NORTHEAST SUB-AREA

**Issues:**

Many of the area's parks have infrastructure that is in poor condition and requires excessive and inefficient maintenance.

Better access is needed to connect neighborhoods with the Smith-Bybee Lakes area and the Columbia Slough.

There is a need for programs that are low-cost and address the particular social and economic problems of the area.

More promotion of Parks Bureau programs and recreational opportunities is needed, especially among underserved groups.

The Cully-Parkrose and Wilkes neighborhoods are park-deficient, with one small, minimally developed park--Sacajawea--to serve the area.

Park safety and security in neighborhood parks are concerns among many residents.

**Strategy:**

Encourage greater use of parks and facilities by renovating sites that are in poor condition and sponsoring more programs in parks.

Work with community and neighborhood groups to meet the needs of underserved groups and to promote Parks Bureau programs.

Address the park deficiencies in the Cully-Parkrose neighborhood.

**Actions:**

1. Initiate extensive renovation at Dishman Pool to correct major deficiencies. Covering of the pool also should be included in the renovation.

2. Initiate extensive renovation at Dishman and Peninsula Park Community Centers to correct major deficiencies.
3. Renovate Farragut Stadium.

4. Undertake extensive renovation at the following parks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Farragut</th>
<th>Glenhaven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>Rocky Butte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Improve the following parks which have a few critical needs and require renovation of specific items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenwood</th>
<th>Hancock</th>
<th>Irving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King School</td>
<td>Normandale</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth Blks.</td>
<td>Rose City Playgd.</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Acquire and develop a neighborhood park in the Wilkes-Rockwood area.

7. Acquire the side slopes of Rocky Butte to protect it from inappropriate development.

8. Improve facilities at Grant and Peninsula Pools.

9. Investigate the potential for developing a jogging path around Rose City Golf Course.

10. Contact neighborhood business and community groups to determine how the needs of underserved groups can best be met.

11. Continue the Parks Bureau’s involvement in addressing the youth-at-risk problem.

12. Work with other agencies in improving pedestrian linkages to Smith-Bybee Lakes and the Columbia Slough.
NORTHWEST SUB-AREA

Issues:

Increasing development around Forest Park will require the development of a neighborhood park in the area.

Public support has been expressed for an indoor swimming pool and more programs for children and the elderly.

Increasing park safety and security in neighborhood parks is a concern among many residents.

Better access is needed to connect neighborhoods with the Willamette River, Forest Park, and the 40 Mile Loop trail.

Strategy:

Work with other agencies to improve connections among the neighborhood’s parks and the riverfront, Forest Park, and other attractions.

Explore the potential for developing recreational facilities (such as a swimming pool and community center) in the neighborhood.

Actions:

1. Explore the need for a community center as part of the long-term plan for all Parks Bureau facilities.

2. Prepare a master plan for Forest Park.

3. Improve the existing trails in Forest Park.

4. Investigate potential routes to improve access from Northwest Portland to Forest Park.
SOUTH SHORE SUB-AREA

*Issues:*  
Because the area includes a wealth of recreational sites, it offers a major opportunity to develop an extensive network of open spaces, parks, and trails that are integrated with employment centers, and are linked to adjoining neighborhoods.

Management of the district’s natural areas needs to be coordinated with the plans and policies of other agencies.

*Strategy:*  
Integrate planning and development of the 40 Mile Loop with urban development of the area.

Improve the district’s natural areas and sloughs for low-intensity recreational use.

Utilize a coordinated approach to the improvement and development of parks and natural areas in the district.

*Actions:*  
1. Renovate the irrigation system at Delta East Park.

2. Redevelop the entrance to improve security and improve signage at Kelley Point Park.

3. Explore the potential for developing a jogging path around Heron Lakes Golf Course.

4. Develop a trail to heronry at Force Lake.

5. Prepare a master plan for Smith-Bybee Lakes. Build new trails as the first phase of the plan.

6. Continue the Parks Bureau’s involvement in other planning efforts for the South Shore.

7. Explore the need for a neighborhood park and other recreational facilities on Hayden Island.
SOUTHEAST SUB-AREA

Issues:

Portions of the area are deficient in neighborhood parks, a situation that is exacerbated by the lack of suitable vacant land.

There also is a shortage of community centers, especially in the Inner Southeast area, where population densities are highest.

The lack of an indoor swimming pool has been expressed as a major concern of the area because of its large population, the number of school-age children, and population densities.

Better access is needed to connect neighborhoods with the Willamette River and proposed public attractions such as the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry.

Strategy:

Use innovative techniques to provide recreational sites and opportunities. This may include the use of:

- "woonerfs", or street closures to provide small pedestrian scaled streets and play areas; and
- recreational sites in industrial areas to provide employee recreation.

Provide a network of open spaces and plazas in areas in which land uses will be changing.

Develop pedestrian linkages between neighborhoods, the Willamette River Greenway, and other riverfront attractions such as OMSI, Oaks Park, and Oaks Bottom.

Actions:

1. Initiate extensive renovation at the following parks:

   Berkeley     Brooklyn     Flavel
   Kern         Laurelhurst   Mt. Tabor
   Powell       Sellwood      Westmoreland
   Crystal Springs Rhododendron Gardens
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2. Improve the following parks which have a few critical needs and require renovation of specific items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berrydale</th>
<th>Clinton</th>
<th>Harrison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
<td>Laurelwood</td>
<td>Lents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Scott</td>
<td>Sewalcrest</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Develop a mini-neighborhood or neighborhood park in the Richmond neighborhood.

4. Undertake minor improvements at Woodstock Community Center.

5. Improve existing trails and build new trails at Oaks Bottom.

6. Pave the parking lot for Oaks Bottom by Vocational Village.

7. Explore the need for a swimming pool as part of the Facilities Master Plan.

8. Explore the need for a community center as part of the long-term plan for all Parks Bureau facilities.
SOUTHWEST SUB-AREA

Issues:

There is a shortage of developed neighborhood parks with space for active recreation, especially in the area south of Multnomah Boulevard.

Undeveloped park sites are unsuitable for neighborhood park use because of slope and other environmental conditions.

There is a shortage of athletic fields, especially for soccer, which has a high participation rate in the Southwest.

Public recreational facilities are limited to two community centers (one of which has limited space) and one outdoor pool that is shared with the school district.

Because of the area’s existing parks, there is a substantial opportunity to develop a trail system comprising parks, streets, and natural areas.

Better access is needed between neighborhoods and the Willamette River.

Strategy:

Identify potential sites that are suitable as mini-neighborhood parks or full-sized neighborhood parks.

Work with the school district to investigate the development of school-parks.

Begin to develop an area-wide pedestrian trail system by improving trails in existing parks and establishing linkages between parks.

Actions:

1. Build new restrooms at Willamette Park
2. Initiate extensive renovation at the following parks:
   - Gabriel (See No. 5)
   - Maricara
   - Albert Kelly
   - Lesser
   - Portland Hts.
3. Improve the following parks which have a few critical needs and require renovation of specific items.

April Hill Fulton Marshall
Council Crest Pendleton

4. Acquire and develop neighborhood parks in the area south of Barbur Boulevard and south of Multnomah Street.

5. Prepare a master plan for Gabriel Park as the first step in developing it as a "magnet park".

6. Improve the soccer fields and develop a walking trail through the forested area in Gabriel Park.


8. Prepare a master plan for Woods Park.
Goals & Policies

This section lists the goals and policies that guide the development, operations, and maintenance of the Park Bureau. The section is divided into two parts:

- Adopted Goals from Portland's Comprehensive Plan
- Goals and Policies for nine subject areas listed below

1.0 Parks and Facilities
2.0 Recreational Programs
3.0 Natural Areas and Environmental Protection
4.0 Community Involvement
5.0 Public Awareness, Marketing, and Information
6.0 Operations and Maintenance
7.0 Funding
8.0 Urban and Environmental Design
9.0 Columbia and Willamette Riverfront
10.0 Park Classification System
ADOPTED RECREATIONAL GOALS

Portland's Comprehensive Plan, revised in 1982, includes several adopted goals and policies for parks and recreation. These are listed below.

GOALS

A. Maximize the quality, safety, and usability of parklands and facilities through the efficient maintenance and operation of park improvements, preservation of parks and open space, and equitable allocation of active and passive recreational opportunities for the citizens of Portland.

B. Preserve, protect, and manage the physical resources of the park system for recreation, environmental protection, economic development, neighborhood stability, human development, culture, arts, and recreation. (1982)

C. Help Portland's citizens understand the benefits of, and have the opportunity to engage in a broad range of recreational activities. (1982)

POLICIES

11.44 Master Development Plans

Maintain master development plans for city parks that address user group needs, development priorities, development and maintenance costs, program opportunities, financing strategies, and citizen involvement.

11.45 Maintenance

Provide programmed preventive maintenance to all city parks and recreational facilities in a manner which reduces unplanned reactive maintenance and emphasizes the use of scheduled service delivery.
11.46 Capital Programming

Maintain a long-range park capital improvement program that balances acquisition, development and operations; provides a process and criteria for capital improvement project selection; and emphasizes creative and flexible financing strategies.

11.47 Improvements

Base the priorities for improvement and development of parklands on documented needs and the following criteria: low long-term maintenance costs, location in deficient areas, broad community support, location adjacent to schools and other public facilities, support of neighborhood stabilization and community development projects and policies, and consistency with park master development plans.

11.48 New Parkland

Increase the supply of parkland, giving priority to: areas where serious geographical and service levels exist, land acquisition necessary to complete the "Forty Mile Loop" system, acquisition of lands appropriate for park development which have been declared surplus by other public agencies, and acquisition of environmentally unique areas and natural drainageways.

11.49 Self-Sustaining Special Facilities

Provide financially self-sustaining special facilities for motorsports, golf, and indoor tennis.

11.50 Other Special Facilities

Develop and operate special recreational facilities which respond to identified public needs, can be programmed to ensure maximum use, and can be financially self-sustaining.
11.51 Aquatics Facilities

Provide aquatics facilities in conjunction with School District No.1.

11.52 Recreation Programs

Provide recreation programs and services including cultural, educational, historic, health, and physical fitness, and sports (competitive and non-competitive) as required to meet a balanced program which includes the needs of the specially handicapped and the elderly within existing resources.

11.53 Public/Private Opportunities

Support private development and operation of single-use recreation facilities which meet an identified public need and the city’s recreational objectives.
The goals and policies described on the following pages are proposed as part of the City's Comprehensive Plan. These goals supplement the existing goals, on the previous pages. The purpose of the goals is to clearly define the operating policies that guide the Parks Bureau. Projects and priorities can be measured against the goals and policies to ensure compliance with the Bureau's overall direction.
1.0 Parks and Facilities

Goals:
A sufficient quantity of parks and facilities shall be provided in response to population numbers and densities, and to meet current and projected recreational needs.

A variety of parks, facilities, services, and programs shall be provided to accommodate a range of uses, activities and interests.

The planning, development, and maintenance of parks and facilities shall occur in a systematic way and in a manner that maximizes the use of the Parks Bureau's resources.

Policies:

1.1 Parkland shall be acquired to address deficiencies in acreage, distribution, or to provide a greater variety of recreational opportunities.

1.2 Utilize innovative techniques to provide open spaces and recreational opportunities, especially in areas where traditional methods are not feasible.

1.3 Design, locate, and maintain parks and facilities to:
- have good access and visibility;
- be completely accessible for the physically disabled;
- be energy efficient;
- accommodate year round use, if appropriate;
- generate minimal impacts on adjoining uses, and
- be in proximity to bus lines and mass transit, wherever possible.

1.3 Review and revise the goals, policies, and priorities of the master plan periodically to ensure their relevance to recreational needs and trends.

1.4 Prepare and maintain up-to-date master plans for all parks managed by the Parks Bureau.

1.5 Coordinate the Capital Improvement Program with the needs and strategies outlined in the Park Futures master plan.
1.6 Design new recreation centers and renovate existing centers for maximum flexibility and multiple use.

1.7 Encourage the grouping of recreational facilities such as community centers, pools, and parks, to minimize operational costs and encourage use of these facilities.

1.8 Coordinate recreation planning and facility development with neighborhood associations, other recreation providers, land use plans, and the plans of other agencies.

1.9 Encourage the school districts to consider the needs of existing and future Community School Programs when renovating or developing new schools.

