



**Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
Accessibility Standards & Design Guidelines  
Advisory Working Group**

**Working Group Members:**

Belleque, Ms. Belleque – Marine Board	Peterson, Randy - ODF
Benson, Iris – OPRD – WG Facilitator	Rippee, Matt - OPRD
Friesen, Lori - OPRD	Sayre, Mr. Sayre
Hansen, Bryce - ODFW	Schaffer, Ashley – Empowering Access
Robinson, Barton – Willamette Partnership	Sparks, Ryan - OPRD
Kesch, Helena - OPRD	Youngblood, Scott - OPRD
Moran, Georgena – Access Recreation	Gauthier, Katie – technical support

**Wednesday, March 23, 2022  
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
Zoom Meeting**

**Notes**

**1. Welcome and Update**

- a. Ms. Benson welcomed Barton Robinson
- b. She noted that Kevin Herkamp is now working for the Ocean Shores program and will no longer be part of the workgroup.
- c. The group introduced themselves for Barton’s benefit.
- d. Ms. Benson briefly discussed the revised meeting agenda.
- e. As we go through the process and hear different perspectives, we will try to be flexible and respond as we go along.

**2. First Workshop Update and Outreach Plan Going Forward**

- a. Ashley Schaeffer from Empowering Access discussed the first listening session.
  - i. Demographics of registered participants was 31 people from Willamette Valley, 3 from the coast, 4 from Central Oregon, one from Eastern, and one from southern Oregon and a good turnout on the actual call.
  - ii. Disabilities represented by participants included physical, cognitive or emotional, and sensory. Also included were people invested in the process like friends and family members.
  - iii. They worked through some of the technical issues, but participants were engaged and even went over the allotted time.
  - iv. Ice breaker questions helped to find out what participants liked to do and places they liked to go with responses like Smith Rock, Silver Falls, and coastal areas.
- b. Breakout rooms were introduced with some success, but some people may have felt intimidated, so use going forward will be reconsidered. Additionally, Zoom doesn’t record the breakout rooms, so conversations and information may be lost or forgotten.
  - i. Question one addressed what access means to individuals. Responses included freedom, having maps that show access points for mobility equipment, and being included in the conversation.

- ii. The second breakout room discussion addressed barriers faced outdoors. Responses include potholes, mattress types, boat ramps, trail access, trail elevation or pitch, coastal access, bathrooms, camping sites, types of campsites, erosion, trail widths, and access to information.
- iii. Mr. Sayre noted that many of the issues brought up were program issues rather than design standards. Lack of access to information was brought up frequently.
- iv. Ashley shared a link to the Jam Board:  
[https://jamboard.google.com/d/1CMUxAuHoev4u25cs-2LrIDLdbZ97CE6bK4-BsEB\\_kbg/viewer?f=0](https://jamboard.google.com/d/1CMUxAuHoev4u25cs-2LrIDLdbZ97CE6bK4-BsEB_kbg/viewer?f=0)

### 3. Document Structure and Priorities

- a. Ms. Benson reported the consultant MIG will start on drafts of trails and water access. They will be basic and simple drafts.
- b. Iris sent the group a draft of a table of contents for the final document with ideas for categories of focus for the document. She's like to get it out soon.
- c. Document questions for the group – what do they think about the table of contents:
  - i. It seems facility specific and heavy, but a few core facilities rose to the top.
  - ii. Are the priorities in the right place? A few core facilities came to the top.
- d. Barton asked if there are there limitations based on legislation to what the group can focus on? It would be a waste to work on programmatic issues if they will be shelved because it's not what Legislators requested.
- e. Ms. Gauthier clarified the Legislation calls out access points, routes and docks. Beyond those – access points could be expanded to “how people get to places” like trailhead access points, boat launches, etc. There is a fair amount of flexibility, since it was not clear on what they meant by standards. We have to meet the minimum, but we can go above and beyond.
- f. There was lengthy discussion about whether to focus on design issues as well as programmatic concerns and meeting the requirements by the deadline. There are many unanswered questions about where to start, what to focus on, what are the goals.
- g. Ms. Friesen asked for group clarification about what to focus on for deliverables and to keep in mind the expectations vs. time and resources:
  - i. Transit – if you can't get to the park, you're defeated from the start.
  - ii. Restrooms and the parks themselves.
  - iii. Connectivity throughout the sites for ease of access to what is offered.
  - iv. Ashley gave a great description of addressing the issues from the individual's point of view – getting to the site, parking, and then proceeding to the viewpoint or other park feature – like telling a story.
  - v. Signage, kiosks and registration were also important.
- h. Mr. Sayre suggested, when we are prioritizing, we should consider individual sites and the reasons people go there.

### 4. Group Questions

- a. Ms. Moran asked Ms. Benson her thoughts on their progress and the process.
  - i. Ms. Benson would like to review her notes and consider fully.
  - ii. She sees the need for including some of the programmatic recommendations and an implementation plan.
  - iii. Ms. Benson feels outlining and detailing a process is the first priority, then facilities based on user experience, layering services and continued evaluation of what implementation looks lie.
- b. Mr. Robinson asked if we are creating just guidelines or if these are enforceable?
  - i. Ms. Benson indicated they'd be standards for OPRD
  - ii. Their work might provide recommendations and resources for non-OPRD.

- c. Would it help to meet more frequently to achieve more clarity?
  - i. Consensus was that smaller discussions or groups might be able to meet to drill down on specific topics and report back to the whole.
  - ii. Most felt schedules were tight all around.

**5. Questionnaire Development (Facilities and Questions)**

- a. Ms. Benson shared the questionnaire and walked through the items. She opened discussion for feedback.
- b. All agreed it was a good list.
- c. The group discussed outreach and resources already identified to start the questionnaire distribution with such as veterans and groups with disabilities.
- d. Ms. Schaffer will send some language suggestions for the questionnaire.

**6. Water Access**

- a. Ms. Belleque, Marine Board, briefed on water access issues.
- b. 2019 Legislation allowed for expansion to boating to other than motorized.
- c. She shared photos of launches and the group discussed some of the pros and cons illustrated in the various attempts at improving access.

**7. Wrap-up and Next Steps**

- a. Ms. Benson will summarize and provide a new scope.
- b. Ms. Belleque suggested that digging in will help clarify some issues.

Meeting adjourned at 16:05