Portland, Oregon

FINANCIAL IMPACT and PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STATEMENT For Council Action Items

(Deliver original to Financial Planning Division. Retain copy.)								
	Name of Initiator Sarah Huggins	2. Telephone N 503.823.3385		-	3. Bureau/Office PP&R/Planning	/Dept.		
	4a. To be filed (hearing date): February 6, 2013	4b. Calendar (Check One) Regular Consent 4/5ths		5. Date Submi Commissioner' and FPD Budge January 23, 20	s office et Analyst:			
,	6a. Financial Impact Section: ☐ Financial impact section comp	leted		6b. Public Involv Public involv	ement Section: ement section com	pleted		
 Legislation Title: Accept the 2012 Master Plan for the Werbin Property as a guide for future development of the park (Resolution). Purpose of the Proposed Legislation: Receive City Council approval for the development concept for the Werbin Property, which will be a new neighborhood park in the Cully neighborhood. 								
3) Which area(s) of the city are affected by this Council item? (Check all that apply—areas are based on formal neighborhood coalition boundaries)? City-wide/Regional Northeast Northwest North Central Northeast Southeast Southwest East Central City								
FINANCIAL IMPACT								

4) Revenue: Will this legislation generate or reduce current or future revenue coming to the City? If so, by how much? If so, please identify the source.

This concept plan will not generate or reduce current or future revenue coming to the City.

5) Expense: What are the costs to the City as a result of this legislation? What is the source of funding for the expense? (Please include costs in the current fiscal year as well as costs in future years. If the action is related to a grant or contract please include the local contribution or match required. If there is a project estimate, please identify the level of confidence.)

Development of the park will cost an estimated \$ 1.34M. Development of ½ of the streetscape (required for development of the park) is estimated at \$500K. Since these are concept-level estimates, they are low confidence figures. Development of the park and required streetscape

improvements will be paid for by Parks System Development Charges (SDCs). The park will have ongoing Operations and Maintenance (O&M) expenses. An average cost/acre for maintenance of a PP&R neighborhood park is \$6,300. The Werbin property is 2.5 acres. Based on average O&M costs, PP&R might expect to see average annual costs for O&M of \$15,760 for the site. This is a low confidence estimate, which will be refined once construction documents are developed. PP&R will return to City Council with a final O&M budget number in 2014.

6) Staffing Requirements:

• Will any positions be created, eliminated or re-classified in the current year as a result of this legislation? (If new positions are created please include whether they will be part-time, full-time, limited term, or permanent positions. If the position is limited term please indicate the end of the term.)

No positions will be created, eliminated, or re-classified in the current year as a result of this legislation.

• Will positions be created or eliminated in future years as a result of this legislation?

No positions will be created, eliminated, or re-classified in future years as a result of this legislation.

(Complete the following section only if an amendment to the budget is proposed.)

7) <u>Change in Appropriations</u> (If the accompanying ordinance amends the budget please reflect the dollar amount to be appropriated by this legislation. Include the appropriate cost elements that are to be loaded by accounting. Indicate "new" in Fund Center column if new center needs to be created. Use additional space if needed.)

Fund	Fund Center	Commitment Item	Functional Area	Funded Program	Grant	Sponsored Program	Amount
	·						

[Proceed to Public Involvement Section — REQUIRED as of July 1, 2011]

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

8) Was public involvemen	t included in the develop	ment of this Council item (e.g.
ordinance, resolution, or n	eport)? Please check the	appropriate box below:

☑ YES: Please proceed to Question #9.

□ NO: Please, explain why below; and proceed to Question #10.

9) If "YES," please answer the following questions:

a) What impacts are anticipated in the community from this proposed Council item?

The Cully neighborhood will get a new developed neighborhood park. Portland Parks & Recreation's goal is to have every household within Portland ½ mile from a park or natural area. The area surrounding this property at NE 52nd & Alberta is currently not served by a park or natural area, so this will provide a new recreational amenity to an underserved area. Through the process PP&R has seen quite a bit of community support for the addition of a new park.

b) Which community and business groups, under-represented groups, organizations, external government entities, and other interested parties were involved in this effort, and when and how were they involved?