1.10 Coordinate and integrate the City’s parks and trail system with plans for bikeways, street improvements, and mass transit.

1.11 Dispose of or trade sites that are undevelopable, have site conditions that preclude full use, or would require maintenance or development costs that exceeds their projected benefits.
2.0 Recreational Programs

Goals:

Parks, programs, and facilities shall be provided for citizens of various ages, abilities, interests, income, and participation levels.

Policies:

2.1 Increase year-round recreation, cultural, and entertainment opportunities (especially during the evenings and weekends) for youth.

2.2 Continue to investigate and develop innovative and flexible recreation programs.

2.3 Ensure that all of the city's parks and facilities are completely accessible to handicapped and disabled residents.

2.4 Emphasize the "mainstreaming" of disabled, elderly, and handicapped persons into recreational programs.

2.5 Maintain and promote a scholarship program that allows low-income citizens to participate in programs.

2.6 Provide drop-in opportunities as well as scheduled programs, where appropriate.

2.7 Provide programs in parks to encourage the greater use of parks, especially during the weekends and evenings.

2.8 Analyze recreational participation rates, activity preferences, and service needs of both users and the general public on a periodic basis.

2.9 Provide recreational opportunities that respond to the special needs of population groups that are underserved or underrepresented in activities.

2.10 Cooperate with the private sector in providing services and facilities where appropriate.

2.11 Promote the unity of City Arts as a complete recreational, arts, an educational program for the city.
3.0 Natural Areas and Environmental Protection

Goals: Natural areas shall be improved and managed to accommodate low-intensity and passive activities, and to foster an appreciation and understanding of the natural environment.

Interpretive and educational facilities and programs shall be established at all natural areas; and shall be coordinated with other providers, whenever possible.

Policies: 3.1 Restrict improvements to those that accommodate low-intensity, non-consumptive, and passive activities.

3.2 Design and locate trails and other improvements to minimize environmental impacts and to preserve the integrity of natural areas.

3.3 Limit maintenance practices and standards to those that generate minimal environmental impacts.

3.4 Develop educational programs to foster an appreciation and understanding of natural areas and shall be coordinated, wherever possible, with other providers.

3.5 Prepare management plans for all of the city’s natural areas to guide their preservation and use.

3.6 Cooperate with other providers in establishing a regional approach to the management of natural areas.

3.7 Develop and maintain an interpretive program at all natural areas that consists of interpretive signs, exhibits, brochures, guided walks, and other appropriate measures.
4.0 Community Involvement

Goals: The interests and needs of citizens shall be considered in the planning and design of all parks and facilities.

Neighborhood organizations, citizens, and other groups shall be encouraged to participate in the planning and maintenance of parks and facilities.

Policies:

4.1 Maintain a volunteer program to encourage the involvement of citizens in planning parks and providing recreational services.

4.2 Establish periodic contacts with Neighborhood District Offices to inform them of projects and planning efforts.

4.3 Encourage the use of parks for neighborhood events and other programs.

4.4 Promote the use of volunteers for selected maintenance tasks at Parks Bureau sites.

4.5 Encourage neighborhood involvement in the maintenance and security of parks where appropriate.

4.6 Support the efforts of advisory boards, non-profit organizations, and citizen groups who assist in managing and developing Parks Bureau facilities.

4.7 Explore and implement new approaches to involve citizens in programs and planning of parks and facilities.
5.0 Public Awareness, Marketing, and Information

Goals:

Information on the Parks Bureau's parks, programs, and facilities shall be readily available to all citizens.

A variety of techniques and methods to distribute information on recreational opportunities shall be utilized.

The promotion of Park Bureau services shall be based on an adopted marketing strategy.

Policies:

5.1 Establish and maintain a comprehensive marketing strategy for the Park Bureau’s services.

5.2 Maintain a current database on existing and projected population trends, demographic characteristics, park and program use, and recreation demand.

5.3 Maintain a marketing strategy that is based on information on program enrollment, park use, and recreation demand to identify trends and patterns.

5.4 Ensure that all Parks Bureau parks and facilities are clearly identified through signs and other graphics.

5.5 Employ a variety of techniques and methods to inform the public, underserved groups, or those who do not have access to traditional information sources.

5.6 Promote the scholarship program and other "financial assistance" plans to identified low-income areas and populations.

5.7 Conduct surveys of low-income and underserved populations to determine specific needs and preferences.

5.8 Work with other agencies, organizations, community leaders, and neighborhood networks to provide programs and assist in promoting Park Bureau programs to underserved groups and the general public.
6.0 Operations and Maintenance

Goals:

Parks and facilities shall be maintained at levels appropriate to their purpose; to assure public safety; and to contribute positively to the appearance of the city.

Park utilities, furnishings, and other facilities shall be upgraded and maintained on a periodic basis.

Policies:

6.1 Conduct an ongoing maintenance program that is designed to prolong the life of existing and future capital assets, reduce operational costs, replace outdated or dangerous equipment, improve park design, and maximize energy efficiency in materials and labor.

6.2 Increase the efficiency of park operations through the use of alternative grounds maintenance practices.

6.3 Promote energy conservation and efficiency at all Park Bureau facilities.

6.4 Integrate maintenance and operations requirements in the design of new parks and facilities.

6.5 Provide and maintain safe and healthful working conditions for all employees.

6.6 Emphasize the use of low-maintenance plant materials in the landscape design of all parks and facilities, where appropriate.

6.7 Ensure that funding and staff levels are commensurate with maintenance responsibilities of the Operations Division.
7.0 Funding

Goals: A comprehensive funding program that utilizes a variety of sources and techniques for park improvement and development shall be maintained.

Policies:

7.1 Promote the use of public/private partnerships whenever possible and when it is in the public interest.

7.2 Explore and utilize a range of financing techniques for the construction of new facilities and the operation and maintenance of existing facilities.

Such techniques shall include, but not be limited to:
- donations of land or structures;
- partnerships with other providers;
- development incentives;
- tax increment financing; and
- easements.

7.3 Maintain a fee policy that considers revenue generation goals and the need to maintain affordable fee schedules.

7.4 Accept donations of land and structures only if they have the potential for recreational use or can be sold, exchanged, or traded to benefit the public.
8.0 Urban and Environmental Design

Goals:

The park system shall contribute to and be integrated into Portland’s urban form and design, and reflect the city’s history and identity.

Parks and facilities shall be designed, operated, and maintained to be assets to their neighborhoods.

Policies:

8.1 Promote the use of parks as an integral element in Portland’s urban form and a vital part in maintaining the attractiveness of the city’s neighborhoods.

8.2 Promote the use and development of parks and plazas in commercial and neighborhood revitalization.

8.3 Develop and maintain a Street Tree maintenance program to ensure the health and aesthetics of the city’s trees.

8.4 Preserve historic sites under the Park Bureau’s jurisdiction in their original state wherever possible.

8.5 Minimize the impacts of parks on adjacent lands through:
- the use of landscaped buffers;
- the development of appropriate facilities; and
- the careful siting of roads, parking lots, and activities that require lighting or generate high noise levels.

8.6 Develop and maintain a citywide trail system that links parks, open spaces, the Willamette Greenway, bikeways, the 40 Mile Loop, other trails, and public attractions.

8.7 Integrate public art into the design of parks and facilities, where appropriate.
9.0 Columbia and Willamette Riverfront

Goals: The Willamette and Columbia Rivers shall be improved to serve as major recreational resources for the city of Portland.

Policies: 9.1 Initiate and coordinate projects and actions along the riverfronts wherever appropriate.

9.2 Promote projects that serve as a stimulus for attractions and facilities along the rivers.

9.3 Provide a balance of uses and activities that recognizes the potential of the Willamette River for recreation and as a "working river".

9.4 Develop access points along both sides of the Willamette River.

9.5 Promote the development of pedestrian connections from adjacent neighborhoods to the Willamette and Columbia Rivers.

9.6 Preserve and protect natural and scenic areas along the rivers.

9.7 Work with other agencies to coordinate the planning and development of waterfront recreational facilities.
The following park classification and guidelines are intended to serve as a reference for the development of Portland's parks. The purposes of the guidelines are to ensure that:

(a) existing and future uses are compatible with a site's intended use and its "carrying capacity";

(b) a variety of parks and recreational opportunities are provided in the city; and

(c) maintenance requirements for parks are consistent and reflect the site's intended use.

Two caveats should be noted. First, because the guidelines cannot cover every conceivable situation, they should be modified under special circumstances or as conditions and needs change. Second, the guidelines should not preclude the development of innovative parks that do not fit into the established framework.
## PARK CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK TYPE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>SERVICE AREA</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mini-Neighborhood     | Small size  
Developed                                                         | Neighborhood              | 2.5 ac.       | Play Equipment                                                                                   | Piccolo                   |
| Neighborhood          | Emphasis on low-intensity  
activities  
Developed  
On-street parking | Neighborhood              | 2.5-10 ac.     | Play Equipment  
Wading Pool  
Restrooms                                                                                       | Kenton  
Irving  
Powell                |
| Community             | Variety of active and passive  
facilities  
Developed  
Off-street parking  
May include natural areas  
Located on major streets with high visibility | Several Neighborhoods    | 10 ac.        | Neighborhood Park facilities  
Off-street Parking  
Court Facilities  
Stadiums  
Community centers  
Swimming pools  
Lighted athletic facilities  
Group picnic facilities  
Restrooms              | Lents  
Westmoreland          |
| Metropolitan          | Riverfront location or  
special attraction for city  
Developed and natural areas | City                      | Varies         | Facilities to accommodate large  
no. of people (depending on size of park)  
Facilities for Community Parks | Waterfront  
Kelley Point  
Laurelhurst           |
| Regional              | Unique attraction in region  
Developed and natural areas | Region                   | Varies         | Varies                                                                                           | Washington  
Council Crest             |
| Roadway               | Associated with road system  
Developed  
Small open spaces for passive recreation | City                      | Varies         | Street trees  
Seasonal landscaping                                                                           |                          |
| Habitat               | Limited use of site  
Natural areas  
Limited amount of developed or manicured areas | City                      | Varies         | Trails  
Interpretive facilities  
Off-street parking                                                    |                          |
| Urban                 | Highly developed  
Accommodates large numbers of visitors |                          | Varies         |                                                                                                 |                          |
| Street Landscaped     | No space for recreation  
Includes only landscaping | NA                        | NA             | NA                                                                                               |                          |
| Areas                 |                                                                            |                            |               |                                                                                                 |                          |
| Special               | Sites that do not fit under the categories above | Varies                    | Varies         | Varies                                                                                           | Transit Mall              |
A. Mini Neighborhood Parks

Mini-neighborhood parks are smaller than neighborhood parks, less than 2.5 acres in size. The facilities available in these parks are generally limited to play equipment.

Role:
Provide outdoor space for active recreational activities in area where larger sites are not possible.

Primary emphasis is on children’s activities and facilities.

Serve as school-park in selected locations

Size:
Varies but recommended minimum size is .50 acre.

Features:
Play equipment
Lawn area

Service Area:
Up to .25 mile radius

Location:
Locate in proximity to potential users.
May be located next to school
Avoid sites next to major roads and other land uses that might deter use or enjoyment of park.

Other Factors:
Because smaller sites have higher maintenance costs/acre, design should be uncomplicated and reflect maintenance requirements.

Should not be used as the principal means to satisfy recreational needs for an area.
B. Neighborhood Parks

Neighborhood parks range in size from 2.5 - 10 acres and serve the neighborhood immediately surrounding them. Facilities provided at these parks are generally limited to play equipment, and an occasional ballfield or tennis court.

Role: Serve as the focus for neighborhood recreational and social activities.

