



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

Working Group Members:

Present:

Benson, Iris – OPRD – WG Facilitator	Gauthier, Katie – Technical Support
Kesch, Helena - OPRD	Sayre, Tom
Moran, Georgena – Access Recreation	Schahfer, Ashley – Empowering Access

Absent:

Friesen, Lori - OPRD	Rippee, Matt - OPRD
Hansen, Bryce - ODFW	Sparks, Ryan - OPRD
Robinson, Barton – Willamette Partnership	Youngblood, Scott - OPRD

GUESTS: No guests

**Wednesday, May 25, 2022
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting**

Notes

1. Welcome and Update

- a. Ms. Benson welcomed everyone and briefly went over the agenda.
- b. She noted going forward the meetings will be to mainly check-in now that we are into document creation and drafting.
- c. She is still working on finalizing the questionnaire. There were over 150 responses and many had comments.
 - i. There are many key topics areas that came up. We will have conversations, but may not be able to tackle here (e.g., procedural issues).
 - ii. Design comments were about more space, more accessible sites and cabins and yurts, and - repeatedly - was to have more benches!

2. Summary of Workshop Comments and Last Session

- a. Ashley briefed on the last workshop. She observed many areas of concern and comments are similar and recurring.
 - i. Janine noted that every engagement causes a new list of things to check out and investigate in the field to see if they could be universal changes.
 - ii. Helena is inspired to hear what excites people and how they are motivated. Glad the agency has the revenue to do some of these projects.
 - iii. Action takes time on our end, but attendees are positive and appreciative.
 - iv. Georgena noted that information sharing is a big ask from many participants. People want to know before they venture out. Being able to find current, updated info on a website is crucial.
- b. Tom was surprised at the low participation at the workshop.
 - i. Ashley reported about 90 people have attended the sessions to date (not including agency staff).

- ii. The last session was not as well-attended, but many people notified Ashley they could not make the event for various reasons.
- c. Tom complimented and questioned Randy on his briefing of ODF sites.
 - i. Randy said ODF is working through establishing a strategic plan part of which is to make spaces more welcome and accessible.
 - ii. There are no funds set aside.
 - iii. ODF has a project focused on reviewing infrastructure including some trails and reimagining to make the spaces more user-friendly from an accessibility perspective and under-represented communities.
- d. We are going to celebrate participants.
 - i. Considering parking passes or other items as appreciation gifts.
 - ii. Having someone from leadership to thank everyone goes a long way in keeping support for efforts.
 - iii. Participants want to know their effort are appreciated and useful. Seeing a final document – or even a draft final – will illustrate how the organization values their input, especially if suggestions are recommended for implementation.
 - iv. Including participants in any document Forward section, if they want to be there, would recognize their efforts.
- e. The next Zoom session is moved to the 21st with 17 people registered so far.
 - i. If people are comfortable with it, some of the prospective videos that were shared might help give perspective to park staff.
 - ii. Georgena informed that Access Recreation created a video for Trion Creek that might be beneficial to staff. Also, Access Recreation can provide training on a broad range of disabilities.

3. MIG Draft

- a. Ms. Benson reviewed preliminary documents. She presented an example of what it might look like by chapter, graphics, etc.
- b. Iris noted this document will be completed digitally in an accessibly format with the ability to select chapters individually.
- c. There are three layers of feedback: general public/participants, the work group and through agency review (i.e., engineering, planning, administrative staff, operations, and leadership levels).
- d. MIG will put together a spreadsheet to identify the recommendations so people may respond to individual items and make comments. These comments can go into refining the final document further.
- e. Hoping for a solid draft in June so we can review the context of the whole document.

4. Next Steps Moving Forward

- a. June 22nd is the next meeting and anticipated to move into reviewing documents and making comments as a group.
- b. Iris will reserve calendar time for a few briefer meetings to touch base and have a more productive use of time (July and August timeframe) as needed.

5. Additional Discussion

- a. Members discussed miscellaneous issues
 - i. OPRD follows ODOT parking rules which supersedes the federal requirements.
 - ii. There should be access aisle/routes all the way across parking lots with curb cuts where needed. Curbs are needed for safety, but wheel stops could be an option as long as the widths between the stops allows access.
 - iii. Janine discussed design directives that provide access to everyone without barriers. If there are exceptions, there need to be acceptable deviations.

- iv. Helena noted that access is no longer just a privilege – it’s something we offer to all and everyone needs equitable access.
- v. Ashley noted that having standards is a baseline.
 - 1. The federal government allows exceptions if there is documentation about why a barrier cannot be addressed and an attempt was made to comply or refer individuals to an alternative/similar location with reasonable accommodations (e.g., slope, stairs or transition areas, etc.)
 - 2. ADA states compliance is not mandatory if the agency can sufficiently document if something is not financially feasible, endangers nature, changes the environment, etc. Must document through a process.
 - 3. Our guidelines need to remove the “when possible” verbiage because that is a built-in way out for design. State the standard and the exceptions. Be clear that these are expectations as we try to move beyond the minimal criteria.
- vi. Questions on having a standard for all parking to be up front and wider. From a design perspective, it might be difficult to do because of available space, required numbers based on occupancy, and/or terrain.
 - 1. Having more space would definitely be a benefit if it is feasible.
 - 2. Georgena notes a senior community center has a reserved area for people who are slow walkers and seniors. That might be an option.
 - 3. Van accessible spaces should be monitored so the wrong type of vehicles do not occupy these special spots, but if they could all be van accessible that would be great.
- vii. ODF is focusing on gravel parking spaces that are 10 feet and at least 25 feet deep to assist with staging and maneuvering outside of vehicles.
- viii. If all parking areas are not required to be paved, there needs to be some basic surface recommendations.
 - 1. There should be a dedicated section for parking as well as in each relevant section.
 - 2. Gravel tends to erode, so transition areas are important to individuals with mobility challenges. Visually challenged has other concerns. We need to find solutions that are all-inclusive, especially the most significant areas.
 - 3. A list of options might be helpful for materials usage in surfacing, transitioning, signage and education.
 - 4. Helena noted a helpful video “When Accessible is Not Accessible” that was used where an individual was try to access a dog park and the person making the recording was providing verbal instruction on movement to gain access to the park. There was a difference in surface of the trail and what was not the trail. Having illustrative detail in our final document for design purposes will be crucial.
- ix. Iris noted there should be verbiage all throughout the design “consider these things” to bring continuity and standardization. Important to have a clear tone and expectations.
- x. Janine noted that terminology throughout should be clear and consistent in usage and meaning. For instance, docks, ramps, etc.
- xi. June 6th is set as the review deadline for the latest information and providing comment. If you can get them to Iris before that would be appreciated.