

**CITY OF DURHAM, OREGON  
PARK AND RECREATION PLAN  
2005 to 2011**

The following groups were actively involved in the development of this plan. Their time and effort in helping bring this plan to completion deserves recognition.

**DURHAM PARK AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE:**

Lisa Butz  
Michele Churchill  
Bill Kaltenthaler  
Tom Love  
Paul Schwarz  
Linda Tate

**DURHAM PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Robert Plame  
Bill Gilham  
Lynn Schroder  
Mary Taylor  
Chuck Van Meter  
Tom Kyle  
Theresa Eisenberg  
Patricia Saab  
Lori Sundstrom

**Table of Contents:**

- 1. HISTORY**
- 2. LOCATION AND PHYSICAL SETTING**
- 3. CLASSIFICATION AND PARK TYPES**
- 4. PARK INVENTORY**
  - A. Durham City Park**
    - 1. Parking**
    - 2. Trails**
    - 3. Nature Areas**
    - 4. Children's Play Area**
    - 5. Picnic Area**
    - 6. Open Space**
  - B. Heron Grove Park**
  - C. Tualatin View Green Space**
- 5. ADJACENT PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES**
- 6. DEMOGRAPHICS**
  - A. Housing and Population**
  - B. Age Distribution**
  - C. Economics**
  - D. Conclusion**
- 7. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**
  - A. Park and Recreation Committee**

- B. Community Survey
- C. Community Meeting
- D. Public Hearing
- 8. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
- 9. FIVE YEAR PLAN
- 10. POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES
- 11. APPENDIX
  - A. Survey Results
  - B. Aerial Photo of Durham
  - C. Map of City Parks Areas
  - D. Park Features Map
  - E. Topographical Map
  - F. Park Photos

## 1. HISTORY

The City is named for Alonzo Durham who operated saw and flour mills on Fanno Creek from 1866-1898. The actual incorporated area consists of 265 acres, the majority of which was the site of the Pilkington Nursery in the early 1900's and that planted many of the big trees that are still growing in the City. Incorporation occurred in 1966 with a population of 250 and with the express purpose of maintaining the natural environment to the greatest extent possible against the encroachment of urban development. In 1975 Durham passed its first tree ordinance prohibiting the cutting of trees on both public and private property and setting forth the following statement of principal:

Originally the area now constituting the City of Durham was forested with fir, pine, cedar, maple and other native trees. Early settlers planted many other interesting specimens that have grown into sizable, attractive trees that enhance the beauty and contribute to the individuality of the City and its environs. The City of Durham is now benefited by a large number of trees both natural growth and planted and grown throughout the years. The maintenance of trees and wooded areas in the City of Durham adds to the scenic beauty of the City. The preservation of trees also tends to preserve the ecology of the City and to retain a livable environment through the filtering effect of trees on air pollution and through the providing of noise barriers. Much of the property within the City is on hillsides and slopping terrain. The uncontrolled cutting or destruction of trees and wooded areas will increase erosion of topsoil, will create flood hazards and the risk of landslides, will reduce windbreaks and shaded areas, will reduce property values through the encouragement of substandard development, and will result in the destruction of aesthetic qualities. The Council of the City of Durham therefore finds it in the public interest and safety to enact regulations controlling the removal of trees within the City in order to retain as many trees as possible consistent with the economic enjoyment of private property.

Maintenance of greenways and treed park areas has been a major focus of city government from the beginning of incorporation and new areas have continued to be added over time as the opportunity has arisen. Durham has developed as a predominantly residential community with no retail and a relatively small area devoted to offices and office parks.

## 2. LOCATION AND PHYSICAL SETTING

Durham is located in Washington County and is part of the greater Portland metropolitan area. It is contiguous to the city limits of Tualatin on the south and east and to Tigard on the north and west. Geologically it is located in the lower Tualatin Valley with an elevation range of from 100' to 200'. Vegetation is one of the primary elements of the natural landscape. A variety of vegetation types characterize the landscape. Both coniferous and deciduous trees are located in the upland areas. The northwestern portion of the City has an abundance of ornamental vegetation left over from the

abandoned Pilkington Nursery. These ornamental bushes and shrubs provide Durham with a wide range of vegetation and give Durham an unusual natural asset.