Size: 2.50-10 acres
Minimum of 5.00 acres is recommended wherever possible

Features: Basic facilities for all sites include:

- Play equipment
- Wading pool
- Restrooms (at sites larger than 5.00 acres)
- Picnic tables for individuals and families
- Paved and soft-surface paths

Larger sites may also include:

- Athletic fields for children’s programs (unlighted)
- Restrooms
- Court facilities
- Parking lots

Service Area: Up to .50 mile radius or about 10 minutes walking time

Location: In center of area to be served or close to bulk of area’s population
Next to schools, if possible
Should be accessible to majority of residents without crossing major streets or other barriers

Other Factors: Selection and design of facilities should not accommodate activities that would generate negative impacts on adjoining residents.
C. Community Parks

*Community parks serve 2-3 neighborhoods with their large size and extensive recreation facilities. These parks have a greater variety of ballfields, play equipment, parking lots, and playcourt facilities than a typical neighborhood park. Examples include Lents and Westmoreland Park.*

Role: Provide a large area for a variety of group activities and facilities

Size: 10 acres or more

Features: Neighborhood Park facilities plus:

- Stadiums
- Community centers
- Swimming pools
- Lighted athletic fields for children's and adults' programs
- Group picnic facilities

Service Area: .25-2.00 mile radius

Location: Centrally located to area served
- Adjacent to major roads
- High visibility sites
D. Metropolitan Parks

Metropolitan parks are used mainly by metropolitan area residents who are attracted to the park by some special feature, such as a waterfront location, beach or water feature. Examples include Kelley Point, Laurelhurst, and Waterfront Park.

Role: Accommodate recreational activities and facilities that complement the site's special characteristics or attractions.

Size: Varies

Features:
- Play equipment
- Restrooms
- Parking lots
- Group picnic areas
- Paved and soft-surface paths
- Natural areas

Special facilities such as interpretive centers or low-impact concessions may also be provided if their use and impacts are compatible with the site.

Service Area: Metropolitan area

Location: Varies, but usually found along major natural features
**E. Regional Parks**

*Regional parks attract users from a wide area, including tourists from out-of-state, because of their unique features. This category includes the City's "signature" parks, such as Washington Park.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role:</th>
<th>Provide recreational opportunities that are unique to the Willamette Valley.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>Includes a range of improvements that can accommodate large numbers of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area:</td>
<td>Within 30-60 minutes driving time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Varies-includes both developed and natural areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Parks

Urban parks are distinguished by their location in the central business district. Typically, they are smaller, have more hard surface area, and serve large numbers of people drawn from the entire metropolitan area. Examples include Ankeny Square and Pioneer Courthouse Square.

Role: Provide open spaces and recreational opportunities for employees and residents of the Central City

Size: Varies

Features: Improvements that can accommodate large numbers of people
Sitting areas
Plazas
Restrooms
Ornamental planting beds

Service Area: Metropolitan area

Location: Central City
Should ideally be part of the downtown open space network
In proximity to high-density areas
Habitat parks are valuable for the wildlife resources they provide. These parks are usually larger, ranging in size from Tideman Johnson’s 6 acres to Forest Park’s 4,600+ acres. There are none of the usual active recreation amenities within these parks, such as play equipment and ballfields, but they provide educational and passive recreation for metropolitan area users.

Role: 
Preserve, protect, and enhance natural areas
Educate users about the importance of natural areas

Size: 
Varies

Features: 
Hard and soft-surface trails
Interpretive centers and exhibits
Parking lots
Restrooms
Picnic sites for individuals and families
May include small areas for lawn and "traditional" park improvements

Facility selection and design should not generate negative impacts on the site or compromise its environmental integrity.

Service Area: 
Metropolitan area

Location: 
Natural areas

Other Factors: 
Emphasis is on maintaining native vegetation and plantings rather than develop high-maintenance planting beds.
H. Roadway Parks

Roadway Parks are typically sites that are designed for the enjoyment of drivers rather than residents. Nevertheless, because these sites have relatively large lawn areas, they provide recreational space for adjacent residents.

Role:
- Beautify selected streets
- Accommodate limited recreational activities

Size:
- Varies but usually smaller than neighborhood parks.

Features:
- Lawn areas
- Benches
- Landscaped Beds

Service Area:
- Immediate neighborhood

Location:
- Along collector streets in residential neighborhoods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>SUB Area</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April Hill</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Lodge</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argay</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrydale</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn School Park</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewitt</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavel</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazer</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammans</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Heights</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healy Heights</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Park</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holman and 13th</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Albert</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King School Park</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lair Hill</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurelwood</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillis-Albina</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrifield</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlook</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklane</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendleton</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Heights</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose City Playground</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## PARKS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewallcrest</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers, Colonel</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside School Park</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tideman Johnson</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unthank</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Powellhurst</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Primary</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfair</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holladay (East)</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luby, John</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchwood</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacajawea</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; 53rd</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (Parkrose Thompson)</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach, Roy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyles, Earl</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundy</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop (Harney)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastridge</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errol Heights</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor View</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnwood</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, Peter</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsley</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight, Frank</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, Floyd</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchview</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlcara</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munger</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Powellhurst</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PARKS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsridge</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenino</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

457.79
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckman Field</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlway</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farragut</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenhaven</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knott</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lents</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montavilla</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Scott</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandale</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellwood Park</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilshire</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hood</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

545.63
## PARKS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Crest</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Springs Rhod. Gardens</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta East</td>
<td>85.98</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta West</td>
<td>632.56</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>90.40</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurelhurst</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach Botanical Garden</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Tabor</td>
<td>195.84</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula (incl. Rose Garden)</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Butte</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellwood Riverfront Park</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terwilliger</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers Marine, Ira</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1256.40
### PARKS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt Arboretum</td>
<td>214.00</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Rose Test Garden</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Gardens</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Point</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>129.28</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainsworth Blocks</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe Circle</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firland Parkway</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd's Circle and Squares</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Parkway</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park 51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College Parkway</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseway Parkway</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aider and 15th</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankeny Plaza</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Fountain</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Wash Fountain</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall and 14th</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holladay (West)</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller, Ira Fountain</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Fountain</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Park Blocks</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Bryant Square</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettygrove</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Square</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza Blocks</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Center</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Blocks</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Mall</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront</td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 439.28  

**Total for Urban:** 18.68  

**Total for Developed:** 70.85
## PARKS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elk Rock Island</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park</td>
<td>4682.57</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams Property (FP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Wilson (FP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox Property (FP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holman (FP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnton (FP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macleay (FP)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himes, George</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Creek</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Butte (Division-Powell)</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquam Nature Park</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>163.00</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Butte</td>
<td>569.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Bybee Lakes</td>
<td>213.22</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Memorial</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5827.75

### Additional Entries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SUB AREA</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bybee Bike Path</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klickitat Mall</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Semi-devel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.22
This chapter describes the most important citywide issues facing the Parks Bureau. Identification of these issues was based on the technical reports prepared for Park Futures, public workshops, interviews with Parks Bureau staff, and discussions with citizens.

Issues described in this section are those that:

- affect all or a large part of the Parks Bureau’s facilities;
- now affect or have the potential to affect large portions of the city’s population;
- relate to many of the Park Bureau’s services; or
- determine how successful the Bureau is in fulfilling its overall mission.

Addressing these issues is important if the Parks Bureau is to meet the city’s future recreational needs in an efficient manner. From the work that’s been done, it’s clear that, while current methods and operations may have been adequate in the past, they will not be in the future. The Bureau’s parks and facilities are old and in disrepair, and sweeping demographic changes over the next 20 years will change the recreational needs of the city.
An Introduction to Chapter 5

Through meetings and workshops with citizens and Parks Bureau staff, many problems relating to the City's parks and facilities were discussed. These issues ranged from broad citywide concerns—such as the management of natural areas—to those that were park specific. These concerns were grouped into the twelve issues outlined in the table at right.

The issues discussed in this chapter focus on citywide concerns—those that generally affect all of Portland rather than specific areas. Addressing these issues is important if the Parks Bureau is to meet the city's future recreational needs in an efficient manner.

From the research done for Park Futures, it is clear that, while current methods and operations may have been adequate in the past, they will not be in the future. The Bureau's parks and facilities are old and in disrepair, and sweeping demographic changes over the next 20 years will change the recreational needs of the city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; FACILITY DEFICIENCIES</td>
<td>Certain sections of the city are deficient in neighborhood parks or community centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL AREAS</td>
<td>Natural areas are major resources that are now underutilized for educational programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>About 40 percent of the city's developed parks are in poor condition with plumbing, play equipment, lighting, paving, or mechanical systems that are in disrepair or inefficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES</td>
<td>Many of the Parks Bureau's facilities have serious deficiencies in space and mechanical equipment that now limits the number and variety of classes that can be offered. The ability of the Bureau's facilities to meet future program needs also is constrained by their current facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY &amp; VANDALISM</td>
<td>The behavior of other users frequently affects the public's enjoyment of parks and has generated an &quot;insecurity&quot; about the safety of city parks. Many of the city's most popular parks are vandalized and misused frequently by teen-agers and young adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION &amp; MARKETING</td>
<td>The lack of a marketing plan makes it difficult to promote Park Bureau's services effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSERVED GROUPS</td>
<td>Awareness of recreational opportunities and participation in activities appears to lower among certain population groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>There is considerable interest among the public in parks that needs to be channelled into specific projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AQUATICS

The City is deficient in the number of indoor swimming pools.

Pools also are in poor condition and are inadequate to meet current and projected program needs.

SPORTS FIELDS

There is an insufficient number of athletic fields for softball and soccer.

Soccer fields are in poor condition.

PLANNING

The Parks Bureau does not have any ongoing procedures to collect and evaluate information on recreation participation and trends.
PARK AND FACILITY DEFICIENCIES

Portions of the city are deficient in neighborhood parks or community centers.

Although the distribution of parks and facilities is generally adequate with respect to population distribution, there are a few areas that have serious deficiencies in parks or facilities.

A. Park Deficiencies

Neighborhood park deficiencies are most critical in three general areas of the city—southwest Portland, the Richmond neighborhood of Inner Southeast Portland, and in the Cully-Parkrose neighborhood. These areas are considered to be critical because of existing or projected population growth and/or because few alternatives exist.

Southwest Portland

The primary park deficiency is in the area bordered by Multnomah Boulevard, the city limits, and the Willamette River. Of the parks in this area, two are developed—Burlingame and Fulton. Both sites are located next to SW Barbur Boulevard, making access difficult for many residents and children.

Of the city-owned sites that are not yet developed, none are suitable for neighborhood parks because of topography. Neighborhood parks usually include large lawn areas that can be used for ballplaying or frisbee, for example. They should also comprise trails and paths that can be used by the elderly, the physically disabled, and other people with physical limitations.

The shortage of developed neighborhood parks is aggravated by a deficiency in sports fields in the area. According to soccer officials, soccer participation in the southwest is among the highest in the city despite the scarcity of fields.

In addition, population projections indicate an increase of 8,000 more residents in 2005 than there were in 1980. Most of this growth is in the area identified above as park deficient.
Montavilla Neighborhood

The district defined by I-84, 82nd Avenue, SE 39th, and Hawthorne Boulevard, is park deficient because there are no neighborhood parks in the area. The two closest neighborhood parks in this neighborhood, Montavilla Park and Laurelhurst Park, are two miles apart, with no parks between them. According to the 1980 Census, there are approximately 16,000 residents in this area.

Inner Southeast

Park deficiencies appear to be most critical in two areas—north of SE Hawthorne Boulevard and east of SE 39th, and in the area bordered by SE Powell Boulevard, SE 50th, SE Clinton, and SE 39th. Both of these districts are no closer than .50 mile from a neighborhood park that is accessible without having to cross a major street. Moreover, the areas include a substantial percentage of land zoned for multi-family use.

Cully-Parkrose

The area generally defined by NE Sandy Boulevard, Columbia Boulevard, and NE 49th Avenue includes two neighborhood parks—Sacajawea and Wellington Parks, which collectively account for 5.94 acres. Because of the large amounts of vacant land available, there are opportunities to acquire a site for another neighborhood park. Other options include the development of school-parks because the area includes four schools.

Other deficiencies in neighborhood parks are in the developing area west of Forest Park, and the area north of Powell Butte. The problem is acute in these areas because there is no vacant park land that can be developed. Consequently, land acquisition is needed to address this deficiency.
Park Deficient Areas
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Areas of Major Park Deficiencies
B. Facility Deficiencies

On a citywide basis, Portland lags behind other comparable cities in the number of community centers (see table on next page).

On a sub-area basis, the distribution of community centers is generally equitable with a few exceptions. The deficiency is most acute in the East sub-area (east of SE 82nd Avenue) which does not have any community centers although there is one community schools, at Parkrose. The problem is considered to be serious also because the district is relatively isolated with no other community centers in proximity to residential areas.