Prior to the start of this project, we tabled at several Cully Main Street events to develop an interest in and understanding of the project.

The following list of stakeholders was created prior to the beginning of this project. Organizations and individuals were contacted to offer the opportunity to participate as members of the advisory committee.

Once the advisory committee was formed, we continued to work with these organizations to encourage participation in the project, especially with providing feedback on the design options. All communications were prepared in English and Spanish. Several advisory committee members were primarily Spanish speaking.

Hacienda CDC

Ortiz Center

NE Clinic

Si Se Puede

NAYA – Donita Sue Fry

Cully Association of Neighbors

Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative – Cully Main Street, 42nd Ave - PDC Dana decline – community led initiative –

Evans Martin, Michael Demarco

SUN schools

PCC - esl classes - David McKenzie

Verde

Let Us Build Cully Park! Coalition

Trinity Lutheran, 55th & Killingsworth – very community oriented

Mosaic Church

PCRI
Latino Network – Sadie Feibel
Adjacent neighbors

c) How did public involvement shape the outcome of this Council item?

The final concept plan for the Werbin Property was recommended by a community project advisory committee. The advisory committee was selected to represent diverse community interests. For each engagement activity all materials were prepared in English and Spanish. Both English and Spanish speakers were available at each open house, the designs and options were presented at the Ortiz Center and to students at Rigler Elementary School. For each open house more than 200 fliers were distributed, lawn signs were placed throughout the community, people received electronic notification directly by PP&R and the Cully Association of Neighbors and an article was placed in the neighborhood newsletter.

Phase One: Site Analysis, Education, Engagement

The key goals in the first phase of outreach were to 1) inform the community about the project, 2) offer them an opportunity to participate, 3) engage them in a discussion about who lived in the community and how they would use the park.

Open House #1 was held at Rigler Elementary School with approximately 30 residents participating. Additionally, presentations were made to two SUN School classes and to three adult classes at the Ortiz Center, a facility that works with the Latino Community.

In total, more than 170 individuals completed the comment form, and more than ¼ of the respondents were non-Caucasian.

Using the information from the comment form, the Project Advisory Committee met, discussed design options and provided direction about the experiences they thought the community was seeking from the park.

Phase Two: Analysis, Understanding and Direction

The second phase of engagement began with Open House #2. At this Open House, the community was provided with three alternative park designs and asked to share their preferred elements and experiences. This Open House was advertised as a social event and held outside at Rigler Elementary. At this Open house, more than 100 people participated and 136 individuals completed the comment form. More than ¼ of respondents were non-Caucasian. Based on the community response, the PAC provided direction to the consultant on the final project design.

Phase 3: Validating the design

At the third and final Open House, the community was shown a design that the consultant believed reflected the intent and value of the community and the PAC. Overwhelmingly, the community indicated a positive response to the design. Of the 50 respondents, more than 82% of

respondents felt the design did a good job of balancing the active and passive recreational needs of the community.

This sense was validated by Cully Association of Neighbors at their General Meeting and by the PAC. The PAC recommended the final design by consensus.

d) Who designed and implemented the public involvement related to this Council item?

Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, the PP&R Community Outreach and Involvement Program Manager developed the Public Involvement Plan and led the public involvement for this project.

e) Primary contact for more information on this public involvement process (name, title, phone, email):

Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, PP&R Community Outreach and Involvement Program Manager, 503.823.5113, <u>Elizabeth.kennedy-wong@portlandoregon.gov</u>

10) Is any future public involvement anticipated or necessary for this Council item? Please describe why or why not.

No additional future public involvement is anticipated. The final concept was recommended by a community project advisory committee, and presented to the Cully Association of Neighbors.

Jeff Shaffer, Finance Manager (Interim)

APPROPRIATION UNIT HEAD (Typed name and signature)