Two major waterways exist within Durham. The Tualatin River originates on the eastern slope of the coast range at 3400' elevation and runs along the southern city limits of Durham separating Durham from Tualatin. Fanno Creek flows in a well-defined channel that runs in a southerly direction through Tigard and Durham City Park, emptying into the Tualatin River on Durham's southern border.

### 3. CLASSIFICATION AND PARK TYPES

#### A. Classifications

The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) recommends that all parks be classified as either active or passive.

**Active uses:** include, but are not limited to baseball, basketball, soccer, volleyball, biking, tennis and skateboarding.

**Passive uses:** include, but are not limited to, sunbathing, bird watching, walking and reading a book.

#### B. Park Types

##### 1. Mini-Parks

Purpose – To supply a small scale park and recreation space for serving the recreational needs of new residential developments.

Size:	Minimum 2,500 square feet
Service Area:	Proposed development
Location:	Within projects having a minimum of 15 and less than 30 housing units.
Facilities & Activities	Children's play equipment, hard surface for wheeled toys, sand area, benches and tables, trash receptacles, and/or similar types of activities
Public Access:	Determined through development review process
Ownership & Maintenance:	Public or private

##### 2. Neighborhood Parks

Purpose – To provide the neighborhood area with a center for passive and active recreation.

Size:	Minimum ½ acre
Service Area:	Neighborhood areas
Location:	Within projects having 30 or more housing units
Facilities & Activities	Active play areas, children's play equipment, picnic areas, drinking fountains, trash receptacles, and/or similar types of activities
Public Access:	Yes
Ownership & Maintenance:	Public

##### 3. Community Parks

Purpose – To provide facilities which serve the community at large.

Size:	Multiple acres
Service Area:	Community wide
Location:	Fanno Creek and Tualatin River Greenway

Facilities & Activities                      Ball Fields, Tennis courts, multi-use paved areas (for basketball, volleyball, etc.) picnic areas with cooking facilities, open play areas, trails, restrooms, irrigation, trash receptacles, fencing, lighting, parking

Public Access:                                      Yes

Ownership &

Maintenance:                                      Public

4. Pedways/Bikeways

Purpose – To interconnect other elements of the park system, schools, and other public places. To provide for conservation of scenic and natural areas, especially water courses and areas subject to flooding. To provide buffer areas along thoroughfares or between conflicting land uses.

Size:    N/A

Service Area:                                      Community wide

Location:    Bordering waterways and areas subject to flooding along transportation and utility corridors

Facilities & Activities                      Scenic ways shall provide trails, walkways and trash receptacles. The land shall be retained primarily in its natural condition along waterways and other areas of natural value. In areas already developed, additional landscaping and rest areas should be provided

Public Access:                                      Yes

Ownership &

Maintenance:                                      Public

**4. PARK, OPEN SPACE AND GREENWAY INVENTORY**

The following inventory describes the park, trail and open space assets of the City, how they developed, and sets the stage for a discussion of how they may be improved, changed or expanded upon to meet the current and future needs of the community. The existing inventory is as follows:

	<u>Acres</u>
<b>Durham City Park</b>	
City Park	20.85
Afton Commons I/II	3.10
Afton Commons III	2.73
Schirado Donation	17.98
Heron Grove Recreation Area A	<u>1.07</u>
Subtotal	45.73
<b>Heron Grove Park</b>	
Recreation area B	<u>.41</u>
Subtotal	.41
<b>Tualatin View</b>	<u>4.22</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>50.36</b>

**A. Durham City Park**

**1. Background**

Durham City Park, though not offering all of the listed facilities and activities set forth in NRPA standards, would be classified as a Community Park. The Park has evolved over time through

various donations of property made in response to the city's policy of requiring dedications of property for park purposes in conjunction with residential subdivision approval. Improvements and maintenance have been funded by the City's General Fund, Grants, and Park System Development charges.

The original 20.85 acres of Durham City Park were deeded to the City in 1977 as a condition of approval of the Kingsgate Subdivision. The site is bounded on the east by the Kingsgate subdivision at an elevation of 168' at the driveway entry and slopes westward to abut the Portland Western Railroad track at 110' elevation. The southern boundary is both the city limits and the Tualatin River. As part of the agreement with the developer of Kingsgate a paved driveway access and twenty car parking lot were provided on the upland side of the site. A gravel path was extended from the parking area to Fanno Creek to match up to the existing bridge. On the west side of Fanno Creek the developer graded the site to drain to Fanno Creek, cleared the brush in the flood plain, planted grass and laid out a combination baseball diamond with backstop and soccer field with removable goals. The ballfield area is no longer in use and the goals and backstop have been removed. Most of the site acreage was left in its natural state.