Other areas that appear to be underserved are Southwest, south of Barbur Boulevard; Northeast, north of the Alameda Ridge; and Inner Southeast. In addition, the inner Northwest may be another area that could support a community center, due to its high population density and lack of existing facilities.
# COMMUNITY CENTERS
Comparison of Portland with Similar Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1986 Population</th>
<th>No. of Community Ctrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PORTLAND</td>
<td>387,870</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>426,300</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>421,910</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>387,490</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>373,750</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>369,750</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include 22 senior centers
Natural areas such as Oaks Bottom, Forest Park, Smith-Bybee Lakes, and Powell Butte are major resources that are now underutilized.

A major feature of Portland’s park system is the amount of natural areas that are easily accessible and offer a variety of recreational opportunities. These range from Forest Park to wetlands such as Oaks Bottom and Smith and Bybee Lakes. They also comprise over 60 percent of the Parks Bureau’s acreage. As such, they represent a significant asset not only for the Parks Bureau but for the city.

Aside from a shortage of programs at these sites, improvements to accommodate increased use also are limited. Basic facilities such as signage, maps, interpretive exhibits, and adequate trails are needed.

A. Current and Potential Use of Natural Areas

Despite the opportunities they offer, use of these sites for Parks Bureau programs is almost non-existent. Organized hikes are sponsored by the Audubon Society and the Parks Bureau mainly in two locations--Oaks Bottom and Forest Park. Beyond these, however, activities are limited. Opportunities for outdoor education also are limited with a dozen programs out of more than 2,000 classes offered by the Parks Bureau.

Although recreational use of these areas is now limited, they represent an exceptional opportunity meet a variety of recreational needs for all age groups. Opportunities include:

- outdoor education classes for children;
- nature study day camps during the summer;
- hiking trips for adults of varying interests;
- ranger programs for older children and teens;
- trail building and maintenance projects for scouts and youth employment programs; and
- outdoor laboratories for universities and research stations.

Developing an environmental education program also provides opportunities to work with the school district and non-profit organizations. Other communities such as
Denver, Colorado, have developed outdoor education programs that are integrated into youth programs for "at-risk" youth and other aspects of a traditional educational curriculum.

The popularity of natural area-activities is underscored by the Park Futures telephone survey. Almost half of all respondents in the survey said they had gone on day hikes in the past year. Participation ranged from 26 percent (South Shore) to 56 percent (Northwest and Southwest).

The survey also found that "to be close to nature" is one of the four main reasons that people visit Portland's parks. Eight out of ten respondents in the telephone survey cited this as a reason.

B. Projected Trends

Current trends indicate that participation is equally divided among men and women and that older people hike throughout their lives. Short-term trends indicate a "...moderate but consistent upward curve..." in participation. Over the long term, however, substantial growth is projected to be "...one of dramatic increase, particularly in the adult age categories." according to one source.¹

The recreational potential of natural areas is significant also because they can be integrated into existing trail systems such as the 40 Mile Loop and Willamette Greenway. Most of the city's most valuable natural areas are located along or in proximity to the 40 Mile Loop or associated trails. Many of the undeveloped parks in the Southwest sub-area are natural areas and can be improved with trails and interpretive exhibits.

Because these areas also serve as wildlife habitat, planning is needed to ensure that incompatible uses and activities are not allowed. Master plans for all natural areas should be prepared to ensure that inappropriate facilities are not developed and to maintain their environmental integrity.

Natural Areas
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About 40 percent of the city's developed parks are in poor condition with plumbing, play equipment, lighting, paving, or mechanical systems that are in disrepair or inefficient. The problem is especially acute for neighborhood parks and parks that are older.

The poor condition of many parks is due primarily to the lack of a consistent funding source to finance capital improvements for nearly 30 years (since the end of the last 10-year parks levy). In addition, the Bureau's maintenance budget has been reduced despite increases in acreage.² As a result, maintenance levels have been reduced at many parks and facilities.

The condition of City parks varies considerably depending on location and type. Parks in good condition tend to be newer, have a high visibility, are located in the downtown, or are "special attractions" such as Washington Park.

Neighborhood parks, parks next to community centers and schools, and "natural" or less developed sites, are in poor to fair condition. Also, older parks, in particular, have major problems that affect how they meet current and projected demands. Many parks are more than 50 years old and have facilities that are beyond their useful life.

The poor condition of park infrastructure increases operations costs because more time is spent on facilities that are in disrepair or are inadequate for maintenance requirements. Because many parks do not have automatic systems, for example, maintenance staff have to operate sprinklers by hand. In other cases, irrigation is done with hoses, a method that is time-consuming and precludes maintenance staff from performing other duties.

Of the few General Fund projects that have been approved to repair or renovate parks, many have been repeatedly postponed because of the City's budget constraints. Consequently, minor problems have grown into major renovation projects at many parks and facilities.

² Between 1967 and 1987, the number of full-time maintenance staff for the Park Bureau has decreased by 29 percent while developed acreage under the Bureau's jurisdiction increased by 76 percent.
A. Assessment by Park Type

1. Special Attraction Parks

These parks tend to be in good condition because they receive higher levels of maintenance due to their visibility and use by large numbers of people. Also, many of these parks have "Friends" groups that help in fundraising and maintenance. While day-to-day maintenance is adequate, correction of "big ticket items" such as leaking roofs, eroding stream banks, and crumbling paving, has been deferred due to budget cuts.

Specific problems include inadequate security and frequent vandalism, repair of irrigation, plumbing, and other utility systems, and inadequate parking and access.

2. Downtown and Urban Plazas

Most of these sites are in very good condition because they are relatively new and have been well maintained. Exceptions include O'Bryant Square and Ira Keller Fountain which have been damaged extensively by transients and skateboarders.

Specific problems include vandalism and use by transients, insufficient lighting, poor condition of paving and mechanical systems; and lack of handicapped accessibility.

3. Parks Next to Schools and Community Centers

Most of these parks are in poor to fair condition. Of the few parks in excellent condition, most were recently built or renovated. They are less visible than the Special Attraction or Downtown/ Urban Plaza parks, but have more visitors on a year-round basis. Because of this heavy use and frequent vandalism, they need to be repaired more often.

Specific problems include insufficient security and frequent vandalism, poor condition of play equipment and utilities, lack of irrigation systems, and lack of handicapped accessibility.
4. Neighborhood Parks

These sites are in fair condition and require extensive renovation and new development. Some site features, such as irrigation and play equipment, are present but are inefficient. Other features, such as handicapped access and planting, do not meet current needs.

Specific problems include lack of handicapped access, poor condition of paths, play equipment, irrigation, turf, and plantings, and conflicts between organized sports leagues and neighbors.

5. Roadways and Landscapes

With few exceptions, these parks are in good condition because they do not have restrooms and play equipment, which are the most expensive features to maintain. They also are maintained frequently because of their high visibility.

Specific problems include lack of irrigation systems, high level of maintenance, and difficult to access.

6. Habitat and Natural Resources

These sites are in relatively good condition. While none are pristine, they support a variety of wildlife and provide opportunities for people to visit wetlands, woodlands, rivers, and streams.

Specific problems include lack of visibility, and an insufficient level of improvements, planning, programming, and maintenance.

7. Forty Mile Loop

Existing bicycle and foot trails are in good condition because they are generally well constructed and maintained. Soft surface trails are in poor to fair condition.
Specific problems include lack of trail continuity in many sections, insufficient number of directional signs, and insufficient parking and trailhead locations.

8. Problem Sites

These sites are in poor condition and are being maintained by the Park Bureau as unimproved parkland. Although assigned to the Park Bureau, they are not perceived as parks by the public because of site constraints and their appearance.

Many sites require additional acquisition or extensive development to function as usable parks. In many cases, these sites are the only open spaces that are available to residents.

C. SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

Two of the most common problems at City parks are the inefficiency of irrigation systems and the poor condition of play equipment. These are discussed below.

1. Irrigation Systems

The condition or lack of irrigation systems is a major problem at many of the City’s parks. A 1986 study by the Park Bureau’s Operations Division found that:

- 39 percent of the Bureau’s park acreage and 25 percent of Street Landscaped Areas with irrigation systems are now beyond their useful life;

- Replacing these systems is estimated to cost $3.3 million (in 1987 dollars);

- Half of all irrigation systems will be past their useful life in 1994;

- Half of the irrigation systems in Street Landscaped Areas will be past their useful life in 1992; and

---

Replacing all of the systems that reach the end of their useful life between 1987 and 2000 is estimated to cost an additional $1.9 million (in 1987 dollars).

2. Play Equipment

Wood rot is a serious problem that comprises the safety of play equipment at many of the city's parks. A review of play equipment by the Parks Bureau determined that over the next ten years, more than 50 playgrounds will have to be completely renovated to replace worn play equipment.

According to a replacement schedule prepared by the Bureau's Operations Division, much of the replacement should occur immediately, around 1996-97, and around 2003. The need appears to be most acute for 18 playgrounds that are currently in poor condition and need to be renovated. Replacement of the 18 playgrounds is projected to cost $107,000 (in 1987 dollars).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Significant Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Attraction</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Inadequate security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor condition of utility systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate parking and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Parks</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use by transients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate utility systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Insufficient security/frequent vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor condition of play equipment &amp; utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of irrigation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of handicapped accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor condition of utilities and site features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor condition of play equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of irrigation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways and Landscapes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Lack of irrigation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High level of maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult access for maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat/Natural</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for more planning and programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty Mile Loop</td>
<td>Poor-Good</td>
<td>Lack of trail continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient parking and trailhead locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Sites</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Unusable due to site conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACILITIES

Many of the Parks Bureau’s facilities have serious deficiencies in space and mechanical equipment that now limits the number and variety of classes that can be offered.

These deficiencies also affect whether the Park Bureau will be able to meet future recreational needs.

Facility condition appears to be especially poor for community centers, arts facilities, support facilities, swimming pools, and stadiums.

The Parks Bureau’s recreational facilities vary considerably from poor to fair in physical condition. Many suffer from inadequate space and inefficient facilities, limitations caused by the use of buildings that were not designed to be community centers. These problems are compounded by inadequate parking, poor appearance, insufficient storage, and other deficiencies. As a result, the number and variety of programs that can be offered is now limited with no appreciable expansion expected for the future.

Other common problems are mechanical systems that are in poor condition, are old, and inefficient (Parks Bureau facilities collectively have an average age of 40 years). Most of the centers still use their original boilers, a practice that requires extensive maintenance and labor.

The problems are most acute at the most popular facilities such as community centers, pools, fields, and arts facilities. Other facilities also are in poor condition such as the stadiums that have extensive dry rot in the bleachers, pressbox, restrooms, and concession stands.

The condition of Parks Bureau facilities is due to the lack of a consistent and adequate funding source for facility renovation since the last parks levy, which expired in the late 1950’s. Also, many of the past levies were used for new construction rather than renovation. In addition, cutbacks have resulted in the loss of the construction and renovation staff in the Parks Bureau. As a result, the Operations staff now focuses primarily on repair and maintenance.
A. ASSESSMENT BY FACILITY TYPE

1. Community Center

These facilities are in good structural condition, but suffer from serious deficiencies in class, storage, and office space. In addition, their mechanical systems are in poor condition and operating inefficiently.

Specific problems include poor condition of mechanical systems; lack of handicapped access; inadequate space, classrooms and storage; and poor appearance.

2. Specialized Recreation

With one exception--Oaks Pioneer Church--these facilities are in fair condition (Oaks Pioneer Church is operated and maintained by the Parks Bureau and a neighborhood group). These sites receive more maintenance because of their visibility but have problems with vandalism, poor mechanical equipment, and shortage of space for support facilities.

Specific problems include vandalism; lack of adequate parking; poor appearance; and inadequate space.

3. Pools

Swimming pools are in poor to fair condition. Because of their age and heavy use, they suffer from a range of mechanical and functional problems. Use of the pools is at maximum capacity. As a result, no appreciable expansion of programs is expected in the future.

Specific problems include poor condition of mechanical equipment; lack of ancillary facilities; shortage of indoor facilities; lack of coordination with Portland School District; and lack of handicapped access.
4. **Playgrounds**

With a few exceptions, these facilities are in good condition. Playgrounds in poor condition tend to be in the older parks of inner northeast Portland.

Specific problems include shortage of sports fields; lack of covered areas; and distance from supervisor's building to playground.

