ECHO PARK SKATE PARK

LVNOC Meeting #1

Echo Park Main Recreation Building – Conference Room

Thursday, October 8, 2015 – 6:00 PM

AGENDA

2. Proposition K’s scope of work – Richard Campbell
3. Project Construction Budget - $350,000 – Richard Campbell
4. Election of the LVNOC Chairperson
5. Design discussion – led by the Chairperson, with help from the Architect – Mark Schoeman and Skate Park Designer, Brian Moore. Participation by all persons at the meeting, including the LVNOC, City personnel, and the public.
6. The LVNOC votes on which design to move forward on.

Minutes to be taken by HMC Architects
Meeting Notes

Meeting # 03  Date  2015-10-08

Present
- David Godshall, LVNOC Committee member
- Ramon Alvarez, LVNOC Committee member
- Anthea Raymond, LVNOC Committee member
- Amaury Hernandez, LVNOC Committee member
- Valentino Quijada, LVNOC Committee member
- Richard Campbell, LA City, Building and Engineering
- Brian Moore, Site Design Group
- Mark Schoeman, HMC Architects, Architect
- Lina Chan, HMC Architects, Designer
- Adam Bass, Council

Project Name  Echo Park Skate Park

Project #  2373003000

Items Discussed
- LVNOC Meeting #1

New Business

#    Action by / Info    Topic (action in italics)

3.1  

3.1.1 Info  Introductions
Richard Campbell introduced the project and budget from Prop K = $350,000.

3.1.2 Info  All in attendance introduced themselves: LVNOC Committee members, business
owners, neighbors, Echo Park Rec. Volunteers, Residents, Skate Boarders (all ages
from 3/4yrs – 50+yrs)

- See attendance list

3.1.3 Info  Member of LVNOC Committee selected chairperson to maintain order during
meeting (Anthea Raymond)

3.2  

3.2.1 Info  Powerpoint Presentation
Brian introduces the work / experience he has completed in the U.S.

- Transition Type Skate Parks – Bowls/Arcs/Tangents/ Radius
- Ex.1 – Pearl Skate Park: mix of transition with little street elements
- Ex. 2 – Hollywood: ½ bowls, ½ plaza, with fenced pathway surround for viewing.
- Ex. 3 – Etnies: Covered bowls with colored concrete
- Ex. 4 – Glendale: 14,000 sf
- Ex. 5 – Tinnel Memorial – art integrated as functional element to skate park.

3.2.2 Info
Our site is about +/-5000 sf.

3.3 Site Elements
3.3.1 Info
Mark introduces the sites context and desired design elements to be acknowledged and included:
- Open entry
- Regional presence/landmark

3.4 Open the Floor for Q/A session
3.4.1 LA City / Info
- Young skate boarder commented that he wants a place to skate that isn’t a parking lot. He does not like getting kicked out.
- Julio asked if the area to the south of the building will be used.
- Mikey asked if the area behind the building could be used for future expansion.
- Mark Lox stated he wants a functional, not artisty skate park. Since there is limited space, he would like to see bowls because he is a transition skater.
- Julio/Mikey stated that Mikey’s skate shop (Die Krusin) has wooden ramps that can be donated to get skate elements in place now and give skaters a place to skate in the meantime.
- Adam Bass, Council, responds by saying accepting donated ramps would become an issue of liability for the City. In addition, the usage of the area behind the building needs to be accessed such that if it were to develop as part of the skate park (in the future), the needs/usage of the building would not be compromised.
- Mikey thought it would help the rec center to utilize that area behind the building and open up the tunnel below the stairs to access under the 101 and over to the baseball fields can occur.
- Adam Bass, Council, mentioned that the tunnels have recently been cleaned.
- Julio asked if the concession stand could stay so there could be a place to sell water/snacks
- Victor mentioned shade would be nice – look at Santa Clarita.
- Dave asked if the using the area behind the building is budgeted? Sophia (super at Echo Park) replied that there is no funding for the area in the back, only $350,000 in funding is available to develop the pool site.
- Courtney stated that most skaters in Echo Park are “street skaters.” Therefore they want a skate park with street features, and a small transition. Look at Cherry Park as an example.
- Anthea asked for a show of hands, how many would like a “street” skate park? +/-90% raised their hands.
- Vrazil summarized that if there are street elements that can be donated and used, then street should be a large part of the design. Transition is important, but street obstacles are available at no cost.
- Brian responded that this site is very tight and street skate needs adequate space requirements for set up, trick, and landing. Lots of space is required and this site is limited.
- Garvanza Skate Park should be looked at as it has both street and transition elements.
- Brian said that one design option to be explored will look at using multi-elements.
- Alby noted that if space is limited, then street skate elements can be incorporated in the deck/viewing area.
- Garvanza was brought up again stating it is a great park, but there are elements that are at two extremes – very basic to very advanced. If a pool is to be incorporated at Echo Park, it needs to be easy – rolling with easy flow – not a “gnarly” pool.
- Mark L. mentioned that a pool should not be 14ft deep, only pro’s use these. We want a transition with a safer bowl option for regular skaters.
- Short vs. Long term goals (funding)
- Brian summarized that there needs to be a balance between street vs. bowls.
- Jeffery would like to see an oval shape with two “sets” (stairs?) that will allow for a change of elevation around a curve.

