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1. Welcome and introductions (5 minutes)

2. Review of work completed and underway (45 minutes)
   a. **Characterizing the current conditions**
      i. Park evaluation findings (see handout)
      ii. Access and park quality maps for the park system
      iii. Funding gaps (see handout)
      iv. Observation re: structure/administration of park and recreation functions within city government
   b. **Aspirations**
      i. Vision and goals
   c. **Recommendation topics**
      i. Measurement of services provided by the system (see handout)
      ii. Project funding protocol and criteria (see handout)
      iii. Addressing gaps identified by the park evaluation and access maps
      iv. Additional funding streams

3. Discussion topics (60 minutes):
   i. A better project selection protocol and criteria
   ii. Strategies for addressing gaps identified by the park evaluation and access maps

4. Sub-committee work upcoming (10 minutes)
   a. Park/open space public funding opportunities
Portland Open Space Vision & Implementation Plan

Proposed Annual Budget Input Process v1

July 24, 2015

Introduction

There has been some tension and confusion in the annual city budgeting process related to park and recreation function funding requests, especially for park functions. This proposal presents a recommended process and specific criteria for evaluating park and recreation-related items for funding. The process and criteria may be useful for developing both capital and operating budget funding requests.

Context

Currently, there appear to be a few key dynamics that are affecting Portland’s parks, open space, and recreation budget process. The recommendations that follow give them conscious consideration in an effort to provide a useful and realistic proposal. (Please note: The following descriptions are based on TPL’s evolving understanding of Portland’s unique processes.)

1. **Tension between Parks-Specific and System-Wide Focus in the Department of Public Services:** Portland’s Friends groups are a powerful asset. Many have completed and continue contributing diligent and thoughtful work to support planning and maintenance in individual parks. It is critical that the City take advantage of and support their efforts. Simultaneously, a system is needed to tackle difficult decisions with fairness and to maintain focus on both system-wide needs and necessary improvements of sites that do not garner the same level of attention given to Portland’s premier parks.

2. **Relative Strength of the Department of Recreation & Facilities in the City Budget Process:** Compared to the parks and recreation functions of the Department of Public Services, the Department of Recreation appears to be in a somewhat stronger position to make strategic planning decisions and secure needed investments to maintain the quality of their assets. This appears to be a consequence of greater resource constraints faced by the Department of Public Services and the fact that the needs of the Department’s parks and open spaces lean more toward landscape maintenance than toward infrastructure replacement or rehabilitation.

3. **Separate Departmental Paths for Project Prioritization and Funding Requests:** The Department of Public Services and Department of Recreation & Facilities currently have separate processes for developing investment priorities and submitting funding requests.

Recommendations

Besides the proposed process detailed in the flow chart on p 2 and the recommended criteria on page 3, there are other changes needed to contribute to a well-functioning annual planning/budgeting cycle. They are as follows:

**Process Recommendations**

- The City Manager should notify all departments about any changes in the city’s project selection methodology in July. It is an ICMA best practice for cities to make their decision-making criteria known at the start of the budget cycle.

- When they submit their Final Recommended Schedule of Investments in January of each year, all departments should include submission request forms (paper or electronic) for each project for which they are requesting funds for the next fiscal year. This provides the departments with an opportunity to justify projects according to City-wide project prioritization criteria and helps the City Manager and City Council make well-informed decisions.

**Structural Recommendation:**

- A dedicated "Parks and Open Space Unit" inside DPS is recommended, rather than this fragmented system where the Cemeteries Division is responsible for both grounds, trails, etc. and burials and the Forestry Division is responsible for both parks tree maintenance and street tree maintenance, etc.
PROPOSAL I
Department of Public Services & Parks Commission Budget Process
(Assumes no changes to the Department of Recreation & Facilities process)

JULY
City announces system for selecting capital projects in next FY

EARLY AUGUST - LATE OCTOBER
Department of Public Services
Compile a List of Candidate Projects
(Early August – Early October)
Sources:
• Portland Open Space Vision & Implementation Plan
• Parks Master Plans
• Unfunded requests from prior years
• Departmental knowledge
• Requests from Friends Groups and other public stakeholders

Submit Materials to Parks Commission
(Late October)
• Full list of candidate projects
• An initial draft of project priorities and a 5-year investment schedule, with justifications
• Revenue estimates (also submitted to the City Manager in November)

EARLY AUGUST – EARLY SEPTEMBER
Parks Commission
Establish the Parks & Open Space Project Prioritization Criteria
• Reviews the next FY Citywide system for selecting capital projects among Department submissions
• Reviews prior year Parks & Open Space project prioritization criteria
• Hears recommendations about any needed revisions to the Parks & Open Space criteria from Department of Public Services and other interested stakeholders
• Makes revisions as necessary, and approves prioritization criteria for Department of Public Services use

PUBLIC STAKEHOLDERS
• Department of Public Services issues call to Friends and Neighborhood Groups and the public for project ideas. Request includes:
  o The approved prioritization criteria to enable respondents to justify requests
  o Upcoming budget estimates to establish appropriate expectations
• Submission Deadline: Early October