5. **Stadiums, Athletic Fields, and Tennis Courts**

**Stadiums** are in poor condition despite a good appearance and heavy use. Principal problems are dry rot and poor drainage of fields, both of which limit current and future use. Specific problems include dry rot; vandalism; and lack of handicapped accessibility.

**Athletic fields** are generally in poor condition, caused primarily by a shortage of fields throughout the city. As a result, existing fields are over utilized during specific times. The situation is compounded by other problems such as poor drainage and a shortage of support facilities.

Specific problems include insufficient maintenance of fields; inadequate drainage of fields; lack of irrigation systems; undersized fields; inadequate restroom facilities; lack of lighted fields; and insufficient parking.

**Tennis courts** are in fair condition with consistent maintenance being the most pressing need. The most important maintenance task is to re-plexipave courts every ten years; courts with greater than average use should be repaved every five to seven years.

An assessment of tennis courts by the Parks Bureau concluded that the lack of consistent maintenance now jeopardizes the use of several courts and the courts at Washington Park should be relocated due to instability of the hillside which has required extensive and expensive maintenance over the last three years.

6. **Community Gardens**

Community gardens are in poor to fair condition because of the minimal maintenance they receive and the constraints of existing locations. Most of the
maintenance is now done by volunteers and alternative community service crews.

Specific problems include inadequate space; insufficient fencing; lack of tool storage; lack of composting space; and lack of handicapped access.

7. **City Arts**

Condition of the facilities varied from poor to fair among the seven sites. Because most of the buildings were not built to serve as community centers, the facility is extremely limited in the number and variety of programs that can be offered now and in the future.

Specific problems include lack of adequate space; poor building condition; and security and vandalism.

8. **Support Facilities**

The facilities are in poor condition. They are old structures that have been modified for their present use and are not efficiently organized. Because they have been a low priority, improvements to the facilities have been limited.

Significant problems include inadequate working space; inadequate security; inadequate storage space; and lack of shower facilities. The consequences of these deficiencies are:

- vehicles are routinely vandalized;
- tools and equipment are stolen frequently;
- excessive time is spent in transporting and unloading equipment;
- workers who use pesticides and other chemicals have no opportunity to shower and decontaminate themselves;
- chemicals and gasoline are stored in unvented or undervented buildings that also are minimally secure; and
- mixing and handling of chemicals is done indoors in the same room used as the employee lunchrooms.
## SUMMARY OF FACILITY CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Significant Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Limited no. of sports fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of covered areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance from bldg. to play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Inefficient mechanical systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Inadequate space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient tool storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient composting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Recreation</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Inefficient mechanical eqmt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pools</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Inefficient mechanical eqmt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of support facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More coordination with School Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Arts</td>
<td>Poor-Fair</td>
<td>Inadequate space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor building condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security and vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadiums and Athletic Fields</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor drainage of fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry rot in bleachers or structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited handicapped access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Facilities</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Inadequate working space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate storage space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of showers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARK SAFETY

The behavior of other users frequently affects the public’s enjoyment of parks and has generated an "insecurity" about the safety of city parks.

The issue over "park safety" covers a range of real and perceived concerns. In short, it appears that the behavior of other users is the most serious problem that detracts from the enjoyment of parks. People still visit parks but worry about being around other people who are less considerate and whose actions make them feel uncomfortable.

As the Park Futures Telephone Survey states,

"...crime is not the main concern, but the behavior of others that makes the experience uncomfortable or unpleasant is the problem." [While] "...security issues are important in planning for Portland parks... Portlanders feel reasonably secure in both their neighborhood parks and in other parks in the system."

Residents appear to be concerned specifically about the unruly or threatening behavior of some park users, transients in parks, drug use and dealing in parks, and drinking and partying in parks at night. The importance of "security" was expressed consistently throughout the project and specifically through the interviews, telephone survey, and public workshops.

According to the Parks Security Task Force report issued in 1987, alcohol abuse in parks is one aspect of the problem. People involved in these activities tend to be between 15 and 25 and participate in early morning or late night drinking, rowdiness, and vandalism. In addition, they often are offensive towards neighbors, park visitors, and damage park property and adjoining residences.

Telephone Survey

In the telephone survey, "the behavior of other users" was what people liked least about the park system (25 percent). Maintenance was second (14 percent), and was followed by "crime/security" (13 percent).
When asked whether they feel safe visiting their neighborhood park during the day, 85 percent of the respondents said they did. Roughly the same percentage said they feel safe in other city parks.

**Personal Interviews**

In the 62 personal interviews conducted in the summer of 1986, "security" was one of four major issues that people mentioned most often and was mentioned by residents throughout the city. Problems included kids drinking in parks, excessive noise, and drug use. The presence of transients also was noted as a specific problem that contributed to the perception of parks as "dangerous". Interviewees noted that while transients might not commit crimes, their presence deterred neighbors from using those parks.

**Public Workshops**

"Security" was identified as the most urgent short-term issue in the public workshops, along with vandalism and crime in parks. The concern over security was underscored by the other issues that were considered to be important because they all touched upon some aspect of the problem.
VANDALISM AND THE MISUSE OF PARKS

Many of the city’s most popular parks are vandalized and misused frequently by teen-agers and young adults.

Vandalism and misuse of parks are two related problems that plague many parks in the city. The issue is serious because the problem is widespread and occurs frequently. Also, considerable staff time and resources are spent repairing vandalism and restoring parks to their original condition. Consequently, less staff time is available for the maintenance of other parks and facilities.

Although the two issues are related, they are discussed separately because each requires a slightly different approach.

A. Vandalism of Parks and Facilities

Vandalism occurs at parks throughout the city and has increased in frequency over the last ten years. The problem is generally worse at parks next to high schools, and in the southeast and northeast sub-areas.

Based on the Parks and Facility Assessments, sites with the greatest amount of vandalism are:

Southeast
Brentwood
Buckman Field
Clinton
Creston
Sewallcrest
Eastmoreland Golf Course
Lents Comm. Gdn. Garden
Col. Summers
Comm. Garden

Northeast
Farragut
Grant
Irving
Ainsworth Blks
Rocky Butte
Rose City Golf Course

North
Columbia

Northwest
Couch

South Shore
Delta East
Kelley Point

Central City
North Park Blocks
Waterfront

The most serious and most common form of vandalism are graffiti and the damage caused by skateboarders. Graffiti is most commonly applied with spray paint and wide felt-tip markers. It is now removed by crews contracted by the Park Bureau but
the problem is so widespread and occurs so frequently that eradication efforts are inadequate.

Litter also is common at many parks. Considerable staff time is spent picking up litter and, like graffiti, means that other maintenance tasks have to be deferred. Other forms of vandalism include the theft of plants and equipment such as bathroom fixtures and valves and irrigation pipes. In some cases, replacing the vandalized fixtures with more durable materials leads to other problems. As an example, aluminum bleachers are now used because wood bleachers were frequently defaced and damaged. The aluminum bleachers however, are portable and are commonly stolen.

According to Parks Bureau staff, vandalism appears to be caused primarily by young males, 10-17 years old. In many cases, a few persons, rather than a large group, are responsible. At some sites, vandalism has decreased when a few key individuals move out of the neighborhood.

B. Controlling Vandalism

Although the problem is easily identified, controlling vandalism is a complex problem that has generated a range of strategies, each of which varies in its effectiveness. According to current literature on the subject, it is common for cities to be ambiguous about how to control vandalism and how extensive enforcement, apprehension, and punishment efforts should go. While some agencies may talk "tough" about vandalism, they frequently are passive in their attempts to curb the problem.

Because of this ambiguity, most cities have a patchwork of "anti-vandalism" strategies that might have great public appeal but in fact, may not be effective. Also, there is typically no accurate way of measuring the effectiveness of such programs. As a result, the costs of many anti-vandalism measures may actually exceed their benefits. Thus, it is clear that, if an "active" strategy is adopted, there must be sufficient resources and enforcement measures to ensure that the campaign will be effective.
C. Misuse of Parks

The misuse of parks is a major problem at about a dozen parks and appears related to the concern over park safety. Misuse is characterized by drinking, loud noise, partying, rowdy behavior, and damage to park property, especially in the late night or early morning.

Associated problems also include criminal mischief, fighting, juvenile drinking, and traffic violations. According to city officials and neighborhood associations, the six parks with the greatest number of citizen complaints are (from highest to lowest): Washington, Willamette, Sellwood, Creston, Unthank, and Irving.

Sellwood Riverfront and Pittock Mansions also had a high number of complaints but separate statistics are not available. Westside parks such as Council Crest, Pittock Mansion, Forest Park, and Washington Park, also have been misused by after-hours visitors.

In response to these complaints, the Parks Bureau has posted 10 parks for "no alcohol"; established "closing times" for 6 parks; and installed gates at 12 parks.

The scope of the problem is illustrated by an incident at Sellwood Riverfront Park, which some residents are reluctant to use after dark. In a 1987 police sweep of the park, a group of 150 people were dispersed by police. Twenty-one arrests were made, mostly for alcohol violations. One officer familiar with the park noted that many of the juveniles come from Estacada and Vancouver and began to visit Sellwood Riverfront after the crackdown on cruising on 82nd Avenue.
The Parks Bureau does not have any ongoing procedures to collect and evaluate information on recreation participation and trends.

Because information is limited, marketing is now done on an individual basis with little direction to specific objectives.

Publicity and promotion are key ingredients in encouraging the use of parks and facilities because recreation is a discretionary commodity whose consumption can be affected by the level of marketing directed at it. Marketing is important also because the Bureau’s programs, facilities, and clients are so diverse, with each requiring a specific promotional strategy.

Aside from not having a marketing plan, the major marketing problem is a shortage of information about park and program use. General participation trends and demographic patterns have been established but additional data is needed to prepare a comprehensive marketing strategy. Other issues include a shortage of staff and resources for marketing, and buildings that aren’t marked as Park Bureau facilities.

A. The Need for Basic Information on Park and Program Use

Before a marketing plan can be done, basic information is needed on recreational patterns and trends including park and program use and the demographic profiles of users and non-users. The Park Futures survey provides an initial database to work from but, as the consultants noted in the survey report,

"Present systems are inadequate to provide a base of information for ongoing planning and management. The Parks Bureau should consider developing ongoing procedures for gathering data on recreation use in parks as well as attitudes and motivations."

The need for a database is important also because the population of Portland and the country be changing substantially over the next 10-15 years (see the section of Population Projections on page 5-60. Aside from a sheer increase in number, the city will experience an increase in households headed by single people, the aging of the

---

5 Telephone Survey Results, prepared by Sextant Consultants, November 1987.
baby boomers, and increases in the percentage of primary-aged children. All of these changes will affect recreation demand and needs.

Information is needed in two basic areas described below.

**Program participation**--Information on enrollment in programs and park use is now collected but is difficult to analyze and use. Also, demographic information, such as income, household type, age, and education, is not typically collected.

**Park Use**--Information on how people use the city's parks is now limited to general participation patterns. More information is needed however, to sharpen the picture of what park facilities are used most and to determine how park design influences the use or non-use of parks.

B. The Need for A Computerized System for Recreation Programs

The ability to collect information and analyze trends is seriously handicapped by the lack of a computerized system to handle program information. Enrollment is now done by hand and consequently, any kind of data manipulation would be financially prohibitive. In addition to detecting recreation participation and trends, a computerized system could also automate registration and allow residents to enroll in classes from any center after examining all of the available choices.

The City of Eugene, as one example, has a network of computers at all recreational centers. Through the system, the City can track participation trends and describe them in terms of demographic characteristics and location of participants' residence.

C. Other Marketing Issues

In addition to the issues described above, the Parks Bureau needs to address the manner in which programs and services are currently promoted. Information about the Bureaus's services and programs are done with no real focus or goal. Instead, services are promoted in a variety of ways whose effectiveness has not been determined.

The marketing of programs is limited also by a shortage of staff and other resources. Communications staff now has several responsibilities that are time-consuming and
preclude them from working on marketing and promotion. As a result, very little time is spent on the marketing and promotion of services.

Some buildings also are not clearly identified as Parks Bureau facilities. In personal interviews conducted for the Park Futures project, many people were unaware that facilities such as the Children’s Museum, Leach Botanical Garden, and Multnomah Art Center belong to the Parks Bureau. This misperception may be due to identification signs and brochures that omit the Park Bureau name or logo.
UNDERSERVED GROUPS

Awareness of recreational opportunities and participation in activities appears to lower among certain population groups due to limitations in income, mobility, and because of language or cultural barriers.