In approximately 1982, with the approval of the Afton Commons Subdivision, two additional parcels of property on the west side of the subdivision were added to Durham's park inventory. The two parcels totaling 5.83 acres consists of densely wooded green way abutting the west side of Afton Commons and dropping rapidly to the eastern bank of Fanno Creek.

In 1993 an additional 17.9 acres was added through the Schirado-Nelson donation. This property is located to the west of Fanno Creek and north of the original park property acquired with the Kingsgate subdivision. Most of the property is within the flood plain to the south and west and rises on the north end to a densely wooded area adjacent to Fanno Creek. The donation effectively tied the Kingsgate donation and the Afton Commons donation together to provide a total of 44.66 contiguous acres.

In the late 1990's an additional 1.07 acres of green space was added with the development of Heron Grove Subdivision. This property is located east of Fanno Creek toward the southern end of the park nearest the confluence with the Tualatin River.

Only minimal development of the park property has occurred over the years, with much of the property being in the flood plain and the balance heavily wooded. The area nearest the parking lot at the higher elevation has been developed with two children's play areas, one installed in the early 1980's with swings, slides, and a play structure, and the second installed just to the east of the original in the mid 1990's with newer but similar play equipment. Some thinning of trees has occurred both to provide better visibility and to remove those considered to be dangerous. A picnic shelter was installed in 1982 with state and federal grant funds and with a local match consisting primarily of citizen labor. The original bridge over Fanno Creek was replaced when the original washed out in the flood of 1996. The original gravel path has been paved with asphalt and additional paved trail areas have been provided. The most recent of these is the Fanno Creek Loop Trail located on the Schirado-Nelson donation. This was installed by Clean Water Services as part of an agreement with the City allowing the use of park property for a new sewer outfall to Fanno Creek. The trail winds into the upland area to the north of the park through a heavily wooded terrain and provides excellent views of Fanno Creek.

Given that most of the park is in the flood plain and heavily wooded it has provided an excellent opportunity to those visiting to walk and enjoy the natural habitat and its wide variety of flora and fauna.

## **2. Service Area**

When Durham Park property was initially dedicated to the City in conjunction with the building of the Kingsgate subdivision it was looked upon primarily as a neighborhood park. Over time as more property was added it came to be conceived more as a community park serving the residents of Durham. Its proximity to Cook Park and Tualatin Park and its link to the Fanno Creek Trail place it squarely in the center of a more area wide park system. However, lacking many of the amenities of developed parks and limited parking Durham Park will likely continue to be a community park. Durham Park serves as a link between Cook and Tualatin parks but by itself it is not a destination for non-Durham residents.

### **B. Heron Grove**

With the development of the Heron Grove Subdivision .41 acres was dedicated to the City for park property. This property would be described as a mini-park for the use of the immediate neighborhood and is located on the east end of the subdivision nearest Upper Boones Ferry Road and Rivendell Drive. Other than a paved walking path through the property and the planting of a couple of trees, this property has remained little more than an empty lot.

### **C. Tualatin View Greenspace**

The Tualatin View Greenspace was dedicated to the City by the developers of the Tualatin View Apartments. A dirt path is maintained through the area providing a southerly view of the Tualatin River. It is intended that the property remain in a natural state without additional amenities.

## **5. ADJACENT PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES**

### **A. Tualatin Community Park**

Tualatin Community Park is a 27.11 acre active park located to the south of Durham City Park, separated only by the Tualatin River. A joint project between Tigard, Tualatin and Durham and funded in large part by ODOT is currently being engineered to provide a pedestrian bridge that would connect the two parks. Construction is anticipated to begin early in 2006.

Located at Tualatin Park are three sports fields, tennis and basketball courts, a playground, skate-park of both skate-boarding and in-line skating, and four picnic shelters. A boat ramp allows access to the Tualatin River.

The Tualatin/Durham Senior Center is located in Tualatin Park providing social, nutritional, recreational, and educational activities to adults over 60 years of age.

### **B. Cook Park**

Cook Park is a 79 acre park located along the Tualatin River just west of Durham City Park. The park is the property of the City of Tigard. In conjunction with the joint pedestrian bridge project, Cook Park will be linked to Durham City Park by a paved walking and biking path. Numerous courts and fields are available for baseball, basketball, volleyball, softball and soccer. It also offers opportunities for more passive activities with horseshoe pits, fishing dock, small boat ramp, playground and several walking trails. Within the Park there are five picnic shelters including barbecue pits and picnic tables.