EARLY SEPTEMBER – LATE OCTOBER
Public Stakeholders
• Reviews project rankings produced by the Scoring and Ranking Subcommittee
• Reviews draft 5-year schedules and justifications (including opportunities to acquire funding matches and other time sensitive factors)
• Produces Parks Commission Recommended Schedule of Investments for the Department of Public Services and the Land Bank Commission, based on all findings from hearings, project rankings, and schedule considerations. These recommendations are provided to the Department of Public Services and the Land Bank Commission for review and revisions prior to DPS’ submission to the City Manager. **

Land Bank Commission*
• Reviews available budget
• Creates candidate projects list and a 5-year investment schedule, with justifications
• Late October: Sends to Parks Commission as an FYI

EARLY NOVEMBER – EARLY JANUARY
Parks Commission
Reviews, Hears, and Scores All Project Proposals
• Conducts a public meeting to hear from Departments, Friends Groups, Neighborhood Associations, and other interested Stakeholders

Scoring and Ranking Subcommittee
• Applies the project prioritization criteria to score all candidate projects, including additions made by the Parks Commission
• Creates a ranked list of project priorities

JANUARY
City departments submit project priorities to the City Manager’s Office

* Assumes no changes to the Department of Recreation & Facilities process

** Capital improvements budget estimates must be approved by the City Manager for FY project inclusion in budget requests.
The Land Bank Commission is included in this process only for purposes of coordination. They inform the Parks Commission about their plans and give the Parks Commission an opportunity to comment on those plans. The Land Bank Commission retains all decision-making authority for their work.

We believe that the Parks Commission should submit their recommended schedule of (ranked) investments (aka funding priorities) to DPS, not to the City Manager. DPS should submit the Final Recommended Schedule of Investments (FRSI) to the City Manager. In advance of submitting their FRSI to the City Manager, DPS should make a reasonable effort to align their FRSI with the Park Commission recommended funding priorities. Additionally, the DPS’ FRSI submitted to the City Manager should include the Parks Commission recommended funding priorities as an attachment.

**Assumptions:**
- The process timeline begins immediately after the prior year’s budget is adopted.
- In order to allow adequate time, work must continue during the summer months, though key aspects of public engagement have been pushed to late summer/early fall. (It was requested that the engagement of Friends Groups happen earlier than the Fall, and it was simultaneously suggested that engagement is not effective during the summer months.)
- This process assumes that 1) the City may revise its allocation decision-making methodology from year to year and 2) the parks and open space project prioritization criteria may need refinements based on the experience of prior years and changes in citywide expectations.

**PROPOSAL II**

**Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Project Prioritization Criteria**

This proposal focuses on providing a set of project prioritization criteria for making parks, open space, and recreation investment decisions. The 23 project prioritization criteria below would be implemented by the Department of Public Services, the Department of Recreation and Facilities, and the Parks Commission.

We would like this list to be in alignment with City Manager and City Council criteria for making overall funding decisions as part of the annual municipal budget process. In the absence of having current citywide criteria upon which to base our draft departmental project selection criteria, we have developed this list based, in part, on a review of past citywide criteria used in Portland as well as criteria used by other cities.

When the City Manager and City Council develop criteria for selecting projects for funding as part of the annual citywide process for preparing the Capital Improvement Plan and Municipal Budget, we hope that this list may be useful. We hope they will also consider including the following two criteria to support and reward the thoughtful efforts of departments that make strategic and judicious funding requests.

1. Advances the objectives or strategic priorities of adopted/articulated visions, plans, or policies (for example, the City’s Comprehensive Plan, the *Portland Open Space Vision and Implementation Plan*, etc.).
2. Project is ranked as a high priority by the department submitting this request, assuming the department has utilized an objective prioritization system (and has not simply submitting a wish list or requests that are more responsive to political pressure than long range strategic planning).

**Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Project Prioritization Criteria**

**Essential**

1. Addresses public health and safety; reduces city liability (Highest score for projects that address an *imminent* public safety need)
2. Fulfills a legal mandate (compliance with local, state, and federal laws, such as ADA or Title IX)

**Articulated Parks, Open Space, and Recreational Objectives**

3. Advances the objectives or strategic priorities of adopted/articulated visions, plans, or policies (for example, the *Portland Open Space Vision and Implementation Plan*, Athletic Facilities Task Force Plan, or Eastern Promenade Master Plan).
**Financial Considerations**

4. Cost avoidance: For example: (a) Prevents costly infrastructure failures or unrecoverable deterioration of a functional or historic amenity; (b) avoids serious costs that could result from delaying the project; or (c) Will measurably reduce O&M costs, including potential savings from energy and water use.

5. Leverages external funds or benefits from significant cost sharing (for example, from federal matching funds or a private matching grant)

6. Meets requirements to access special funding streams (for instance, project is eligible to use impact fee revenue or funds for water quality improvements)

7. Funding has been identified for ongoing O&M costs that will result from the project

**Timing/Efficiency**

8. Seizes an acquisition or funding opportunity that may be lost if no action is taken

9. Can be bundled with other projects to achieve cost efficiencies (for instance, a roadway project that also replaces a deteriorated storm drain)

10. Project readiness: Project has a clear timeline, reliable estimates of costs for each major milestone, and no anticipated major hurdles likely to lead to schedule delays.