The existing and projected needs of disabled and elderly residents cannot be met with current levels of staffing and existing equipment.

Publicity of Park Bureau programs and services does not reach some potential users due to language and/or cultural barriers.

Four groups are described in this section as being "underserved" by existing programs. This is not to suggest that only these groups have unmet recreational needs, but represent examples of population groups that have serious needs because of social, economic, and cultural barriers. They also tend to have lower incomes and, as mentioned below, do not participate in recreation programs or activities as much as middle or upper income groups.

A. Low Income Residents

National and local recreational surveys have confirmed that lower-income residents use parks and participate in programs less than higher income persons. In the Park Futures survey, this trend was evident especially for residents with incomes below $10,000/year. Census statistics indicate that lower income populations are concentrated in the Central City, inner Northwest, inner Northeast, and a portion of North Portland.

In Portland, about one-third of those with incomes less than $10,000 never visit their neighborhood parks, compared to 24 percent for the city. As shown in the table on the next page, participation in Parks Bureau programs also is lower--12 percent of the persons with incomes less than $10,000 enrolled in programs over the past year, substantially lower than other groups.

Census statistics indicate that lower-income persons are generally:

Single women or women head of households: Female heads of households with children under 18 at home and single women have the lowest incomes of all household types;
Less educated: People without high school diplomas had about half the income of high school graduates and one-third the income of college graduates;

Younger than 25 or over 65: Median income for those under 25 and over 65 was considerably less than other age groups.

Approached from another perspective, it appears that low-users of parks, are likely to be female heads of households, older, and have lower educational levels. In addition, they were more likely to have a low awareness of recreational opportunities and to have low participation rates for any form of recreation.

### Participation in Parks Bureau Programs and Use of Parks by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households w/ Incomes Less Than $10K/Yr</th>
<th>Citywide Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit Neighborhood Parks Daily or Once per Week</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Visit Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


B. The African-American Community

The 1983 National Survey of Outdoor Recreation found that the African-American population has slightly different recreational patterns than other groups. Participation was generally lower for all activities among African-Americans and there were no activities in which their participation was significantly higher than whites.
Activities in which participation rates were generally equal were walking for pleasure, picnicking, bicycling, jogging, outdoor team sports, and tennis. Participation in activities by whites was significantly higher than African-Americans for swimming, boating, canoeing, day hiking, golfing, nature study, water and snow skiing, and ice skating.

Demographic characteristics also are different and may help to explain the variance in recreational trends. According to the 1980 Census, about half of all African-American families are headed by women; household incomes tend to be lower; and a larger percentage of African-American households did not have a car. As a result, African-American are less likely to have the resources to fully participate in the city's recreational opportunities.

| National Participation in Selected Activities by White and African-American Persons |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                   | Whites | Afr.- Amer. |
| All Activities                    | 89     | 11          |
| Day Hiking                        | 98     | 2           |
| Pool Swimming                     | 93     | 7           |
| Driving for Pleasure              | 92     | 8           |
| Attending Outdoor Performances    | 91     | 10          |
| Picnicking                        | 90     | 10          |
| Bicycling                         | 89     | 11          |
| Jogging                           | 87     | 13          |
| Outdoor Team Sports               | 87     | 13          |

Source: 1983 National Survey of Outdoor Recreation

According to some Portland neighborhood leaders, African-Americans also are less likely to travel outside the neighborhood for recreation because of limited incomes. Because African-American residents are concentrated in inner Northeast Portland, many residents are not exposed to other opportunities. Some of those contacted for this project cited situations where children did not participate in activities because they
did not have money for bus fare; because getting into a pool cost 25 cents; or because the class fees were too high.

The Need for Creativity and Sensitivity

Two key considerations in dealing with ethnic minority groups were stressed by many people—the need for creativity in programs and in encouraging participation. Traditional techniques to distribute information and increase awareness may not be effective or relevant for some ethnic groups. Rather, outreach programs must be tailored to address the cultural and social characteristics of each group.

Another consideration is sensitivity to cultural differences. Some of the persons interviewed for this project mentioned this specifically as a problem when previous attempts were made at establishing programs for ethnic minorities.

C. The Southeast Asian Community

Southeast Asians comprise about 7,000 persons in the metropolitan area with most in the City of Portland. Of this total, about 3,500-4,000 are children under 18. Almost half consist of Vietnamese; and about one third are divided equally among Laotians and Cambodians.

Most of the population is in southeast and northeast Portland, specifically around the Halsey Square apartment complex next to Rose City Park. Vietnamese and Laotians live mainly in Southeast and Northeast Portland with a concentration of Laotians in the area around SE 122nd Avenue.

Recreational Opportunities

According to leaders in the community, Southeast Asians have recreational needs that can be met through organized programs and activities. The need is especially acute for adults who do not have as much access to the same programs that their children do. According to Father Vincent Minh of the Southeast Asian Vicariate, Southeast Asians are interested in practical subjects that foster their assimilation into society. Subjects of interest include woodworking, buying homes, investing, and using banks.
Issues and Needs

Based on interviews with those familiar with the Southeast Asian community, there are three major problems to be addressed:

Language is a major impediment to more use of Park Bureau programs. While most children are relatively fluent in English, many adults are not, and cannot use the Bureau's program guides. Also, because most of their contact is through the schools, Southeast Asian children are probably unaware of the opportunities provided by the Parks Bureau.

Many Southeast Asians do not read The Oregonian, which is a major source on programs for other Portlanders. Instead, most read newspapers printed in their language.

Cost also is a consideration because many in this community work at relatively low-paying jobs.

Scheduling is critical because many Southeast Asian adults work two jobs and are especially busy during the week. Normal classtimes, thus, may not work for many Southeast Asians.

Addressing the Need

While there are substantial barriers to be overcome, the Southeast Asian community has an established network that can be used to encourage participation in Parks Bureau programs. Public schools are central to the lives of many Southeast Asians and can be used as a conduit for information. The school district also employs Southeast Asian teachers who can provide a link between the community and the Parks Bureau.

Much of the recreation for Southeast Asian children is now sponsored by the public schools. After-school badminton and volleyball programs for example, are provided by some schools specifically for Southeast Asian students.
D. Disabled and the Elderly

According to the 1980 Census, there are about 75,000 residents (20 percent of the city’s population) over 60 years old. The percentage of over-65 residents is about 20 percent in the city with the greatest concentrations in the Central City (30 percent) and the lowest in the East and Southwest sub-areas (16 percent).

According to program staff, the physically disabled population tends to live in group homes that are dispersed throughout the city. In contrast, mentally ill clients tend to be concentrated in two areas—in northwest Portland where many live independently, and in Northeast and Southeast Portland where there may be more people living with parents.

Current demand for the Senior Leisure Services/Disabled Services Program is substantial because public recreational opportunities for its clients are limited. Because it is the most comprehensive program of its type in the Willamette Valley, many of its patrons are from outside Portland—25 percent for the SLS program and 10 percent for the DSP. This may be due to the distribution of group homes which tends to be greater outside the Portland area. Some programs attract larger numbers of non-Portland users—about one-third of participants for the deaf programs are from Vancouver, Washington.

Program Needs and Issues

One problem common to both the Disabled and Senior Services Programs is that programs are often held at times and locations that are not convenient or preferable for elderly and disabled participants.

Other specific issues include:

- Community centers are closed during the weekends, which is the prime time available for disabled users;

- There is a lack of programs during the day, which is the preferred time for elderly users; and
There is one program (OASIS) in downtown Portland, which is the most convenient location for elderly and disabled because all of the bus routes pass through the area.

In addition, less than 10 percent of developed parks are completely accessible to disabled users. Over 80 percent are only partially accessible to disabled citizens. Furthermore, many parks have parking lots that do not have spaces reserved for disabled visitors.

Specific Issues for Disabled Citizens

According to program staff, three basic needs for the Special Recreation Program are:

- An increase in the number of part-time staff, funding for materials, and scholarships. Because funds are now limited, the program can offer only one event/quarter for the deaf. Additional funding could be used to hire more interpreters which would improve access to Park Bureau programs.

- Additional funding also is needed for supplies and materials that are used for classes and events. The need for increased funding is more acute now because revenue goals for the program have been raised, forcing an increase in registration fees. Because many participants have lower incomes, additional scholarships are also needed.

- An expanded outreach program. Outreach, through flyers and brochures, is important to reach the program's clientele, many of whom cannot be reached through conventional methods. If sufficient funding was available, television should be considered because it is a main source of information for disabled people, many of whom have poor reading skills.

Over the long term, a new lift van will be needed because the existing van is old and has a limited life, despite being recently fitted with a new lift. The van is a critical part of the Disabled Recreation program because of its emphasis on excursions rather than providing activities in one location. Many of the parents of disabled clients are unable to lift them into cars and consequently, depend on the program's van for recreational opportunities.
A better location for the program's office also should be considered because the current building is difficult to see from the parking lot. In addition, access is inconvenient and slippery in wet weather, which is a problem for the elderly and disabled. One access route requires visitors to cross two tennis courts. Another route requires visitors to use stairs while the other is steeply ramped.

**Specific Issues for the Elderly**

The Senior Leisure Services program is aimed at elderly residents who have limited financial resources. The program is based on a decentralized approach and emphasizes outreach services because many of its participants have limited resources or mobility. Programs are held in a variety of facilities, ranging from Loaves and Fishes meal sites to assisted living facilities.

Use of the program has increased steadily since its inception in 1974. Between 1982 and 1988, the number of participant hours has increased from 15,800 to 44,150 hours.

According to staff at the SLS program, typical program participants share the characteristics noted below:

- 90 percent are female;
- 68 to 80 years old;
- live in subsidized housing and apartments;
- minor to major health problems (23 percent have health problems);
- 2 out of 3 users depend on public transportation;
- lives alone, usually in subsidized apartments;
- low income, with dependence on Social Security;
- limited opportunities to socialize or recreate;
- little family support; and
- depends on social services to continue living independently.

In a 1986 survey of 225 SLS participants, major needs identified were for programs and activities such as movies, bingo, bus trips, arts and crafts, picnicking, swimming, and walking. The survey also revealed that participation is highest among residents of Southeast, Southwest, and Northeast Portland and lowest for Northwest and North Portland.
Long-Term Projections

Over the long term, the need for disabled and elderly programs will likely grow for several reasons. First and foremost, the number of elderly is projected to increase significantly. The percentage of the 65+ age group has grown from eight percent in 1950 to 12 percent in 1980, and is projected to exceed 20 percent by 2030.6

While the long-term is difficult to predict, there are indications that the future elderly will likely be more active and participate in a greater variety of activities. As one article noted:

"Though the baby boom's activities may change with age, the generation is likely to participate in recreational activities at a higher level throughout its life than today's older generation."7

The number of disabled participants is also expected to increase due to the current trend of de-institutionalizing facilities such as the Fairview Training Center. The effect of this policy is an increase in the number of disabled people moving into the community. According to the Park Bureau’s Disabled Citizens Program Coordinator, many of these people have low functional skills that require specialized recreational programs.

Relatedly, there is a critical need for the Park Bureau’s SLS and DLR Programs to act as the City’s clearinghouse for leisure services for the elderly and disabled. No other agency fills this need which SLS and DLR staff could do if additional resources were provided.

---


CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

There is considerable public interest in park issues that can be directed towards volunteer projects and programs.

Interest in getting involved in parks was expressed strongly through the survey, public workshops, interviews, and the Public Safety Task Force. Many residents expressed an interest in helping with the maintenance and planning for neighborhood parks.

The feeling was clearly expressed by one person in the Park Futures interviews⁸, who stated that:

"Parks and open spaces can become the spearhead for community revitalization, a rallying point for community involvement and pride."

Involving residents in parks can also be beneficial to the Parks Bureau by broadening its constituency and strengthening its relationship with neighborhoods. Aside from building a base of support, citizen involvement can also educate the public about the complex issues involved in designing and maintaining parks.

