

NEXT MEETING:
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2007
4:00 – 6:00 P.M.
MILWAUKIE CENTER

STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE

For

N. Clackamas Park

December 20, 2006

Milwaukie Center

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Present:

Representatives: Sally Shook, Eric Shawn (chair), Fr. Matthew Tate, Tony Clark, Lisa Gibson

Alternates: Rick Frank, Susan Shawn, Steve Berliner

Absent: JoAnn Herrigel (vice-chair), John Denny (rep), Eleanor Johnson (rep.), Jim Schuld (alt.), Holly Denman (alt.)

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

Staff: Dan Zinzer, Michelle Healy, Kelsie Jordan Clackamas County

Introductions/Opening Comments/Meeting Minutes

Eric Shawn welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the committee to review the November meeting minutes. Michelle Healy passed out a packet of information for each committee representative which included the prior meeting minutes, a chart of follow-up activities related to the ball field construction, and additional information pertaining to the amplified sound policy.

Action: The committee approved the November minutes as presented.

Dog and Park Work Group Report

Eric asked for feedback from the stakeholder groups on the recommendations that were forwarded by the dog work group at the November stewardship meeting. Eric asked for feedback using the 1 to 5 finger rating system (1 indicating full support).

Recommendation 1 - Should there be more dog parks in the district?

- Sally Shook gave full support to having more dog parks, noting the importance of having them spread out in order to control noise.
- Rick Frank was in full support but commented that the dog parks could possibly be compatible with some school district facilities.
- Rick commented that the school district was in agreement, as long as disposal was done properly. He suggested looking at Water Tower Park.
- Lisa Gibson rated the idea a one. She agreed with having the parks be spread out.
- Tony Clark gave his full support towards additional parks.
- Susan Shawn said that her general impression from the Friends of NCP was full support.
- Eric stated that it appears that there is consensus from the stakeholders to support the recommendation for more dog parks in the District.

Recommendation 2 - Features of a Quality Park

(At the November meeting, the dog working group presented a list of features that should be included in a quality dog park.)

- Sally said that she was in full agreement with everything on the list. She commented that they were all necessary for success.
- Rick thought that while having everything is ideal, sometimes it can be very difficult to have it all. He said a location shouldn't be discounted if you can't have everything on the list. Features listed are similar to what all the stakeholder groups want in the park.
- Lisa agreed with Rick, saying that the features are shared interest of everyone.
- Tony said that ideally they would like all the features, but that the group would possibly take a look at what's easiest to implement.
- Susan said that the general consensus of the Friends was a one, with maybe a few twos.

Recommendation 3 - Trading the horse arena and dog run locations

(At the November meeting, the dog work group suggested swapping the locations of the dog run and horse arena.)

- Sally Shook said that trading doesn't solve the problem, just moves it. She could not support.
- Rick said he would accept whatever the dog and horse people agree to do.
- Lisa Gibson said that she accepts because it makes it less cumbersome for the equestrians to use the arena. She asked, however, if moving the horses would result in a larger impact on the creek.
- Tony was interested in swapping if the equestrians agreed and if the existing horse arena space could be improved.
- Susan was extremely concerned about having both the baseball and dog park noise on the south side of the park.
- Eric said the Friends of NCP were divided on this recommendation, but there was more weight against it.

- Pat O'Donnell commented that four people in the Friends group ranked it a 5 (completely against).
- Dick Shook said that safety issues between the arena and ball fields should be looked into.
- Susan asked if the arena is usable if it stays where it is.
- Lisa Gibson explained that it is usable. Although it is cumbersome to get to, for the most part horses are safe. She was concerned that noise from the baseball and dogs might disturb the horses, which could be dangerous. Parking with the baseball players is especially difficult, and is a big reason why riders stopped coming to the park.
- Tony thought that if Lisa is ok with where the horse arena is currently located than it should stay there.
- Lisa agreed with keeping the arena but didn't want to eliminate dog area.
- Father Tate commented that the property donor wanted a horse area at the park, so it should probably stay there.
- Eric commented that it sounds like there is not a lot of support for the swap and that there is an operational problem to address between the arena and ball fields to address.

Action: Consensus from the stewardship committee not to move forward with this recommendation, but to keep the arena in its current location.

- Dan said the District will begin looking at restoration of the horse arena.

Recommendation 4 – Keeping a dog park in NCP

Discussion:

- Sally thought that a new enclosed area (at an alternate location) which meets the dog owner's needs should be built ASAP. Dogs could stay at NCP until another quality park is ready.
 - Rick Frank recognized the need for dog parks in the area. He was neutral and willing to work with the issue as long as there is a dog park provided.
 - Lisa wanted the dog park to stay at NCP, provided off leash activity stayed in designated areas.
 - Tony said that most of the dog owners want the park to stay here, but some were willing to move if there is another quality park. Overall, however, he thought that the park should stay at NCP, in addition to adding more parks elsewhere. He wanted the NCP dog run to be used by neighborhoods rather than operating as a regional destination dog park. This would likely happen if there were more dog parks.
 - Susan said that there was a general consensus from the Friends of NCP to keep the park where it is, but not total agreement. Many neighbors walk to the park with their dogs, if it were moved they would lose this amenity.
-
- Eric gave an additional recommendation of creating a dog park on the property to the east of Clackamas Christian Center.
 - Tony said there was not only that one, but other possible close locations to NCP.