11. Project is already under development (partially built) or part of a prior commitment

12. Has a high potential for partnership/collaboration across departments in terms of implementation, maintenance, or funding

13. Advances multiple priorities simultaneously; addresses more than one need within a department or across departments

14. Will ready a project for implementation (for instance, completion of an engineering plan or cost estimates)

15. A minor investment that would have a big impact on the character of a park

**System Equity & Community Livability**

16. Improves geographic distribution of parks and recreation facilities; brings or improves a park or facility to an underserved area; brings a facility for a neighborhood for a first time before improving or expanding an undersized but existing functional facility elsewhere

17. Improvements will serve an area with a very high population density or a high percentage of low-income residents, children, or seniors

18. Supports program offerings for multiple user groups and age cohorts

19. Prioritize improvements to underperforming or deteriorating parks over improvements to higher functioning parks

20. Improves multiple sites simultaneously

21. Promotes health, wellness, and active lifestyles

22. Promotes environmental education, stewardship, and sustainability

23. Promotes personal and community enrichment and overall community livability
Summary of Parks & Open Space Budget Requests and Allocations: Fiscal Years 2014 - 2016

July 17, 2014

The following summarizes:

- All parks, open space, and recreation capital project allocations for fiscal years 2014 (2013-2014), 2015 (2014-2015), and 2016 (2015-2016)

- All parks, open space, and recreation capital project requests and operating funding requests and allocations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015

Capital Budgets

In fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Department of Public Services and Department of Recreation & Facilities requested over $8 million for 30 parks, recreation, and open space capital projects. During those two years, the City allocated just over $1.3 million combined for twelve of those projects and two additional projects that originated from sources other than departmental requests. Another $1.3 million was allocated in fiscal year 2016 for one new project and to continue work on two previously funded projects. Information on departmental requests for fiscal year 2016 could not be located.

The tables on the following three pages summarize funding requests, recommendations, and allocations for parks, open space, and recreation capital projects for fiscal years 2014 through 2016. These tables include all projects classified under “Parks, Fields, Trails” (which includes Recreation) and those related to the golf course or ice arena, typically listed under Facilities. The only Recreation projects excluded are those pertaining to Hadlock Field since the stadium functions as a professional rather than community or recreational sports facility.

Projects recommended for funding in future years of the five year Capital Improvement Plan cycle are included for context (in grey), but requested dollar amounts are only shown for current year projects requests.

1 Due to the facts that the 2016 Municipal Budget is not yet publicly available and that the 2016 CIP did not contain a list of departmental capital funding requests consistent with the 2014 and 2015 CIPs, we could only provide summaries of the information listed in the second bullet for fiscal years 2014 and 2015.
## Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Budget Requests & Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Departmental Request*</th>
<th>City Council Approved CIP Recommendation¹</th>
<th>Appropriated Funds¹</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Promenade Walkways</td>
<td>unknown (annual fund financed)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Eastern Cemetery “Dead House” Restoration</td>
<td>unknown (annual fund financed)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capisc Pond Park Improvements</td>
<td>unknown (bond financed)</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: Department of Public Services</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Recreation &amp; Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena Bleachers Replacement</td>
<td>unknown (bond financed)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson Park Softball Field “A” – Amenity and Field Upgrades</td>
<td>unknown (bond financed)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyman Moore Sports Complex Renovation</td>
<td>unknown (bond financed)</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Rehabilitation</td>
<td>unknown (bond financed)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: Department of Public Services</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There was no tally of requests in the City of Portland Capital Improvement Plan FY 2016 – FY 2020.

¹ From "Table B. Recommended 2016 Capital Projects – General Fund [Cash and Financed]" and/or "Table C. Recommended Capital Improvement Plan – General Fund" of the City of Portland Capital Improvement Plan FY 2016 – FY 2020.

² Appropriations of bond financed projects found in the ORDER APPROPRIATING $18,731,000 OF BOND PROCEEDS FOR THE CITY'S 2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. Appropriations for annual fund projects are assumed as the Municipal Budget for FY 2016 has not yet been made publicly available.
### Fiscal Year 2015 Capital Budget Requests & Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Public Services</th>
<th>Departmental Request</th>
<th>City Council Approved CIP Recommendation*</th>
<th>Appropriated Funds¹</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East End Beach Parking Lot Paving</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>(annual fund financed) $35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Line Replacement at Evergreen Cemetery</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>(annual fund financed) $15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery Wall along Stevens Avenue Repair, Ph. II</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capiscim Pond Improvements</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$563,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($2,250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park Walkways Repair</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($235,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery Expansion</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deering Oaks Lighting</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($120,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park Fence Repair</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($224,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1. Summer Park Lighting Improvements</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2019</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facilities at Deering Oaks</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2019</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($300,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Promenade Walkways</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($51,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Square Rehabilitation (For FY 2015 &amp; 2016)</td>
<td>$761,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($761,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cemetery Retaining Wall Repair Along Federal Street</td>
<td>$935,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($935,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deering Oaks Parking Lot Paving</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($41,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress Square Redesign, Phase I (For FY 2016/2017)</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2016/2017</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** Department of Public Services | **$5,377,000** | **$683,000** | **$120,000** | **($5,257,000)** |