A. Existing Opportunities

The Parks Bureau is probably the greatest user of volunteers of any City agency. The existing volunteer program was initiated in November, 1979, and has provided the Parks Bureau with over one million hours of volunteer time. In fiscal year 1990, approximately 200,000 volunteer hours were donated throughout the park system. The estimated value of these services was over $1,000,000⁹. Volunteers serve as coaches, instructors, gardeners, and help with a variety of maintenance tasks at several parks.

The use of volunteers at the Parks Bureau has remained fairly constant over the past few years. What has increased is the number of volunteers organized around specific sites and Friends’ groups or other organizations.

⁹ Source: Volunteer Coordinator, Portland Parks Bureau.
B. Considerations in Increasing Citizen Involvement

While the use of volunteers will always be a mainstay of the Parks Bureau, several factors should be considered. First, the success of these projects often requires considerable staff support for organization and training to ensure that projects are completed in a professional manner.

Second, because most volunteer projects tend to occur over one or two-days, they are most useful for short-term improvement activities. The use of volunteers for long-term maintenance can be helpful but requires substantial staff support, especially in the early stages of planning and training. In general, interest in these projects is more difficult to sustain.

Third, although the Parks Bureau has a Volunteer Coordinator and uses the most volunteers of any City agency, serious expansion of the program is limited until additional staff can be hired. An increase in the use of volunteers will also require additional training for staff to teach them how to recruit and work with volunteers.

Fourth and finally, future volunteer projects should recognize that greatest need in the Bureau is for maintenance, rather than installation. Consequently, it may be prudent to develop volunteer projects that are long-term and assist with park maintenance.

C. Ideas for Increasing Citizen Involvement

Among the new ideas that should be considered by the Parks Bureau are the following, which were suggested by citizens and Bureau staff.

- Helping the Parks Bureau with maintenance, security, and making parks more of a neighborhood focus. Neighborhood patrols were mentioned frequently along with the use of residents with maintenance responsibilities.

- The Adopt-A-Park idea was mentioned frequently in meetings and in interviews. Under the program, a neighborhood or school would be responsible for basic maintenance such as litter pick-up.

- Annual or semi-annual projects such as plantings or minor repairs on park furniture could also be developed. Projects and maintenance could be
coordinated through a neighbor or teacher who would serve as the liaison to
the Parks Bureau and who would work with the District Foremen.

- More projects that involve families.

- Developing formal volunteer participation projects in partnership with
  neighborhood groups. These projects could include assignments such as
  planting annual beds in neighborhood parks. The Park Bureau would
  coordinate the project, provide training, and assist on the day of the project.

- Explore the development of park committees in each district office to act as a
  liaison between the neighborhoods and the Parks Bureau. The committees
  could be responsible for coordinating neighborhood needs requests, assisting
  the Park Bureau in planning and development projects, and act as a conduit for
  information from neighborhood groups.

- Look into the idea of having Parks Bureau staff work later in the day to work
  with volunteers after work. Because of current shift patterns, Bureau
  personnel are rarely around when residents are home and available.

- More outreach efforts are needed to encourage and work with neighbors on
  volunteer projects.

Chp. 5 - Issues, Trends & Opportunities
The City is deficient in the number of indoor swimming pools.

Pools also are in poor condition and are inadequate to meet current and projected program needs.

Swimming is one of the most popular recreational activities both locally and nationally with participation levels that have remained very consistent through the years. According to a national recreation study, 45 percent of Americans swam at least once in 1960, compared to 51 percent in 1982. The study notes also that outdoor swimming has a "...widespread following among all demographic segments and...[holds] up fairly well with advancing age."

The Park Futures survey, conducted in 1987, echoes the national participation rate--52 percent of Portland residents swim "sometimes" or "often" in a year. Participation is consistent among the eight sub-areas, ranging from 49 percent in the South Shore to 55 percent in the Central City.

Evaluation of the city’s aquatics facilities is based on comparison with other cities, review of standards, assessment of existing condition, public meetings, and review of current uses.

A. Current Condition of Pools

According to the Facilities Assessment prepared by the Parks Bureau in 1988, the city’s pools are in poor to fair condition and suffer from structural and mechanical problems. This is due both to their age--the average age is 45 years old--and the heavy use they receive.

In addition, mechanical and circulation systems are inefficient, resulting in excessive energy and water costs. At one pool, for example, water losses of 1,000 gallons/day are common because of inefficient circulation and leakage.

The pools also need to be checked to ensure compliance with State Health Division standards for filtration and circulation. When these standards are revised soon,
the use of chlorine disinfectant for public pools will not be accepted. If this occurs, Parks Bureau pools may not be "grandfathered", according to the Bureau’s Aquatics Director and filtration systems for all of the City’s pools will have to be modified.

B. Adequacy of Facilities to Meet Current and Projected Needs

Current facilities were considered by the Task Force to be inadequate for the reasons noted below. As a result, many of the city’s needs are not being met because programs are limited in variety and the number of people that can be served. As the Task Force states in its report, public pools "...are too few in number and too overcrowded to serve the needs of the majority of Portland families."

Specific deficiencies noted by the Task Force are noted below:

- With one exception, all of the city-owned pools are outdoor pools, limiting public use to 10-12 weeks in the summer.

- All of the pools lack the support facilities that are essential to meet the different needs of the community. Features such as a sauna, whirlpool, weightroom, daycare space, and family locker/dressing rooms, broaden the appeal of an aquatics center, and attract a wider range of visitors.

- Most pools are too small and limit the programs that can be offered. Of the four program areas basic to an aquatics program--recreational, instructional, therapeutic, and competitive--none now appear to be adequate.

- Facilities are old and outdated and consequently, may be a disincentive for some users. Patrons have complained of antiquated locker rooms and showers, and the lack of off-street parking. Because of these conditions, many residents use pools outside of Portland or join health clubs, according to the Task Force report.

- Crowding and insufficient pool time also are problems that may be attributed to a shortage of indoor pools. The use of all pools during the summer is especially heavy. Consequently, many people who use public pools never return because large crowds detracted from their enjoyment, according to the Parks Bureau’s Aquatics Director.
C. Comparison with Other Cities

As shown in the table on the following page, the City of Portland fares poorly when ranked against comparable cities. In this comparison, Portland’s service ratio (see definition on the next page) is twice that of the other cities.

**COMPARISON OF PORTLAND’S AQUATIC FACILITIES WITH OTHER CITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. Public Indoor Pools</th>
<th>Service Ratio¹¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1: 140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1: 63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis/St. Paul</td>
<td>624,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1: 62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>488,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1: 61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County, WA</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1: 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Victoria, BC</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1: 57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary, AL</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1: 52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, BC</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1: 50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This "deficiency" is underscored also when considering that the Eugene-Springfield and the Tualatin Hills Park District, both serving a population one-third the size of Portland, have four and five indoor pools respectively. National standards¹² recommend one indoor pool for every 50,000 people. By this standard, the City of Portland should have seven additional indoor swim facilities.

¹¹ Calculated by dividing the city’s population by the number of public pools. The resulting ratio theoretically describes how many residents are served by one pool.

D. Public Meetings

The improvement of the city's pools was mentioned as an issue at five of the seven Park Futures workshops held in spring of 1988. Specific ideas that were commonly expressed were:

- A new covered pool that is centrally located;
- Renovation of existing pools;
- More covered pools to allow year-round swimming; and
- More wading pools.

At the public meetings held by the Aquatics Task Force, comments that were voiced most often were that: (1) public swimming facilities need be expanded and improved; (2) participants prefer indoor pools in proximity to their neighborhoods; and (3) a pool in the city's center was preferred by coaches, parents, and those who swim competitively.

E. Recommended Strategy

To address the deficiencies described on the previous pages, the Aquatics Task Force recommended that the following new facilities be built:

(a) A multi-use aquatics facility that is centrally located and includes:
   - a 50 meter pool;
   - seating and deck space for competitions;
   - therapeutic instructional pool;
   - whirlpool and sauna;
   - recreational features such as rope swing and water slide;
   - locker facilities for large groups, families, and disabled;
   - media facilities such as a "crow's nest";
   - fitness facilities such as weightroom and aerobic area; and
   - classroom, daycare room, recreation area, and concessions.

b) Five multi-use community pools, preferably near high schools where pools are not available or would not be upgraded. Each pool would include:
   - a 25 meter, L-shaped pool up to 12 feet deep;
   - seating and deck space for competitions;
-therapeutic instructional pool;
-recreational features such as rope swing and water slide;
-locker facilities for large groups, families, and disabled; and
-classroom, daycare room, recreation area, and concessions.

(c) A multi-use wave pool consisting of a wave pool and other features such as a waterslide, small waterfall, play area for small children, whirlpool, and sunbathing decks.
ATHLETIC FIELDS

There is an insufficient number of athletic fields for softball and soccer.

Soccer fields are in poor condition.

Athletic fields are now distributed throughout the city, with the largest concentration in the north and southeast. Of the 110 public fields, 71 are in City parks and 38 are on school district property.

Despite the relatively large number of fields, several areas of the city have a severe shortage of facilities, including southwest, northeast, and central city. The demand for fields is greatest for soccer and is greatest in southwest Portland. Since 1975, the sport has grown dramatically and has expanded its player base to include youth, and both men and women's leagues. As an example of this growth, the Portland Youth Soccer Association (PYSA) has increased from 20 teams and 300 players in 1975 to 300 teams and 4,400 players in 1988.

A. Existing and Projected Participation

National surveys and interviews with Parks Bureau staff reveal that participation in organized sports is about 60 percent men and 40 percent women. The 1983 National Survey of Outdoor Recreation found that approximately 90 percent of participants were between 12 and 39 years old. Projections for the future indicate that participation will likely be stable or increase slightly for the three sports.

B. Impact of Field Shortage

The shortage of fields has four basic impacts on parks and recreation, listed and discussed below:

Practice time is limited for teams. Practice time is available only when fields are not being used for scheduled games, which is typically before 4:00 PM. The shortage of practice fields is especially acute in the downtown and on the west side.

Opportunities to use the fields are limited for non-team persons and for other sports programs and users. Priorities for field assignment are PIL, adult
softball/soccer, and youth programs. Non-Bureau sponsored athletic programs, rarely get preferred field times because they are not sponsored by the Bureau and consequently, have a lower priority. These programs include colleges, clubs, and corporate leagues. The public also has third priority if they are not part of an organized team.

*Fields are over used and in poor condition because there is little time for renovation.* Also, many of the city’s soccer and softball fields share the same turf. The fields are used throughout the year with little or no time for turf restoration because renovation would decrease the number of fields available for competition. Furthermore, the lack of irrigation systems makes it difficult to restore fields to their original condition.

The problem is exacerbated by the lack of a field maintenance and restoration program in the Parks Bureau. As a result, fields are in poor condition with potholes and puddles during the winter. Furthermore, the budget for field renovation is limited and has decreased over the past few years.

*Fields are being developed in parks that may be inappropriate for organized sports.* As an example, soccer fields have recently been created at Willamette and Cathedral Parks, two of the most popular and heavily used parks in the city. Neither site was designed to accommodate sports fields, which now precludes the use of the large lawn areas for general recreation during games.
PARK FUTURES
A Master Plan for Portland's Park System

PREPARED BY:
Bureau of Parks and Recreation
City of Portland, Oregon

- Baseball
- Soccer
- Football
RIVERFRONT OPPORTUNITIES

The Willamette and Columbia Rivers are major resources with considerable potential but are now underutilized due to a lack of planning, riverfront facilities, and financial resources.

The Willamette and Columbia Rivers have played key roles in the growth and development of Portland. Like many other port towns, Portland owes its existence to these two rivers and, like other towns, has recently begun to rediscover what a resource and attraction they can be.

A. The Willamette River

The Willamette River is a multi-faceted resource for commerce and navigation, recreation, scenic views, wildlife habitat, and functions as a seam that binds the east and west sides together. Much has been done to improve public access and use of the riverfront. Over the past ten years, the City has removed Harbor Drive to create Waterfront Park, developed Riverplace and its esplanade, and built moorage facilities in the downtown. Future projects include the relocation of OMSI and the development of a housing and office complex south of the Ross Island Bridge.

The importance of the river to Portland residents was underscored in the Park Futures workshops where "use of the riverfront" was among the most frequently mentioned issue. Specific concerns included improving access from neighborhoods to the riverfront; acquiring more riverfront land; better access for canoes and kayaks; and development of the Willamette Greenway trails.

