Welcome!
Please take a moment to answer our poll:
https://pollev.com/christinajan159
Ke'pel Creek, CA
We are currently working with the Yurok Tribe to protect 2,000 acres of timberland here.
Photo by: Chris Bennett

Park Qualities Incubator
Session II - From Concepts to Metrics & Action
Park Qualities Incubator, Session II

- **Nov 16:** Framework - Linking park experience types and health outcomes
- **Today:** Framework – Translating concepts to metrics and action
- **Jan 18:** Workshop – Review 2 or 3 new mapping approaches developed from the first two sessions
- **Feb 15:** Workshop – Review revised approaches and open review period for participants
- **Mar 15:** Beyond experiences – Exploring additional approaches to park quality metrics

**Agenda:**

- Recap prior session
- Plenary Presentations, with Q&A:
  - Jonathan Avila, *Acting Deputy Director* – City of San Diego, CA
  - Brett Horner, *Park & Trail Planner* & Olivia Lau, *GIS Technician* – City of Portland, OR
- Breakout Groups (50min)
- Session Closing & Exit Poll
Recap: From Park Quality to Park Qualities

- **Presence of a park**
  Do residents have at least one park or open space within a 10-minute walk?

- **Park acreage**
  Is there enough park space for everybody to enjoy?

- **Park activities**
  Are there a wide range of activities (amenities and programming) for residents to do?

- **Park investment / maintenance**
  Are the parks clean and well-maintained?

- **Park visitation/perception**
  Do people feel welcome? Is the space being used by the community?

- ✔ 10-minute walk park access %
- ✔ Park acres per capita
Session I Recap: Making the Case

When asked about the goals for improved park quality data emerged, 3 common use cases emerged…

**Improved planning & decision-making**
- Improve capital improvement planning & resource allocation
- Identify popular parks/amenities to inform planning & resourcing decisions

**Improved technology & data systems**
- Develop park inventory & asset tracking system where a digitized process is lacking
Recap: What are characteristics of these park types?

Active
- Physical infrastructure (e.g. fields)
- Generic park assets (e.g. bathrooms)
- Social infrastructure (e.g. sports leagues)

Natural areas
- Evokes feelings (e.g. of separation)
- Infrastructure (e.g. trails & viewing areas)
- Social infrastructure (e.g. nature walks)

Social interaction
- Physical infrastructure (e.g. event space)
- Generic park assets (e.g. bathrooms)
- Social infrastructure (e.g. community assets)
Recap: What’s missing or should change?

- What’s value in measuring these separately vs in aggregate? What about diversity of experience types rather than total amount?

- What about common park infrastructure like bathrooms?
Streamlining amenity definitions & standards

NRPA & TPL have been collaborating to streamline amenity definitions and the survey process…

➔ Please share your feedback with us on amenity definitions & classifications by **Friday, Dec 23rd:**
Translating Concepts to Metrics & Action

Presentations by

- **Jonathan Avila**, Acting Deputy Director - City of San Diego
- **Brett Horner**, Parks & Trails Planning Manager, & **Olivia Lau**, GIS Technician, City of Portland
Addressing Park System Inequities

City of San Diego Parks Master Plan
Park Equity

Addressing long-standing inequities experienced by people in Communities of Concern and other marginalized populations allowing everyone to fairly share the same benefits from parks and attain full and equal access to recreational opportunities regardless of one's background, identity, ability, and location.
San Diego’s Park System

2nd Largest urban park system in the United States

+42,000 Acres of parkland

400+ parks operated and maintained

200 miles of trails
San Diego’s Development and Park History

12,000 BP
- Kumeyaay Sovereignty

1700’s
- The Mission & Old Town

1800’s - 1940
- Horton’s New Town & Inner Suburbs

1940 – 1980
- Post-War Boom & Planned Development

1980 - Present
- Reurbanization & Smart Growth

First Parks Master Plan - 1956

2020 Parks Master Plan
One City | Two Park Realities

Early development without park standard

Master Plan Development with park standard & development impact fees

Systemic disinvestment in older and urbanized neighborhoods

Historical redlining, & emphasis on the single-family housing model
ONE CITY

TWO REALITIES
ONE CITY | ONE SYSTEM

City of San Diego Parks Master Plan
Key Parks Master Plan Recommendations

- New Equity Goals
- New Park Standard
- New Access Goals
- Implementation Actions
- Equitable Regional Park Access
- New Citywide Park Fee
Why
Change the
park
standard?
2.8 Acres per 1000 residents
Built-out neighborhoods at a land disadvantage
Perceived access vs. actual Access
Encourage our City priorities.
New Equitable Park Standard

100 recreational value points per 1,000 people

Community Centered Approach

Better opportunities for community-directed park investments

Reflects a community’s social and recreational priorities

How did we develop the park standard?

A Park =

Land + Recreational Experiences + Equity & Access

Current City Park Standard

2.8 acres per 1,000 people

Calculate the recreational value of community planning areas that meet 2.8 acres standard

- Linda Vista CPA = 75 points per 1,000 people
- Carmel Valley CPA = 69 points per 1,000 people
- Mission Beach CPA = 190 points per 1,000 people
- Navajo CPA = 72 points per 1,000 people

New City Park Standard

100 points per 1,000 people
Recreational Value Methodology

Regional
- Regional Park
- Open Space
- Shorelines

Local
- Park Size
- Amenities + Recreation opportunities
- Access + Connectivity
- Activation + Engagement
GIS-Based Park Scoring
Park Need Index

- GIS-based index used to prioritize park funding
- Systematic evaluation of park metrics
- Will consider the quantity, quality, safety and accessibility of parks
- Will consider various social factors.
CONCEPT TO METRICS
Factoring In Park Quality and Variety

Trust for Public Land | December 14, 2022
Our Objective

• Starting with walkable access mapping, dig deeper and find out what’s in the parks when you get there. We wanted to add depth and dimension to the proximity metric. Who has good access to what, and where?
Existing Parks System: Developed Parks & Natural Areas

77% of households within ½ mile of a park or natural area
Our Parks Level of Service (LOS)

- Shows how well the parks and recreation system is meeting the needs of community.
- Provides a framework to plan the system’s growth and care over time.
- Sets targets for acquisition of land and development of assets to provide over time as resources allow.
- Can be used to meet equity objectives
Community Engagement

- Dot survey
- Previous outreach analysis
- Community needs survey
- Listening Sessions
- SCORP and Metro surveys
Data Analysis

- PP&R studied service levels for 13 park assets.
- PP&R assigned service area distances by integrating the GIS model with information obtained through community engagement.
Data Analysis - Playgrounds

- Service areas analyze how well our facilities are serving the community
  - Spatial catchment area of a park based on travel distance from a park’s access points
  - Distance is measured through a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) model that considers the ability to travel to a PP&R property (walking, bicycling, driving, public transit).
  - Barriers to access such as highways, rivers, or railroads are considered
PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION™
Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

Natural Areas Access

NORTHEAST PARKS

Kelly Butte Nature Park

LEVEL OF SERVICE: NATURAL AREAS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

- Portland areas open to the public
- Households within 2 miles of natural areas open to the public
- Portland Parks & Recreation properties
- Non-residential zoning

206,989 Households in Service Areas
73,357 Households Outside Service Areas
Data Analysis

Level of Service: Total Number of Recreation Experiences
PP&R Developed Parks and Natural Areas Open to the Public

Note: This graphic aggregates service areas of all PP&R developed park assets and natural areas open to the public. It illustrates the total number of PP&R developed park assets and natural areas open to the public that are available to individual households.
Development expenditures (%) allocated to projects in areas with either low income, people of color, or youth populations above the Portland average.
OUR NEXT STEP

Are there disparities, by race and income, in the number of park experiences people have once they get to their local park?
Questions/Discussion
Thank you!

Brett Horner, Brett.Horner@portlandoregon.gov
Olivia Lau, Olivia.Lau@portlandoregon.gov
Questions?

Please put your questions for speakers in the chat or Q&A
Goals:

- For each experience type, share with the group **how** you would summarize the amount available to a neighborhood.
- Share feedback not only on **how** we’re counting, but also **what** we’re counting.
- Zooming out, what city-wide policy goal would be most successful in your city?
Breakout Poll & Wrap-Up

Share your answers from the breakouts with the larger group*:
https://pollev.com/christinajan159

*The last 3 questions are part of our session feedback survey, these will remain anonymous and will not be shared with the larger group.