| Department of Recreation & Facilities | | | |
| Payson Park Softball Field “A” – Amenity and Field Upgrades | $400,000 | (bond financed) $200,000 | $200,000 | ($200,000) |
| North Golf Course Clubhouse (200,000 more for FY 2016) | $225,000 | (bond financed) $225,000 | $225,000 | $0 |
| Payson Park Playground and Splashpad | $50,000 | (bond financed) $50,000 | $50,000 | $0 |
| Roof at Ice Arena | $125,000 | (bond financed) $150,000 | $150,000 | ($65,000) |
| Softball Field at Riverton School | $75,000 | Recommended for FY 2017 | $0 | ($75,000) |
| Golf Course Rehabilitation ($100,000 more annually) | $100,000 | Recommended for FY 2019 | $0 | ($100,000) |
| Driving Range | $45,000 | Recommended for FY 2017 | $0 | ($45,000) |
| Bleachers at Ice Arena (For FY 2016) | Recommended for FY 2017 | * | * | * |
| Lyman Moore Sports Complex (For FY 2016) | Recommended for FY 2017 | * | * | * |
| Playground at Riverton School (For FY 2016) | Recommended for FY 2017 | * | * | * |
| Multipurpose Field “B” at Payson Park (For FY 2016) | * | * | * | * |
| Dougherty Field Master Plan (For FY 2016/2018) | * | * | * | * |
| North Course Bathroom with Concessions (For FY 2016) | * | * | * | * |
| Playground at Hall School (For FY 2017) | * | * | * | * |
| Practice Fields at Deering High School (For FY 2017) | * | * | * | * |
| Lights and Irrigation at Deering Oaks Baseball Field (For FY 2017) | * | * | * | * |
| Softball Field “A” Lights at Payson Park (For FY 2018) | * | * | * | * |
| Softball Field Lights at Riverton School (For FY 2018) | * | * | * | * |
| Playground at Longfellow School (For FY 2018) | * | * | * | * |
| North Course Clubhouse Landscaping (For FY 2018) | * | * | * | * |
| Tennis Court Lighting at Deering Oaks Park (For FY 2019) | * | * | * | * |

**TOTAL** Department of Recreation & Facilities | **$1,110,000** | **$625,000** | **$625,000** | **($485,000)** |

| Land Bank | | | |
| Land Bank | unknown | unknown | unknown | unknown |

*Table C. Recommended Capital Projects – General Fund* in the City of Portland Capital Improvement Plan (City Manager Recommended) FY 2015 – FY 2019 only included information for fiscal years 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2019. It is possible that some of these projects were intended to be recommended for funding in fiscal year 2018, but that the plan document is missing this information.

¹From "Table G. Requested Capital Projects – General Fund" of the City of Portland Capital Improvement Plan (City Manager Recommended) FY 2015 – FY 2019.

²From "Table B. Recommended 2015 Capital Projects – General Fund (Cash and Financed)" and "Table C. Recommended Capital Projects – General Fund" of the City of Portland Capital Improvement Plan (City Manager Recommended) FY 2015 – FY 2019.

³Appropriations of bond financed projects found in the ORDER APPROPRIATING $15,911,000 OF BOND PROCEEDS FOR THE CITY’S 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. Appropriations for annual fund projects found in the "Approved Capital Expenditures FY15" table on pages 9-10 of the City of Portland Municipal Budget July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015.
### Fiscal Year 2014 Capital Budget Requests & Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Departmental Request</th>
<th>City Council Approved CIP Recommendation</th>
<th>Appropriated Funds</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Commercial Street Trail Design and Construction ($200,000 more for FY 2015)</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cemetery “Dead House” and City Tomb Repair</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $25,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Promenade Walkways and Retaining Wall Construction</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $60,000 (B)* (Retaining Wall Only)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>($40,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery Wall along Stevens Avenue Repair</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $20,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>($70,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cemetery Fence and Section of Retaining Wall Replacement</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>$20,000 (C)*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park at High Street and Spring Street Design and Construction ($225,000 more for FY 2015)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery Expansion</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park Walkways Repair</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($235,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Cove Trail (North Side) Realignment and Retaining Wall Removal</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($165,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park Fence Repair</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($224,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Improvements at Ft. Sumner Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cemetery Retaining Wall along Federal Street Repair</td>
<td>$935,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($935,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Service into Eastern Cemetery Extension</td>
<td>Not requested</td>
<td>(bond financed) $15,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalls and Roof Fort Allen Gazebos Reconstruction and Repainting</td>
<td>Not requested</td>
<td>(bond financed) $30,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspian Pond Park Improvements</td>
<td>Not requested</td>
<td>(bond financed) $80,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACTS Martin’s Point East Coast Greenway Trail Connection (For FY 2016/2017)</td>
<td>Recommended for FY 2016/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Field, Trails (Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended annual allocations for FY 2015/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: Department of Public Services</strong></td>
<td>$2,219,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>($2,044,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Departmental Request</th>
<th>City Council Approved CIP Recommendation</th>
<th>Appropriated Funds</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field and Track Replacement at Fitzpatrick Stadium</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $1,050,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Golf Course Club House Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $150,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Club House Restaurant Area Improvements</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>(bond financed) $70,000 (B)*</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson Park Playground and Splashpad Replacement/Repair</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyman Moore Sports Complex Renovation (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground at Riverton School Replacement (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground at Longfellow School Replacement (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field at Riverton School Renovation (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Field “B” at Payson Park Renovation (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena Roof Refinishing (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena Bleachers Replacement (For FY 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground at Hall School Replacement (For FY 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Fields at Deering High School Renovation (For FY 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights and Irrigation at Deering Oaks Baseball Field (For FY 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field “A” Lights at Payson Park Replacement (For FY 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field Lights at Riverton School Replacement (For FY 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deering Oaks Park Tennis Court Lighting Installation (For FY 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL: Department of Public Services</strong></td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
<td>($50,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Land Bank | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Land Bank | unknown | $73,000 | unknown | unknown |