Current Issues and Problems

Despite their recreational potential and interest among Portland's residents, more can be done however, to develop the river as a recreational corridor. Moreover, there are several issues, that need to be addressed and which are described below.

1. Lack of an overall vision for the recreational use of the river. A variety of plans have been prepared for different parts or uses of the river but there is no overall plan that integrates individual projects into a unified concept. Such a plan could serve as a vehicle to resolve use conflicts and congestion on the...
river, ensure that subsequent development is linked to the river, and define linkages between existing and proposed attractions.

2. Development of recreational trails in the Willamette Greenway has not been a citywide priority. This is because: 1) no one City agency is responsible for the development of trails in the Willamette Greenway and along the Columbia Corridor; and 2) bicycle path funding policies emphasize commuter bicycling rather than recreational bicycling. The result is that most of the developed trail segments have been those required of developers. With the exception of some segments in City parks, much of the trail in public ownership has not been completed.

The two City agencies that deal primarily with the Greenway focus on regulatory aspects rather than trail planning and development—the Office of Transportation Engineering reviews trail design to ensure that the City's design standards are being followed and the Planning Bureau enforces Greenway regulations.

3. Several critical linkages are missing in the Greenway Trail. Although major portions of the Greenway Trail have been developed, several connecting linkages are needed. As the Willamette Greenway Update 1985/86 stated, "...only scattered portions of the trail have been completed, limiting the effectiveness of the Greenway trail as a public access mechanism."

Connections are needed from Riverplace to John's Landing, Sellwood Bridge to Willamette Park, Burnside to Steel Bridge, Lower Albina to the Eastside Esplanade and the west side of the Willamette River, and Eastside Esplanade to the Coliseum and the Holladay Street corridor.

4. Pedestrian connections across the Willamette River also are needed. The conditions of bridges in the Central City preclude them from serving as effective pedestrian connections. Some bridges have narrow sidewalks; the Hawthorne and Morrison Bridges also require some pedestrians to cross traffic to get to access stairs; and none are built to promote leisurely strolls. Moreover, there are few opportunities to get down from the bridges to the Esplanade or Waterfront Park.13

13 The Central City Plan includes a policy for the Willamette Riverfront (Policy 2/R3) that calls for the enhancement of bridge walkways for pedestrians and bicyclists. The plan also notes the need to "...increase the role of the bridges as linkages between the east and west sides of the Central City."
Access from adjacent neighborhoods to the river is poor. In many areas, freeways, major roads, and industrial uses act as obstacles between adjacent neighborhoods and the river. In other areas, designated routes and signage are needed to identify linkages to the river. The problem is exacerbated because much of the City’s riverfront parkland is not located in proximity to population concentrations. To address this issue, the Willamette Greenway Update identified potential access points along the river.

Opportunities

While the entire Willamette River within the city is a resource, its recreational potential of the river appears to be most promising south of the Broadway Bridge. This corridor includes Willamette Greenway trails; most of the city’s riverfront parks; major attractions such as the future OMSI site, the Convention Center, Oaks Park, and Riverplace; some of the best views of the river; and significant natural resources such as Ross Island and Elk Rock Island. Moreover, current metropolitan area policies for the river define the area south of the Bridge as a... in which recreational uses are more appropriate.

As a recreational and open space corridor, the riverfront could provide a focus for tourist activities and economic development. Some of these opportunities are outlined in the Central City Plan; other opportunities include:

- Development of a Maritime Museum, river taxis, light watercraft center, boat tie-ups in the downtown, and an aquarium;

- Linkages between parks, activity centers, adjoining neighborhoods and the riverfront-specific streets can be designated, signed, and developed, as pedestrian routes to connect residential areas with the riverfront.

- Development of the Greenway Trail system and an inner-city riverfront loop trail;

- Educational programs, tours, and interpretive signs on the riverfront to heighten appreciation of the river’s attributes and its role in the city;

- Preservation and enhancement of the Ross Island-Oaks Bottom natural area. The gravel extraction lease on Ross Island expires in 2016 and use of the area
for habitat preservation or public purposes should be considered. Preservation of the island could be combined with the Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge and a potential no-wake zone in the Holgate Slough to create a major wildlife area within an urban environment.

Acquisition of additional riverfront land. The Willamette Greenway Update 1985/86 recommended several riverfront sites for acquisition and to facilitate development of the Greenway Trail on both sides of the river. Among these are Ross and Hardtack Islands and land between Ross Island Bridge and Oaks Bottom.

Acquisition of these parcels would, as the Greenway Plan states:

"...provide the City with the opportunity to develop a linear park system along the east bank...[and]... provide Brooklyn and other southeast Portland neighborhoods the opportunity for waterfront access."

Development of a large riverfront park that can accommodate a wide range of uses should be considered. The need for a large waterfront park is suggested by: 1) site constraints at Waterfront Park and 2) the lack of a large multi-use park that generates and accommodates a range of recreational activities.

The use of Waterfront Park is now limited because of its size, linear configuration, design, and visual separation from the water's edge. Activities in the park are limited to a narrow band that are either temporary or passive in nature.

A large riverfront park would accommodate a wide range of activities and facilities and would be easily accessible for all Central City residents. It would be a combination of passive areas and facilities that promote a variety of recreational activities.

B. The Columbia River

Recreational uses and facilities along the Columbia riverfront have been less well developed, due in large part to the extreme shortage of public land. Despite this shortage, the area has significant potential to offer a host of river-related recreational activities.
Current Issues and Problems

Like the Willamette River, the Columbia River has several issues that need to be resolved if it is to realize its full recreational potential. These issues are described below.

1. Shortage of available public land. The major constraint to current and future recreational use of the riverfront is a lack of public land. As a result, recreational improvements are now limited to two County boat ramps and a paved bicycle/hiking trail. Much of the riverfront along Marine Drive is owned by the Port of Portland, which will likely develop it for industrial purposes.

2. Lack of an overall vision for the recreational use of the river. The area also lacks a plan to direct future recreational improvements. Unlike the Willamette River, little attention has been paid to the recreational improvement of the Columbia riverfront. Although there has been little interest or pressure to improve access to the Columbia River, this will likely change as development in the South Shore and around the airport increases. Increases in the number of employees and the development of the trail system will probably increase the importance of the riverfront as a recreational resource.

3. Access from adjacent neighborhoods to the river is poor. As with the Willamette River, roads, and industrial uses act as obstacles between adjacent neighborhoods and the river. A trail system between the river and Columbia Boulevard will be developed but additional linkages are needed to connect Northeast and East County neighborhoods to the river.

Opportunities

Like the Willamette River, the Columbia riverfront is a resource of considerable recreational potential. The popularity of the riverfront will likely increase as the South Shore area is developed with industrial uses and offices. Comensurate with this urban development will be the construction of recreational facilities such as trails, viewpoints, and other support features.

The need for recreational facilities such as trails and open spaces will likely increase from the 20,000+ employees projected for the South Shore Industrial Corridor. The
Marine Drive bikepath can be linked to the trails along Columbia Slough to create a pedestrian network between the South Shore and Kelley Point Park.

1. **Preservation of Government Island as a wildlife preserve.** The island could be a vital piece in the City’s natural areas system. The Port of Portland, which owns the island, has no current plans to develop the island and, according to Port officials, would be interested in proposals to maintain it as open space.

2. **Development of a recreational trail corridor along the river.** A paved trail now connects Blue Lake Park to Multnomah County’s boat ramp at NE 47th Avenue. The *Airport Way Development Plan* (1989) notes that a "...trail and bike system will be a major amenity for local business as well as a recreational facility offering access to the Columbia Slough and other protected resource areas." This corridor could be enhanced with viewpoints of the river and the airport, picnic facilities, and interpretive signage.

3. **Development of a scenic parkway or boulevard along Marine Drive.** The 10.6 mile drive between NE 33rd Drive and NE 185th was one of the highest rated of the 15 drives surveyed. According to the Planning Bureau’s *Scenic Sites, Sites, and Drives Inventory*, the drive offers views of open areas, the airport, the Columbia River, Government Island, and "...particularly spectacular views of Mt. Hood."

   In addition, several specific views from Marine Drive were rated highly. The view of the I-205 Bridge and Mt. Hood was rated second of 46 bridge views in the City’s study of scenic views (*Scenic Views, Sites, and Drives Inventory*, Portland Planning Bureau, 1989).
The demand for Parks Bureau services will likely change significantly over the next 20 years as Portland's demographic profile changes.

Over the next 10-15 years, the population of Portland and the country be changing substantially, largely due to demographic changes in the "baby boomer" generation (those born between 1946 and 1964) and growth in certain sectors of the city.

A. Nationwide Demographic Changes

Aside from a sheer increase in numbers, the city will see changes in household composition; the aging of the baby boomers; and growth in the percentage of primary-aged children.

Household composition is projected to be change dramatically with an increase in people living alone or in non-family households. Only half of the new households formed over the next 14 years will be families (compared to 75 percent in 1975) leading to an increase in the number of households headed by single people.

The aging of the baby boomers, as they grow out of the 30's and 40's and into middle age and beyond, will also have an impact. In the next 15 years, the Census Bureau foresees an increase of 71 percent in households headed by 45-54 year olds. According to the Census Bureau, the trend will accelerate sharply in 20 years as the leading edge of the boomers begins to turn 65. By 2030, the over 65 age group will comprise 22 percent of the country's population, up from 12 percent in 1988.

An increase in the primary ages (6-12) also is projected over the next seven years. The number of children under five is now the greatest since 1968 and between 1988 and 1995, most of the growth in children under 18 will be in the 6-13 age group.

At the same time, the percentage of newborns and teen-agers will decrease. The number of children under 5 should increase up to 1991 then slowly decline. The percentage of teen-agers aged 14-17 will begin to increase in 1991.
B. Population and Household Trends in Portland

In Portland, these demographic changes will be accompanied by:

- Increases in specific areas rather than uniform growth; High growth sub-areas include East, Northwest, and Southwest, with 23, 22, and 14 percent increases respectively.

- Greater increases in multi-family dwellings rather than single-family units. Multi-family units are expected to grow by 12 percent while the increase in single-family units is projected at three percent. Increases in single-family units will be greatest in the Southwest (3,200 units) and the East sub-areas (2,200 units).

- A 14 percent increase in the 35-64 age group (see table below) and a decrease in the under 35 age group. In Portland, the proportion of 0-19 year olds will decrease from 31 percent in 1980 to 23 percent in 2005. In the same period, the 45-64 group would increase from 18 percent to 28 percent of total population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION FORECAST BY AGE GROUP: 1980-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>% Population</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: METRO
C. Implications for Recreation

These changes will, in all probability, also affect the demand for recreational facilities and participation in activities. Potential short-term impacts on the Park Bureau will be:

- An increase in recreational needs in the East, Northwest, and Southwest sub-areas, where substantial growth is expected. The areas and their projected population increases are East (23 percent or 19,200 persons), Northwest (22 percent), and Southwest (14 percent).

Interestingly, these three areas also are noted as being deficient in either facilities or developed parkland.

- A greater need for recreational activities and facilities for children and teenagers. This is due to the "echo" of the baby boom (an increase in number of children aged 5 to 13) that is now in elementary schools.

Significant impacts can be expected over the long term as well. These include the following:

- Growing popularity in activities such as walking and recreational bicycling, especially with the addition of trails along the river and parks. In Recreation Trends to the Year 2000, Kelly speculates that the boomer cohort "...may be transferring from physically demanding activities to other styles of engagement with natural environments."

- A need for recreational facilities and activities that are appropriate for older persons. Kelly has noted that by 2000, the leading edge of the baby boomers "...will be in that Pre-retirement period with time and financial resources at a peak."

- A larger market for programs for both married and single women.

- An increase in non-family participants and those who are single.
# PROJECTED TRENDS FOR SELECTED RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current Participation*</th>
<th>Long Term Trends**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking for pleasure</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Relative stability or slight increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Gradual decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving for pleasure</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting the zoo</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending sports events</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending outdoor concerts</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Increased participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Slight increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day hiking</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Substantial increase, especially in adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Increased participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football/softball/baseball</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis or racquetball</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Slight increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorboating</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Potential increase with growth of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Variable-depends on economy &amp; facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golfing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Increased participation-depends on growth in facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Substantial increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing, canoeing or kayaking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Increased participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Telephone Survey Results, 1987, Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation.