



Videra Park

**WORKSHOP #2
MEETING REPORT
October 5, 2006**

Workshop time: 6:30 to 8:00pm

Workshop location: Churchill Estates, 1919 Bailey Hill Rd., Eugene

Workshop facilitator: Philip Richardson

BACKGROUND

City of Eugene Parks & Open Space Planning staff hosted the second of two neighborhood workshops to discuss upcoming improvements to Videra Park. Videra Park is a 5.88-acre neighborhood park located in the far south of the Churchill neighborhood, at the intersection of 29th Ave. and Randy Lane. The City of Eugene Parks and Open Space Division purchased the property in 2003 using funds from the 1998 Parks and Open Space bond measure. Parks SDC (Systems Development Charge) funding is now available for improvements to Videra Park.

The workshop included a review of the results of the previous workshop, brief discussion of the site, and a thorough explanation of the draft concept design. This was followed by a general, informal discussion of the draft concept design. Goals for the evening included 1) sharing results of the previous workshop and; 2) gathering comments about the draft concept design, including funding priorities. About 20 neighbors attended the workshop.

ADVERTISEMENT

Advertisement for workshop #2 included the following:

- Over 500 postcard invitations were mailed to interested parties and stakeholders, including participants from the first meeting, as well as residents within ½ mile walking distance of the park.
- An article on the event was included in the September 28th issue of the Council Newsletter.
- The workshop was included on the Parks and Open Space online schedule of events, and the City Manager's Office calendar of public meetings.

PRESENTATION

Meeting participants convened at Churchill Estates. A presentation was given by Philip Richardson, Parks Planner, covering the project background and previous workshop results, including specific desires for improvements and related issues, as well as an overview of funding sources, process and time line for Videra Park improvements.

The draft concept design was presented and described in detail. Due to site constraints such as slope and vegetation, park development will be concentrated around a play area in the far eastern portion of the site. This portion of the park was impacted by surrounding development, while the remainder of the site buffering the creek will remain a natural area. The active play area will be connected to a main entry at the corner of Blacktail Dr. and W 29th Ave. Proposed improvements include the following features:

- construction of a children's play area, large enough to fit a play structure or swing set but not both,
- a picnic area with a picnic table, located adjacent to the playground;
- natural play features such as boulders and logs located centrally in the eastern, developed portion of the park;
- new park furniture including benches, drinking fountain, trash receptacles, bike racks, entry sign and rules sign;
- street trees and shrub beds buffering the park along Blacktail Dr., W 29th Ave., and Randy Lane, including native plants and trees;
- enhancement of existing natural areas, along the creek corridor and the Oregon White Oak savannah and woodland, through invasive species removal, selective girdling and thinning of encroaching Douglas fir and additional native plantings;
- sidewalks on the north, east, and south boundaries of the developed park area, along Blacktail Dr., W 29th Ave., and Randy Lane; and
- a nature trail running the length of park site through the natural area, parallel to the creek, and connecting to Randy Lane to the north and the children's play area to the southeast.

DISCUSSION

An informal and productive discussion of the draft concept design was held. All participants had an opportunity to share ideas and comments. Participants were asked to share thoughts about the proposals, priorities, etc. Generally, there appeared to be positive support for the proposals outlined in the draft concept design. Workshop participants supported both the type and configuration of improvements.

Street Trees

Participants expressed interest in assisting staff with tree selection for trees to be placed along W 29th and Randy Ln. In general, participants support deciduous trees and there is strong support for natural area enhancements. The approved list of street trees is posted at the end of this workshop report; neighbors are welcome to provide feedback on tree selection.

Detention Pond

Participants requested that the aesthetics of the detention pond on the far west portion of the park be improved. In response to participants' questions about plans in the works by the homeowner's association (HOA), a representative of the developers responded that \$20,000 is budgeted for neighborhood beautification, and will likely be allocated at the October 25th HOA meeting. The detention pond may be included as a beautification project, but the developer would like

assurance that the HOA is willing and able to maintain beautification improvements on an ongoing basis. Since the detention pond is not technically a part of the neighborhood park, staff explained that funds for neighborhood park development would not be spent on beautification of the detention ponds.

Play Area Improvements

Staff emphasized that the steep slopes limit what can be done for play improvements on the site. The play area is proposed for the flattest area of the entire site, however even this area has significant slope. To create a flat area of sufficient size for a large playground, large retaining walls would be required. The expense of these retaining walls would severely impact the funding available for playground equipment. Also, existing oak trees within the flattest area further limit the extent of excavation desirable. Balancing the playground size against these costs led towards a relatively small proposed play area. There is likely only room for a swing set or a play structure, but not both. General consensus was expressed in favor of a climbing structure in the play area rather than swings. Multiple participants noted that swings take up more space, and there are already swings at nearby Skyview Park. Participants preferred a small-scale climbing structure, similar to the example of Marche Chase Park.