* Projects recommended for funding in fiscal year 2014 should be listed in both “Table B. Recommended 2014 Capital Projects – General Fund” and “Table C. Recommended Summary 2014-2018 Capital Projects – General Fund” of the City of Portland Capital Improvement Plan FY 2014 – FY 2018. Unfortunately, these two tables contain entirely different 2014 parks and recreation project listings. Table B lists ten 2014 projects under the “Parks, Fields, Trails” and “Golf Course” headings. Only two of those projects are similarly reflected in Table C. In addition, Table C lists one project that is not listed in Table B. All projects listed in either table are shown here. Letters in parentheses indicate if a project was listed in only Table B or only Table C (rather than in both tables).


8 An Appropriation Order for the 2014 CIP could not be located online. Due to the inconsistency noted above, a call was placed to the City Manager’s office to identify which projects were actually funded.
Operating Budgets

Between fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the general fund budget increased by 3.2% from just under $171 million to over $176 million. During the same time, the funds dedicated primarily to parks, open space, and recreation functions increased by 4.2% in the Department of Public Services and 4.7% in the Department of Recreation.\(^\text{11}\) The Divisions of Cemeteries, Forestry & Horticulture, and Districting are those that primarily serve parks and open space functions in the Department of Public Services. The budgets of these Divisions make up less than one-fifth the total Public Services budget. In the Department of Recreation and Facilities, the Divisions primarily serving parks and recreation functions are the Ice Arena, Athletic Facilities, Recreation, Aquatics, Therapeutic Recreation, and the Golf Course. Together, the budgets of these divisions are approximately 37% of the total Recreation and Facilities budget.

Projected Public Services tax levy revenue was $12.2 million in FY 2015 and almost $12.6 million in FY 2014. Projected recreation and facilities management tax levy revenue was $3.6 million in both FY 2015 and 2014.

**Fiscal Year 2015 Operating Budget Requests & Allocations\(^\text{12}\)**

The gap between what the Department of Public Services requested for parks and open space management and what they were allocated was over $193,000 in FY 2015. Unfunded requests include the salary for an additional full-time maintenance worker in the Cemeteries Division and costs for temporary help and contractual services across all three Divisions. Unfunded parks and recreation requests for the Department of Recreation and Facilities were relatively minor in FY 2015 and primarily affected contractual services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Division</th>
<th>Departmental Request</th>
<th>City Allocation (from Municipal Budget)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Unfunded</th>
<th>Percent of Dept. Budget</th>
<th>Percent of City General Fund Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Public Services</strong></td>
<td>$18,082,944</td>
<td>$16,311,223</td>
<td>$1,751,721</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>$6,570,472</td>
<td>$5,886,028</td>
<td>$684,444</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry &amp; Horticulture</td>
<td>$693,495</td>
<td>$668,815</td>
<td>$24,680</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districting</td>
<td>$2,114,821</td>
<td>$2,040,611</td>
<td>$74,210</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL For Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Functions</strong></td>
<td>$3,478,788</td>
<td>$3,285,454</td>
<td>$193,334</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Recreation and Facilities</strong></td>
<td>$11,948,579</td>
<td>$11,732,029</td>
<td>$216,550</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena</td>
<td>$533,013</td>
<td>$533,013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Facilities</td>
<td>$793,084</td>
<td>$772,084</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$1,615,149</td>
<td>$1,605,139</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>$404,512</td>
<td>$404,512</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Recreation</td>
<td>$159,168</td>
<td>$159,168</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$790,569</td>
<td>$784,069</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL For Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Functions</strong></td>
<td>$4,295,485</td>
<td>$4,257,985</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Year 2014 Operating Budget Requests & Allocations\(^\text{13}\)**