Several events occur at the Park on an annual basis including the Tigard Festival of Balloons which attracts several thousand visitors.

### **C. Other Public and Private Recreational Facilities**

Within a short distance from the City of Durham there exist a number of facilities providing both indoor and outdoor recreational opportunities.

## **6. DEMOGRAPHICS**

### **A. Housing and Population**

The analysis of local population and demographic trends is important for a broad understanding of the community and the preferences of its citizens for park, open space, and recreational opportunities.

According to the 2000 U.S. census, Durham's population was 1382. Total housing units in Durham totaled 552. Of the total housing units, 222 were located in apartment complexes. Approximately 90% of all dwelling units located within the city are less than 30 years old. Three hundred and two dwelling units, constituting 92% of the single-family residential units, were owner-occupied. The median value of owner occupied housing units was \$248,300 compared to \$188,600 and \$197,700 for the surrounding communities of Tigard and Tualatin respectively.

### **B. Age Distribution**

Within the total population 370 individuals were identified as being under the age of 15. This is approximately 23% of the population. Eighty-two individuals were identified as being over the age of 65 years. The median age of the community was established at 34.4 years with there being only slightly more females than males.

### **C. Economics**

Per capita income for Durham is listed as \$29,099 in contrast to \$25,110 for Tigard and \$26,694 for Tualatin. This contrast becomes even more pronounced when taken in context. Approximately 29% of Durham's population is housed in subsidized housing. Consequently per capita income for the single-family residential portion of the population would have to be considerably higher than the city wide average of \$29,099.

### **D. Conclusions**

As noted earlier, Durham is located in the greater Portland metropolitan area and is totally surrounded by the cities of Tigard and Tualatin. Consequently, there is little chance for additional buildable land to be annexed into the City. Since most of the land lying within the city limits is already occupied by dwellings, with only about 40 acres of residentially zoned property available for building, the population and number of housing units should remain fairly stable well into the future. On the downside this means there will be very little opportunity for the acquisition of additional park property in the future. It also means that the traditional means of acquiring funds for capital park improvements, system development charges imposed on new development, will continue to dwindle and the City will have to rely on its already limited general revenue stream and potential grants. The main consideration into the future in terms of parks and recreation will be the changing character of the population and how changing needs are addressed with a limited revenue stream.

The higher average for home ownership generally signals a more stable population with a vested interest in the community and not prone to frequent residence changes. However, it also means that with little housing turnover the average age of the population will continue to rise and there will be fewer park and recreation needs for the younger segment of the community.

Presently, the Durham population has a higher percentage of school age children and fewer elderly in the population than on average. The majority of the population is composed of adults between 21 years of age and pre-retirement with above average income levels. This segment of the community will likely seek out recreation and play opportunities for children as well as opportunities for picnics walking, jogging, bicycling, running and more general enjoyment of park amenities associated with a natural setting. There may also be a substantial interest in organized young people's sports activities such as soccer and baseball or recreational activities such as Easter egg hunts, summer day camps,

and group outdoor learning activities. This plan will need to address how access is provided to such a myriad of activities given the City's limited park space as well as funding.

Acknowledging that Durham's per capita income is noticeably higher than that of the surrounding communities, the potential exists for residents to seek out private sector opportunities for outdoor activities such as golf, tennis and other organized sports. Recreational opportunities for younger people in the family might be attained through enrollment in privately offered programs.

## **7. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**

To better understand the park and recreation needs and wishes of the community, in addition to what might be inferred from the demographics, the City embarked on a plan for soliciting public input.

### **A. Park and Recreation Committee**

It was recognized from the beginning that public involvement was both necessary and desirable. A Park and Recreation Advisory Committee to work with the Planning Commission and City staff in devising a Comprehensive Park Plan was solicited through the Durham Newsletter in January of 2005. The Committee met on March 15, 2005 with the City Administrator for the purpose of compiling a community survey. The survey was then distributed to all households within Durham with the Durham Newsletter. It was also made available on the City website. Ninety-four total responses were received with twenty-three of those being submitted via the internet. The Advisory Committee met again on June 7, 2005 to discuss the survey results and make recommendations to City staff for incorporation of the results into the planning activity.