Participants emphasized the importance of benches placed around the play area as well as throughout the meadow and natural area. Interest was expressed in a second picnic table, possibly further west in the meadow. Staff noted that this location would have maintenance and slope concerns. A few participants expressed support for the addition of a second picnic table in place of the swings. There was general support for a picnic table to be located in the shade.

One participant asked if a sand pit could be located in the natural play area. Staff noted that sand features require ongoing maintenance, and that maintenance vehicles would not be able to access the natural play area.

Traffic Calming

Participants expressed strong support for traffic calming improvements. There was general consensus for a stop sign at Blacktail & W 29th. Staff noted that the neighborhood must work with Rob Inerfeld of Public Works Transportation for any requested transportation improvements, and that the Churchill Neighborhood Association would be a good place to start these efforts.

Meadow

A participant asked if it was possible to plant oaks in the meadow area, potentially as a volunteer project. Staff replied that some oak plantings could be included as part of the natural area enhancement improvements.

Mowing Schedule

In response to a question about the mowing schedule, staff noted that un-irrigated field areas within neighborhood parks are typically mowed 3 times per year.

Paths & Trails

One participant asked if there were alternatives to concrete sidewalks, especially given the steepness on Randy Lane. Staff noted that concrete sidewalks are required for street frontage

along park property, but there may be a possibility to bring the sidewalk further in from the street as part of the PUD development process for the property immediately north of Videra Park. This would be built in place of a gravel path running north of the creek through the natural area. General preference by meeting participants was given to a gravel nature trail rather than a concrete sidewalk. Staff noted that a connecting bridge from Herald Lane may also be possible, depending upon applicable regulations and permitting requirements.

Funding & Priorities

Funding is available through parks system development charges (SDCs). Funding for ongoing maintenance costs are provided through a separate operations budget and do not need to be considered within the capital improvement budget. Due to rising construction costs and limited budgets, it is often not possible to fund all improvements identified in the concept plan in the first phase of park construction. For this reason, it is important to identify funding priorities. The next step in the planning process includes detailed cost estimates for construction of all park features identified in the concept plan. Once this cost estimate information is available, it will be possible to determine which features can be included within the phase I construction budget. According to preliminary cost estimates, it may be possible to construct all proposed improvements with the available construction budget.

Volunteer Opportunities

Additional discussion was given to possible volunteer projects for park improvements. Staff noted that the gravel trails are a popular and easily achievable volunteer project for park neighbors. Contact information was shared for Parks & Open Space's two main coordinators for volunteer projects. For volunteer projects related primarily to watershed enhancement, such as improvement of the creek and natural area, contact the Stream Team coordinator, Lorna Baldwin at 682-4850 or lorna.j.baldwin@ci.eugene.or.us. For park construction projects such as gravel paths, contact Volunteer in Parks coordinator Matt McRae at 682-4845 or volunteerinpark@ci.eugene.or.us.

NEXT STEPS

The level of response and viewpoints offered at the workshop suggest a reasonable representation of the neighborhood. The participant group appeared to express general support for the plan, and stated that it met their needs and desires. Staff will pursue the implementation of the plan and consider the formal design process concluded, with the exception of following up with workshop participants via letter regarding the outcome of budget discussions, and possibly presenting the design at a future neighborhood association meeting for general information.

Participants were reminded that an update letter will be sent out regarding the outcome of budget discussions, and that construction is likely to occur in 2008. Participants or other interested parties are welcome to discuss the project or submit comments at any time via phone, email or delivered mail.

ATTENDEES

The following parties attended the workshop:

Tom Saylor
Sarah Forsyth
David Hiebrecht
Scott Ricker
Rick Tromel
Mark Lawrence
Garry Kunkel
Louanne & Craig Koch
Vida & Larry Ellins
Jerry & Veronika Walton
Larry & Laurie Ormsby
Ann Field
Julie Butler
Lloyd Helileson

COMMENTS SHEETS

The following comments were recorded on comment sheets provided at the workshop and turned in to City staff at the end of the event or mailed thereafter.

1. *Do you feel the proposed concept plan fulfills the needs of the neighborhood? Why or why not?*

- Yes, Natural, yet useable – works for children (play area) & adults (nature trail).
- Yes. Especially when the Nature Trail is completed. Good design job.
- Scratch swings.
- Yes * Please keep the play area small I would prefer no swing – more a toddler jungle gym as shown in the picture.
- On balance it's ok.
- I think it generally fulfills the needs of the neighborhood. My only concern, or reflection after the meeting, is that the proposed small play structure is the only playground item and it will at best entertain 2-3 children and probably no children over the age of 5 or so.

2. *Are there any important park features missing from the proposed concept plan?*

- I'd like to see it mowed more often!
- It would be nice to have several areas w/ picnic table(s), and benches. I'd eliminate swings and have a rock, slide, climbing structure instead. Stop signs or speed bumps are needed at the corner of Blacktail/29th and Randy & 29th.
- More picnic tables. Perhaps with swings gone, and small climbing structure centered 2 picnic tables could be added in corners.
- Nice plan – nice job.
- I don't think so, the more natural the better.
- The "city detention ponds" should be included. The "city" must take responsibility

-
- for the condition of these ponds and trees on Randy Lane.
 - I think the play structure needs to be bigger, like at most other parks, and that there should be 2-3 swings.
3. *What is the MOST IMPORTANT park feature (that should be included no matter what)? List at least three of your highest priorities, in order of importance (1=most important).*
- (1) play area; (2) nature trail; (3) benches.
 - Removing invasive plants on the site.
 - (1) Nature trail; (2) Meadow w/ added trees; (3) Playground w/ picnic tables.
 - (1) Nature trail; (2) Trees; (3) Side walk.
 - Trail & trees.
 - This is significant because the playground area is the most important feature of the park.
4. *What park features are LEAST IMPORTANT? List at least three of your lowest priorities, in order of importance (1=least important).*
- (1) Natural play area; (2) playground – play equipment.
 - Playground features.
5. *Would you be interested in participating in a volunteer effort related to the park? What type? (Some possibilities might be tree and shrub planting and care, trail building, care of natural areas, park patrol, etc.)*
- Yes – Planting & care; Trail building.
 - Yes
 - I may be able to help
 - Possibly; would like to be involved in tree selection on 29th.
 - Yes – tree and shrub selection and planting.
6. *Any other comments?*
- Nice addition to neighborhood.
 - * Please note, I am in the only home adjacent the park. I am very concerned with noise. The natural play area is way too close to my property. If a area such as this is built, it needs to be the same distance, between houses. – more where you show the meadow. (other side of trail). This will effect my happiness, my property value, and my general enjoyment of living there.
 - Overall very good design. Stop signs at corner would be great.
- I was unable to make the videra park meeting today with the draft plan. I was unable to open the file for the draft plan so my comment is based upon suggestions made at the initial meeting. You stated the possibility of creating a walking path through the remaining acerage. Because the area is so narrow, I urge you to let it stay wild, brambles and all. This will provide the wildlife with a safe area to be undisturbed and would also minimize the maintenance the city would have. With so much area cleared, this is a small consideration. Thank you.

Appendix A Approved Street Tree Species List

SPECIES NAME	COMMON NAME	SOIL TYPE	PLANTER WIDTH	MATURE HEIGHT /WIDTH	UNDER WIRES	CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
Acer campestre	Hedge Maple	type II	4	35/30	yes	
Acer circinatum	Vine Maple	type I	8	20/15	yes	Only understory tree & under wires
Acer ginnala 'Flame'	Flame Amur Maple	type II	4	20/20	yes	Only understory tree & under wires
Acer griseum	Paperbark Maple	type II	4	25/15	yes	Only understory tree & under wires
Acer macrophyllum	Big Leaf Maple	type I	6	100/80	no	
Acer nigrum 'Greencolumn'	Green Column Black Maple	type II	6	40/25	no	
Acer pseudoplatanus 'Atropurpureum'	Spaethii Sycamore Maple	type I	6	45/35	no	
Acer rubrum 'Doric'	Doric Red Maple	type III	4	30/15	yes	
Acer rubrum*	Red Maple	type III	6	50/40	no	
Acer saccharinum	Sugar maple	type I	6	60/35	no	
Acer trunc. X A. plat. 'Keithsform'	Norwegian Sunset Maple	type II	4	40/30	no	
Acer trunc. X A. plat. 'Warren red'	Pacific Sunset Maple	type II	4	35/25	no	
Acer X freemanii 'Autumn Blaze'	Autumn Blaze Maple	type III	6	60/45	no	
Acer X freemanii 'Celzam'	Celebration Maple	type III	6	45/25	no	
Aesculus hippocastanum 'Baumannii'	Bauman Horsechestnut	type III	6	40/30	no	
Aesculus X carnea	Red Horsechestnut	type III	4	35/30	yes	
Alnus oregona	Red Alder	type III	4	40/30	no	Along wetlands only
Betula jacquemontii	Jacquemont Birch	type II	4	40/30	no	
Betula nigra	River Birch	type II	6	60/40	no	
Betula papyrifera	Paperbark Birch	type II	6	50/30	no	
Carpinus betula	European Hornbeam	type II	4	35/20	yes	
Carpinus carolina	American hornbeam	type II	6	35/20	yes	