In FY 2015, unfunded requests for Department of Public Services parks and open space functions totaled $121,000. The majority of these funds were requested for temporary help. The gap between what the Department of Recreation & Facilities requested for parks and recreation functions was almost $200,000. Over half was an unfunded request for golf course supplies. The remainder represents a mix of supplies, contractual services, and temporary help requests split across all parks and recreation serving Divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Division</th>
<th>Departmental Request</th>
<th>City Allocation (from Municipal Budget)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percent Unfunded</th>
<th>Percent of Dept. Budget</th>
<th>Percent of City General Fund Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Public Services</strong></td>
<td>$18,059,684</td>
<td>$16,916,779</td>
<td>$1,142,905</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>$604,192</td>
<td>$589,617</td>
<td>$14,575</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry &amp; Horticulture</td>
<td>$615,264</td>
<td>$590,514</td>
<td>$24,750</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districting</td>
<td>$2,054,427</td>
<td>$1,972,349</td>
<td>$82,080</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL For Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Functions</strong></td>
<td>$3,273,885</td>
<td>$3,152,480</td>
<td>$121,405</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Recreation and Facilities</strong></td>
<td>$11,384,183</td>
<td>$10,829,178</td>
<td>$555,005</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Arena</td>
<td>$518,567</td>
<td>$515,429</td>
<td>$3,138</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Facilities</td>
<td>$750,922</td>
<td>$737,172</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$1,580,026</td>
<td>$1,566,426</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>$399,007</td>
<td>$394,007</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Recreation</td>
<td>$160,313</td>
<td>$157,763</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$854,412</td>
<td>$694,527</td>
<td>$159,885</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL For Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Functions</strong></td>
<td>$4,263,247</td>
<td>$4,065,324</td>
<td>$197,923</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{11}\) In the Department of Public Services, the Divisions of Cemeteries, Forestry & Horticulture, and Districting are being defined as those primarily serving parks, open space, and recreation functions. In the Department of Recreation and Facilities, the Divisions of the Ice Arena, Athletic Facilities, Recreation, Aquatics, Therapeutic Recreation, and the Golf Course are being defined as those primarily serving parks, open space, and recreation functions.

\(^\text{12}\) From City of Portland Municipal Budget July 1, 2014– June 30, 2015.

\(^\text{13}\) From City of Portland Municipal Budget July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014.
Summer 2015 Portland Park Evaluation

Objective:
The Trust for Public Land created a rapid assessment tool to evaluate the public parks’ accessibility, active amenities, educational uses, supportive facilities, aesthetics, safety and maintenance conditions. The Summer 2015 Portland Park Evaluation is meant to provide a snapshot-in-time analysis to help assess comparative current park quality; provide a baseline for future evaluations; and inform decision-making regarding future investments.

The Trust for Public Land understands that park quality is not solely based upon these factors and that there are other elements that could be included in a comprehensive analysis (such as park design and/or surrounding land-use conditions), however due to resource constraints and our desire to provide a replicable and affordable tool, we developed and deployed this rapid park quality assessment tool to evaluate Portland’s parks.

Process:
A total of 61 parks were evaluated over five days in mid-June by three staff from The Trust for Public Land. Staff began with a three hour calibration session to assure consistent scoring between evaluators. The Trust for Public Land staff then met with two City of Portland staff to field review the tool with them. (Note: the tool had already been vetted with city staff and a subcommittee of the Portland Open Space Vision and Implementation Stakeholder Group, and it had been previously beta tested in the field).

Each park was evaluated for the following factors: accessibility; trails; park features; supportive facilities; safety and maintenance; and aesthetics. For parks that did not have certain features present (e.g. trail, active amenity, supportive facility, or other recreational and educational use), a N/A was denoted. All parks have the possibility of scoring a perfect score [5.0]. Additionally, while on site, the evaluators documented obvious (to the lay-person) location-specific deficiencies.

In tandem with the rapid assessment tool, evaluators also created an inventory of amenities (by amenity category) for each park and recorded the precise public access points for all 61 parks using GPS. This information is being integrated into Portland’s GIS system.

---

1 For purposes of this rapid park quality assessment, Portland city staff and Trust for Public Land staff defined a park as "any publicly owned open space in Portland that is intended to be used for passive or active recreation." Using this definition, city staff developed a list of parks for the park evaluation (See Appendix A). Trust for Public Land staff evaluated all of these parks for this evaluation except for 1 park on Peaks Island and 1 park on Cliff Island that they were not able to assess due to time constraints (denoted by asterisks).
Recommendations:

This section focuses on conveying overarching recommendations for city staff and other stakeholder consideration for improving the quality of Portland’s parks. There are some suggestions for individual parks that the evaluators noted during the field work, and those will be transmitted to city staff separately.

1) **Promote park character.** Although the majority of parks are in good condition, many lack individuality or character; and taken together, the park system therefor lacks diversity. We recommend creative place-making on an individual park basis. Besides improving the user experience, creative place making can greatly enhance the aesthetic value of the parks.

2) **Improve signage.** Consider using signage to create a brand identity for the Portland park system. Every park should have a branded “City of Portland Park” sign with the name of the park. Signage can also be useful to promote Portland’s history and legacy (i.e. signage for downtown plazas/squares, “Castle in the Park,” Bell Buoy Park, etc.) Signs can also help better promote Portland’s trail connectivity. There are currently several kiosks highlighting citywide trail connectivity; but additional maps/kiosks could be useful.

3) **Better maintain the basketball courts, baseball fields and soccer fields.** Among the athletic facilities, these seemed to be most in need of repair and improved maintenance.

4) **Re-paint crosswalks** in proximity to parks and open spaces.