- Sally said that we should consider that the dog run is in buffer as an intermediate step. Group should wait until the buffer is drawn on the map to address it.
- Susan Shawn asked Michelle if this was part of the north side master plan.
- Rick said that there should be discussion and an evaluation of the pros and cons.
- Dan Zinzer suggested giving the consultant information about the dog run and asking for their professional opinion on where the dog run might be best situated in the park. Is there any way we can accommodate everyone?
- Eric said it is important to talk with the City of Milwaukie about this issue, too. Recommends keeping the dog run in the park until there is a better option.

Action: Consensus to ask the consultant for their professional opinion during the north side planning process and then reevaluate the dog park location.

Story board Report

Susan presented a power point presentation summarizing the work of the Story Board sub-committee (presentation attached with meeting minutes).

Discussion:

- Michelle asked who is doing the writing, design of the boards, and the artwork.
- Dan and Michelle suggested that the consultant could do the design, writing and fabrication of the board with input from the stewardship committee.
- Michelle explained that there are people out there with a lot of experience in producing interpretive boards and we should take advantage of their knowledge and experience.
- Steve Berliner commented that he knew butterfly and dragonfly experts that could help with content.
- Susan said she would know everything by February. She told the group she was applying for a grant from Metro to pay a teacher to be at the park to entertain kids not playing baseball.
- Rick agreed that he could help with mailings to get the word out to the ball player families.
- Susan also noted the importance of quality drawings on the boards and likes the idea of a 3D watershed model. She said that by February she should have the names of three artists that might be used for the design of the boards.
- Eric said that JoAnn still needs to meet with her group and give input, so the topic will reappear on the January agenda.

Next steps: Consensus that the sub-committee would continue to work on ideas for the boards. Also, that the District would include the boards in the RFP. The consultant will work closely with the committee on the design, fabrication, location and content of the boards.

Amplified Sound Policy

Eric gave a quick overview of what was included in the packets handed out by Michelle regarding the sound policy. Michelle explained that the information from NCPRD was used to create the original draft policy. The other articles are new research that Eric found.

Discussion:

- Eric Shawn explained decibel levels, saying that every time you double in distance from the source the sound drops five decibels. He noted the importance of considering your audience, and suggested measuring sound levels at the closest boundary.
- Rosemary Crites questioned why there need to be loud speakers at all.
- Rick clarified that the speakers would not be used for play-by-play. Amplified sound would only be used to introduce players, make short announcements, and announce awards. The speakers would also point at the bleachers not out to the fields. Also, the amplified sound would only be used for special games, not during every game or practice.
- Father Tate mentioned examining how sound travels- the level of sound depends on where you are since sounds travels in an arch.
- Dan said that the biggest amplified sound issue is going to on weddings...he's not as concerned about the ball fields.
- Eric Shawn addressed the issue of rules applying to the entire park or only the fields. He thought rules should apply to the whole park. He had concerns that the DAB is not supportive of a policy for the whole park.
- Michelle stated that it was her interpretation that the DAB was not against rules for the whole park, but they just that they wanted the group to really examine the issue.
- Eric said that the city can establish certain volume, time and place of the national anthem.
- Dan commented that Parks can control the level of sound. People must apply for a special permit for amplified sound.
- Susan asked if there were any consequences if the policy is broken, such as a fine.
- Michelle suggested excluding rule breakers from future use of amplified sound at the park.
- Susan wants to write this into the policy.
- Dan said that the policy must be something both the DAB and BCC can accept.
- Eric said that ambient sound level plays into how the sound is heard.

Next steps: There was consensus to continue working on the policy at the next meeting.

Ombuds Activity and Reports

- Eric encouraged the committee to examine the assessment of follow-up activities chart provided by the District.
- Michelle asked about the north side plan including the Milwaukie Center. She never recalled that being part of the north side plan.
- Eric commented that he thought that related more to park operations/scheduling of events.

- Rosemary was very concerned about the chemical spraying because she is on well water.
- Dan explained that ball field chemicals are very low and it shouldn't affect her water quality. He suggested that she have her water tested to establish a base line water quality before the ball fields are operational.
- Eric Shawn asked if it was possible for NCP to be Audubon Certified.
- Dan told him it was, although it is a lengthy process.
- Dick Shook expressed concerns about the turbidity of Mt. Scott Creek from the construction.

Next meeting is January 24, 2007 from 4 to 6 p.m. at the Milwaukie Center. Meeting adjourned until 2007. Happy New Year!