### **B. Community Survey**

The survey solicited information on the use of the adjacent Cook and Tualatin parks as well as the frequency of use of Durham Park and how it was most often used. In addition, it sought information on how each of the functional areas of the parks was used and what improvements the citizens would like to see. Lastly, it gathered information on the basic demographics regarding age ranges of household members along with length of residence in Durham and section of the City within which the respondent resided. Additional area was left on the survey for the respondent to provide general comments.

#### **1. Survey Overview**

The vast majority of those responding indicated they frequented Durham Park and were in general agreement that Durham Park should continue in a mostly undeveloped state, providing opportunities for getting outdoors, walking, biking, observing nature and taking children to the small play areas. A significant number of those responding thought trail connectivity between Durham neighborhoods and Durham Park was desirable. Many of the respondents indicated that they currently utilize Tualatin Community Park and Cook Park for active recreation and were looking forward to the connecting pedestrian bridge as a means to reach those destinations. A trail system that would provide easy access from the neighborhoods to Durham Park would facilitate being able to use the new pedestrian bridge. There was a consensus by the majority that better maintenance of the existing facility was of greater importance than additional capital improvements. Those improvements that were noted as desirable were those that would require low maintenance and would be an enhancement to existing uses rather than expanded uses.

Even though most were in favor of the pending connections to Cook Park and Tualatin Community Park they still viewed Durham Park as a neighborhood park serving the residential neighborhoods of Durham. Almost half of the respondents were in favor of some annual community event being held at Durham Park. The older respondents expressed a concern for safety given the somewhat isolated location of the Park and the dense foliage bordering some of the walking paths.

### **C. Community Meeting**

A community meeting was held on the evening of September 19, 2005 for the purpose of taking additional comments from the public and providing clarification of issues. Notice of the meeting was hand delivered to each residence in Durham a week ahead of the meeting date. Residents were informed in the notice that written comments would also be accepted and that the Draft Park Comprehensive Plan had been posted to the City website for review. Those desiring a hard copy of the Plan could obtain one at City Hall.

## 8. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The National Park and Recreation Association has developed a set of standards to be used as the baseline adequacy of park and recreation facilities in a community. The standards are generally expressed as so many miles of trail per 1000 population or so many acres of neighborhood park per 1000 people. However such standards should only be used as guidelines. The Standards, were first shaped in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and designed for communities that bear little resemblance to today's communities. Though modified over time they have not kept pace with societal changes. Changing demographics, work and commute patterns, technology, and public values have together fostered changes in recreational interests. National standards do not account for differences in topography, climate, regional preferences, or community age characteristics. All communities are different and have different needs and demands for parks, trails and open space facilities that vary with the demographic makeup of the community, as well as with local attitudes.

Certain planning criteria need to be met if park and recreational standards are to serve the needs of the community.

- A. The standards should be relevant to needs and lifestyles of today.
- B. They should be flexible enough to allow for change over time.
- C. They should reflect the preferences of the population being served.
- D. They need to be attainable both from a practical and financial standpoint.

The following goals and objectives are a direct result of information obtained through the community survey combined with general conclusions to be drawn from area demographics and an understanding of the financial constraints of the City.

- A. The primary goal of the City of Durham shall be to enhance and maintain a well-kept, attractive and safe neighborhood recreational area for the residents of Durham..
- B. Continuing emphasis will be placed on protecting and preserving environmentally sensitive areas for the passive enjoyment of park visitors.
- C. Maintain and protect open space areas that provide habitat for fish and wildlife while encouraging public use for flora and fauna observation and interpretation.
- D. Continue the policy of requiring dedication of sensitive area property adjacent to Durham Park when parcels are subdivided for the purpose of gaining stewardship of those properties and allowing for the interconnection of trails throughout the park with the residential areas of the City.
- E. Promote those improvements that emphasize the passive nature of both Durham Park and the Tualatin greenspace.
- F. Work cooperatively with the neighboring cities of Tigard and Tualatin to provide Durham's citizens with active recreational opportunities.
- G. Develop partnerships with other public agencies and the private sector to provide social and cultural recreational opportunities.
- H. Understand and plan for future needs and trends in recreation by:
  - 1. Monitoring changes in Durham demographics and desires.
  - 2. Assessing the changes in recreation and leisure trends influencing participation.
  - 3. Seeking regional solutions to assist with meeting Durham's recreation needs.

- I. Minimize the cost impact of park operations and capital improvements by seeking out grants and donations and relying on volunteer help.

## 9. FIVE YEAR PLAN

### A. Implementation

For Durham the amount of funds needed to provide capital improvements must necessarily be balanced against the city's need to provide on-going maintenance of the existing and planned park facilities. Items identified in the proposed Capital Improvement Plan have therefore been prioritized based on the expressed interest by the community as well as the likelihood that funding would become available and the City's ability to provide on-going maintenance of new improvements. The Capital Improvement Plan is a general timetable for accomplishing the planned improvements. Much will depend on when funding becomes available. This could be either earlier or later than the Plan currently contemplates. Also the City will need to continue to monitor the changing demographics, desires and needs of the community to insure that projects planned for later years continue to be of importance as the timing for the improvement is nearer. Additionally, new opportunities may arise and should not be ignored because they do not appear in the Capital Improvement Plan.

### B. Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

The following CIP elements are identified as belonging to one of seven broad task categories and reflect the preferences of the majority of respondents to the community survey.

Task 1 Environmental: A significant number of the survey respondents placed significant emphasis on the environmental elements of Durham Park. There was a general recognition that Durham Park is and should remain for the most part in its natural state. Many of the park users responded that they utilize the park just to get outside, walk, enjoy the open space and bird watch. The removal of non-native vegetation and restoring the appropriate riparian and hydraulic function of Fanno Creek ranked high with the survey participants.

Task 2 Trail Connectivity: Trail connectivity ranked very high among the respondents. Many currently use the offerings of Cook Park and Tualatin Community Park. They indicated that they were looking forward to the completion of the pedestrian bridge over the river. The interconnecting trail system will provide easier access to the forthcoming bridge site for both Afton Commons and Heron Grove subdivisions and facilitate resident's ability to utilize adjacent facilities that provide recreational opportunities that Durham cannot provide. A few expressed opposition to connectivity for fear it would lead to undesirable foot traffic through the residential areas.

Task 3 Picnic Area Improvements: Very few of the respondents indicated they utilized the picnic area or the picnic shelter. The primary reason appears to be lack of water and possibly power to the site and no restroom facilities anywhere in the park. Many also recognized, however, that restroom facilities in particular would easily become targets for vandalism. Restrooms also require on-going maintenance and the City has no maintenance staff. While Durham Park is used extensively year-round, the use of the picnic area would likely see the most intensive use during the period from the middle of May to the middle of September. Water and power could be provided with the control mechanisms located in a locked box and accessible only to those obtaining the key from City Hall. Restroom facilities can be provided on a seasonal basis by contracting for a portable facility that could be secured on a concrete pad.

Task 4 Play Area Improvements: Parents and grandparents, according to the survey, often take younger children to the park to use the existing play structures. By far, the majority felt that maintenance of what was already there should be the primary objective. The play equipment does have a long, but limited, life. Certain pieces will periodically have to be replaced as they weather and deteriorate.

Task 5 Heron Grove Park Improvements: Few respondents to the survey indicated that they ever use or would use the small Heron Grove Park. At most those indicating an interest

thought upkeep, minor plantings and possibly the location of a bench or two should be the extent of the improvements.

Task 6 Playfield Improvements: The area commonly known as the ballfield, in recognition of its original usage, is more appropriately referred to as the playfield. This section of the park is one of the most intensely used even by non-Durham residents. The overwhelming expression of the survey participants was to continue it as it is, with the possibility of placing a couple of benches around the perimeter.

Task 7 Additional Trail Element (Gazebo): Support was expressed for the placement of a gazebo near the touch down point of the planned pedestrian bridge. All indications are the bridge when once completed will find extensive use. The gazebo would provide a stopping point for those using the system of trails that will then exist.

**FY2005-2007 {Total \$ Requirement: \$7,500}**

1. Task 1a. Perform an environmental assessment to identify non-native vegetation as well as botanical features that should be maintained and preserved in Durham City Park.
2. Task 1e. Conduct a survey of Fanno Creek to identify potential actions necessary to restore proper stream function.
3. Task 2a. Initiate preliminary planning for connectivity of Heron Grove to park trail system via a new bridge across Fanno Creek.
4. Task 3a. Locate and pour a concrete slab for the placement of a seasonal toilet facility at Durham Park.
5. Task 4a. Remove sight obstructions between upper and lower play area, grade and plant with grass.
6. Task 5a. Prepare a landscape design and complete implementation at Heron Grove Park.
7. Task 5b. Placement of one or two benches at Heron Grove Park.

**FY2007-2008 {Total \$ Requirement: \$41,000}**

1. Task 1b. Contract for or organize volunteers to begin removal of non-native vegetation from Durham Park.
2. Task 2b. Formalize engineering design for new Fanno Creek bridge. Begin seeking funding.
3. Task 7a. Explore design options for gazebo to be located near touchdown point of Tualatin River pedestrian bridge.
4. Task 3b. Locate a drinking fountain in picnic area east of children's play area.

**FY2008-2009 {Total \$ Requirement: \$26,000}**

1. Task 7b. Contract for and complete construction of gazebo.
2. Task 2b. Continue seeking funding for Fanno Creek bridge.
3. Task 1c. Develop a replacement tree plan for Durham Park.
4. Task 6a. Add one or more benches at ball field area (dog off-leash area)
5. Task 3c. Install water and power to picnic area
6. Task 1d. Locate interpretative and educational signage where appropriate.

**FY2009-2010 {Total \$ Requirement: \$501,000}**

1. Task 2c. Construction of path and bridge connecting park trail system to Heron Grove.
2. Task 2d. Design of future connecting trail between Afton Commons and Durham Park

**FY2010-2011 {Total \$ Requirement: \$2,500}**

1. Task 4b. Replace swing set in lower play area and possibly add one additional piece of play equipment.

Environmental	Funding Source	2005-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Task 1a	Volunteer	\$0				
Task 1b	Volunteer		\$0			
Task 1c	Volunteer			\$0		
Task 1d	Volunteer			\$0		
Task 1e	Volunteer	\$0				
subtotal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Trails						
Task 2a	Staff	\$0				
Task 2b	Grant		\$40,000			
Task 2c	Grant				\$500,000	
Task 2d	General Fund				\$1,000.00	
subtotal		\$0	\$40,000	\$0	\$501,000	\$0
Picnic Area						
Task 3a	General Fund	\$1,000				
Task 3b	General Fund		\$1,000			
Task 3c	Grant			\$10,000		
subtotal		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0
Play Area						
Task 4a	General Fund	\$1,000				
Task 4b	General Fund					\$2,500
subtotal		\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$2,500
Heron Grove						
Task 5a	General Fund	\$5,000				
Task 5b	General Fund	\$500				
subtotal		\$5,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Off-Leash						
Task 6a	Donations			\$1,000		
subtotal		\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0
Gazebo						
Task 7a	Staff		\$0			
Task 7b	Grant			\$15,000		
subtotal		\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0
Total		\$7,500	\$41,000	\$26,000	\$501,000	\$2,500

## 10. POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

- A. City General Fund
- B. City Street Fund: Funds can be used for providing bikeways and paths.
- C. System Development Charges
- D. General Obligation Bonds
- E. HUD Block Grants
- F. Local Government Grant Program: Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) administers this program. They support development projects for local parks. Small grants that do not exceed \$50,000 total cost and large grants that exceed \$50,000 with a maximum of \$250,000 are available through this program.
- G. SAFETEA-Lu Transportation Enhancement Funds: This funding source supports the development of bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- H. Conservation Fund American Greenways Program: The American Greenways Dupont Awards Program is administered by The Conservation Fund and provides small grants to local greenway projects.
- I. Land and Water Conservation Fund: This program is administered by the National Parks Service and the Department of Interior. It assists communities in providing outdoor recreation and open spaces.
- J. Urban Forestry Grants: There are several funding grant programs that provide money for urban forestry projects. One is funded by the U.S. Small Business Administration and provides grants to purchase and plant trees.
- K. Department of Environmental Quality 319H grants: These are directed toward watershed quality enhancement.

- L. Oregon Watershed Enhancement Program: Grants are for up to \$10,000 with a 25% match.
- M. Sponsorships/Partnerships/Donations: The City should encourage civic responsibility and stewardship. Public, private and not-for-profit organizations may be willing to join with the City in providing enhanced recreational facilities.
- N. New funding sources sometimes become available, often as one time opportunities, and the City should continually be on the lookout for such sources to evaluate whether or not they match the needs of Durham's parks.

**11. APPENDIX**

- A. Survey Results**
- B. Aerial Photo of Durham**
- C. Map of City Parks Areas**
- D. Park Features Map**
- E. Topographical Map**
- F. Park Photos**