5) **Better designate entrances and perimeters for community gardens** (i.e. flagstones or pavers leading to entrance gates, upgrade fences for gardens)

6) **Install more supportive facilities.**
   i. "No Butts About it" receptacles for cigarette butts, as the vast majority of litter in the parks is cigarette butts. (*Unless this is perceived as contradictory to the "Breathe Easy" signs posted at these public spaces.*)
   ii. Trash cans, and where trash cans are not present, have "pack in/pack out" signs
   iii. Bike racks for parks that don’t already have them
   iv. Water fountains at school playgrounds / athletic fields
   v. Where dogs are allowed [as shown by leash law signs, etc.] have dog waste bags available (e.g. cemeteries, natural areas, etc.)

7) **Address erosion of dirt trails in parks.** This should be a priority for maintenance staff or consider leveraging AmeriCorps trail crews to help with trail maintenance.
Results:

The value of the rapid park assessment tool is not so much in judging the overall park system, but rather in providing a comparative analysis for parks within the system. Accordingly, in the sections that follow we list the highest scoring parks and lowest scoring parks. In the first section (directly below) we provide the overall results. Then we list results by category.

### Overall Park Evaluation Score:
This is a cumulative weighted score of park access, trails, active amenities, other recreational, fitness, and educational uses, supportive facilities, safety and appearance concerns, and aesthetics.

#### Highest scored parks [all sites with scores 5.0 – 4.9]
- Back Cove Trail
- Boothby Square
- Mayor Baxter Woods
- Congress Square Park
- Longfellow Square
- Lobsterman Park
- Post Office Park
- Eastern Promenade

#### Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 3.6 – 4.0]
- Lincoln Park
- Longfellow Elementary school
- Riverton Trolley Park
- Martin Point Park
- Trinity Park
- Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
**Park Evaluation Score for Accessibility:**

*This category evaluates park entrances, safe and convenient access to entrances, transportation access, and accessibility to all park areas.*

 Highest scored parks [all sites with a score of 5.0]
- Back Cove Trail
- Boothby Square
- Mayor Baxter Woods
- Congress Square Park
- Longfellow Square
- Lobsterman Park
- Post Office Park
- Eastern Promenade
- Tommy’s Park
- Hall School
- Bayside Trail
- Riverton School
- Bell Buoy Park
- Bramhall Square
- Harbor View Memorial Park

 Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 3.0 – 4.0]
- Martin Point Park
- Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
- Riverton Trolley Park
- Belmade Park
- Stroudwater Park 1
- Quarry Run Dog Park
- Fox Field
- Pine Grove Park
**Park Evaluation Score for Trails:**

*This category evaluates paved trails or paths, in addition to dirt trails. Not all parks contained trails.*

**Highest scored parks [all sites with a score of 5.0]:**
- Back Cove Trail
- Mayor Baxter Woods
- Post Office Park
- Hall School
- Bayside Trail
- Riverton School
- Presumpscot School
- Ocean Avenue School
- Deering HS / Longfellow Elementary
- Deering High School / Longfellow – Presumpscot Park
- Capisic Pond Park
- University Park
- Tate-Tyng Tot Lot
- Payson Park
- Fort Sumner Park
- Munjoy Playground
- Caldwell Square
- Baxter Pines
- Nason’s Corner Park
- Pine Grove Park
- Quarry Run Dog Park

**Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 2.0 – 3.5]**
- Peppermint Park
- Lincoln Park
- Trinity Park
- Longfellow Elementary School
- Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
**Park Evaluation Score for Active Amenities:**

*This category evaluates sports fields & courts, and other active recreational structures. Not all parks contained active amenities.*

**Highest scored parks [all sites with scores 5.0 – 4.5]**
- Back Cove Trail
- Deering High School / Longfellow – Presumpscot Park
- Quarry Run Dog Park
- Peppermint Park
- Adams School Playground
- Heseltine Park
- Ocean Avenue School
- Deering Oaks Park
- Eastern Promenade
- Payson Park
- Tate-Tyng Tot Lot
- Munjoy Playground
- Lyseth / Lyman Moore School Grounds
- Bayside Playground

**Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 3.0 – 4.0]**
- Stroudwater Playground
- Riverton Trolley Park
- Longfellow Elementary School
- Nason’s Corner Park
- Riverton School
- Dougherty Field
Park Evaluation Score for Other Uses:
This category evaluates other recreational and educational uses. Not all parks contained other uses.

Highest scored parks [all sites with a score of 5.0]:
Deering High School / Longfellow – Presumpscot Park
Adams School Playground
Heseltine Park
Eastern Promenade
Payson Park
Lyseth / Lyman Moore School Grounds
Deering HS/ Longfellow Elementary
Western Promenade
Fox Field
Hall School
Clark Street Park
University Park
Fort Sumner Park
Caldwell Square
Baxter Pines
Pine Grove Park
Evergreen Cemetery
Conservation Area at Evergreen Cemetery
Longfellow Park
Fessenden Park
Bedford Park
Oat Nuts Park
Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
Boothby Square
Longfellow Square
Compass Park
Belmade Park

Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 1.0 – 3.7]:
Longfellow Elementary School
Martin Point Park
Lincoln Park
Harbor View Memorial Park
Reiche School
**Park Evaluation Score for Supportive Facilities:**