<i>Catalpa bignonioides</i>	Southern Catalpa	type III	8	60/40	no	
<i>Celtis occidentalis</i>	Common Hackberry	type II	6	45/40	no	
<i>Cercidiphyllum japonicum</i>	Katsura Tree	type I	6	60/40	no	Site protected from excessive heat
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	Eastern Redbud	type III	4	30/30	yes	
<i>Cladrastis lutea</i>	American Yellow wood	type II	4	40/40	no	
<i>Cornus nuttallii</i>	Pacific Dogwood	type II	4	40/20	no	
<i>Corylus columna</i>	Turkish Filbert	type II	8	40/20	no	
<i>Frax. oxy. aureafolia</i> 'Golden Desert'	Golden Desert Ash	type III	4	30/20	yes	
<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	White Ash	type III	6	60/40	no	
<i>Fraxinus latifolia</i>	Oregon Ash	type III	6	40/30	no	Along wetlands only
<i>Fraxinus ornus</i>	Flowering Ash	type III	4	30/25	yes	
<i>Fraxinus oxycarpa</i>	European Ash	type III	4	40/35	no	
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Green Ash	type III	4	60/40	no	
<i>Ginkgo biloba</i>	Ginkgo	type I	6	60/25	no	
<i>Koelreuteria paniculata</i>	Goldenrain Tree	type I	4	30/30	yes	
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	Tulip Tree	type II	8	80/40	no	
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	Black Gum, Tupelo	type III	4	50/20	no	
<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>	American Hophornbeam	type III	8	35/25	no	
<i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>	Sourwood	type II	4	30/25	yes	
<i>Platanus X acerifolia</i> 'Bloodgood'	Bloodgood London Plane	type III	8	100/50	no	
<i>Pyrus calleryana</i>	Flowering Pears	type II	4	35/20	yes	Only understory tree or under wires. 'Bradford' not approved.
<i>Quercus acutissima</i>	Sawtooth Oak	type II	6	40/40	no	
<i>Quercus bicolor</i>	Swamp white Oak	type III	6	60/45	no	
<i>Quercus coccinea</i>	Scarlet Oak	type II	6	50/45	no	
<i>Quercus frainetto</i> 'Schmidt'	Forest Green Hungarian oak	type II	6	50/30	no	
<i>Quercus garryana</i>	Western White Oak	type II	6	60/40	no	
<i>Quercus imbricaria</i>	Shingle Oak	type II	6	55/45	no	
<i>Quercus macrocarpa</i>	Burr Oak	type II	6	70/40	no	
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin Oak	type II	6	75/40	no	

Quercus phellos	Willow Oak	type II	6	70/50	no	
Quercus robur	English Oak	type III	4	60/40	no	
Quercus rubra	Northern Red Oak	type II	6	75/50	no	
Quercus shumardi	Shumardii Oak	type II	6	70/50	no	
Sophora japonica	Chinese Scholar-Tree	type II	6	60/40	no	
Stewartia pseudocamellia	Japanese Stewartia	type II	4	40/20	no	
Styrax japonicus	Japanese Snowdrop Tree	type I	4	30/20	yes	Only understory tree or under wires
Tilia americana	American Linden	type II	6	60/35	no	
Tilia cordata	Littleleaf Linden	type II	6	50/30	no	
Tilia tomentosa	Silver Linden	type II	6	50/40	no	
Ulmus 'Homestead'	Homestead Elm	type II	6	50/35	no	
Ulmus 'Pioneer'	Pioneer Elm	type II	6	50/50	no	
Ulmus 'Urban'	Urban Elm	type II	6	50/35	no	
Ulmus parvifolia	Lacebark Elm	type II	6	60/50	no	
Zelkova serrata	Zelkova	type II	6	60/40	no	
Evergreens						
Abies grandis	Grand Fir	type II	20+	100/40	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Abies nobilis	Noble Fir	type II	20+	100/40	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Calocedrus decurrens	Incense Cedar	type II	20+	60/40	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Cedrus atlantica	Atlas Cedar	type II	20+	60/30	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Cedrus deodara	Deodar Cedar	type II	20+	80/40	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Pinus ponderosa	Ponderosa Pine	type II	20+	100/80	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Pseudotsuga menziesii	Douglas Fir	type II	20+	120/40	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Sequoia sempervirens	Coast Redwood	type II	20+	150/80	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Sequoiadendron giganteum	Giant Sequoia	type II	20+	120/80	no	Must be approved by U.F.
Thuja plicata	Western Red Cedar	type II	20+	100/60	no	Must be approved by U.F.