*This category evaluates supportive facilities such as permanent restrooms, sufficient number of trash cans, functioning drinking fountains, man-made shelters/natural shade, and benches.*

**Highest scored parks [all sites with a score of 5.0]:**
- Eastern Promenade
- Payson Park
- Western Promenade
- Mayor Baxter Woods
- Post Office Park
- Evergreen Cemetery
- Longfellow Park
- Oat Nuts Park
- Boothby Square
- Longfellow Square
- Compass Park
- Belmade Park
- Back Cove Trail
- Congress Square Park
- Deering Oaks Par
- Lobsterman Park
- Bell Buoy Park
- Quarry Run Dog Park
- Dougherty Field
- Capisic Pond Park
- Tommy’s Park
- Monument Square
- Reiche School
- Harbor View Memorial Park
- Martin Point Park
- Longfellow Elementary School
- Peppermint Park
- Tate-Tyng Tot Lot
- Bramhall Square

**Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 1.0 – 3.0]:**
- Canco Woods Natural Area
- Stroudwater Park 1
- Bedford Park
- Pine Grove Park
University Park
Deering High School / Longfellow – Presumpscot Park
Caldwell Square
Fort Sumner Park
Heseltine Park
Trinity Park
Stroudwater Playground
Riverton Trolley Park
Nason’s Corner Park
Ocean Avenue School
Stroudwater Park 2
East End School and Community Center
Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
Fessenden Park
Lyseth / Lyman Moore School Grounds
Adams School Playground
**Park Evaluation Score for Safety and Maintenance:**

This category evaluates park context/surrounding environment, maintenance concerns, inappropriate park use, park design, directional signage, and nighttime safety.

**Highest scored parks [all sites with a score of 5.0]**
- Longfellow Park
- Boothby Square
- Congress Square Park
- Lobsterman Park
- Fessenden Park
- Trinity Trail
- Back Cove Trail
- Belmade Park
- Deering HS/Longfellow Elementary
- Stroudwater Playground
- Caldwell Square
- Bedford Park
- Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial

**Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 3.8 – 4.4]**
- Harbor View Memorial Park
- Bayside Trail
- Compass Park
- Lincoln Park
- Martin Point Park
- Fox Field
- Bell Buoy Park
- Riverton Trolley Park
- Bramhall Square
- Fort Sumner Field
- Dougherty Field
Park Evaluation Score for Aesthetics:
This category evaluates aesthetics; including: diversity of use and activity, variety and presence of vegetation, variety and coordination in programmed environments, high quality materials, sense of style, effective mitigation of noise and surrounding land uses, and history and culture celebrated by park design.

Highest scored parks [all sites with scores 5.0 – 4.9]
- Oat Nuts Park
- Conservation Area at Evergreen Cemetery
- Presumpscot School
- Adams School Playground
- Heseltine Park
- University Park
- Pine Grove Park
- Eastern Promenade
- Congress Square Park
- Back Cove Trail
- Ocean Avenue School
- Mayor Baxter Woods
- Evergreen Cemetery
- Lobsterman Park
- Monument Square
- Longfellow Square
- Quarry Run Dog Park

Lowest scored parks [all sites with scores 3.4 – 4.3]
- Bramhall Square
- Fox Field
- Lincoln Park
- Longfellow Elementary School
- Riverton Trolley Park
- Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
- Trinity Park
- Bell Buoy Park
- Bedford Park
- Riverton School
- Martin Point Park
- Belmade Park
- Compass Park
- Tommy’s Park
Appendix A

A complete park list for the 2015 Portland Park Evaluation.

1. Adams School Playground
2. Back Cove Trail
3. Barrows Park / Baxter’s Sundial
4. Baxter Pines
5. Bayside Playground
6. Bayside Trail
7. Bedford Park
8. Bell Buoy Park
9. Belmade Park
10. Boothby Square
11. Bramhall Square
12. Caldwell Square
13. Canco Woods Natural Area
14. Capisic Pond Park
15. Clark Street Park
16. Compass Park
17. Congress Square Park
18. Conservation Area at Evergreen Cemetery
19. Deering High School / Longfellow - Presumpscot Park
20. Deering High School / Longfellow Elementary
21. Deering Oaks Park
22. Dougherty Field
23. East End School and Community Center
24. Eastern Promenade
25. Evergreen Cemetery
26. Fessenden Park
27. Fort Sumner Park
28. Fox Field
29. Hall School
30. Harbor View Memorial Park
31. Heseltine Park
32. Lincoln Park
33. Lobsterman Park
34. Longfellow Elementary School
35. Longfellow Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Park Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Longfellow Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Lyseth / Lyman Moore School Grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Martin Point Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Mayor Baxter Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Monument Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Munjoy Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Nason's Corner Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Oat Nuts Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Ocean Avenue School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Payson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Peppermint Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Pine Grove Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Post Office Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Presumpscot School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Quarry Run Dog Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Reiche School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Riverton School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Riverton Trolley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Stroudwater Park 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Stroudwater Park 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Stroudwater Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Tate-Tyng Tot Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Tommy’s Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Trinity Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Western Promenade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Ace Ballfield*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>City Acres Ballfield*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>