### 3.5 Possible Timeline of Project/Construction

3.5.1 Info
Richard, Mark S., and Brian briefly discussed the timeline required to design, approve, bid/award (4-5 months), construct (4-6 months) this project. An estimated timeline of 18 months may be possible.

### 3.6 Area behind building, option?

3.6.1 LA City/Info
Richard concluded that he will investigate whether or not the area to the south of the building can be used (future phase?). He will determine if it is feasible (now/future)? He will contact Mikey Barriga/Julio Douglas regarding the possibility of donating skate ramps.

### 3.7 ADA Requirements

3.7.1 Info
Mark S. mentioned that the site will be ADA accessible. Meeting this requirement is a necessary component of design and has a cost implication.

### 3.8 Budget – Design/Construction Cost

3.8.1 Info
Brian made it clear that the budget of $350,000 available will only cover design and construction of the skate park. Additional funding is needed for anything more.

3.8.2 Echo Park/LA City/Info
Sophia mentioned that the skate park may develop in phases (regarding the area behind the rec center). However, the money available is to start on the given site. We need to prioritize the needs and wants. She will see if the area south of the building is “on the table.”

3.8.3 Info
Brian said that there are many elements that need to be addressed before the actual funds for the skate park design can be assessed. The available funding will need to address demolition, shack, fencing/wisteria, lighting, earth/dirt movement, ADA, entry – before skate elements can truly be decided upon.
**3.9 Site (old proposed location vs. new pool location vs. other?)**

3.9.1 Info

Vincent R. said that he wants a real skate park in Echo Park. There are all age groups wanting a skate park and that he wants the kids present to dream big. He questions if this site is the best site possible? He noted that the proposed site by the play area was no longer an option because there is a safety concern for kids. However the skate park by Lincoln/Lake Street has kids next to a skate park that works well.

3.9.2 Info

Richard asked if anyone knew of a good site for a skate park. Vincent suggested we look at a site on Douglas St. and Colton St., at the Echo Park Pool. This is a large site that would be a great location for a skate park. Richard responded that there would be time needed to get an acquisition for this site. He also mentioned that funding will be in the next cycle of funding. He suggested talking to your council member now to get this started.

**3.10 Concrete**

3.10.1 Info

Vrazil asked if concrete could be donated. Richard responded that this could only happen after the project has been awarded and if the contractor would allow it.

**3.11 Durability**

3.11.1 Info

Brian explained that it is undesirable to have recycled elements utilized as skate materials because of rapid wear and tear, as well as maintenance issues. He noted that skate elements are replicated with concrete to prevent rapid damage. Mark S. added that we have one shot to get this right, and quality and durable materials are needed to help insure that.

**3.12 Volunteering**

3.12.1 Info

Julio/Mikey mentioned that they are willing to maintain this skate park because it is a part of their community. They want to help clean/maintain, open/close the park.

3.12.2 Info

A person asked if this skate park will be supervised and if volunteering to do so could happen? Hours of operation? Who maintains?

3.12.3 Info

Victor said that kids in this community need a leader to look up to, and this could be a place for them to join together.

3.12.4 Info

Sophia mentioned that volunteering could incur some liability issues. Anthea responded that there could be a subcommittee of the Echo Park Advisory Board set up just for skate parks only. If this were set up, this is where volunteers could sign up formally.

**3.13 Private Funding**

3.13.1 Info

Someone asked whether Private funding would be possible, i.e. Tony Hawk Foundation? Brian responded that it would be acceptable; however, to qualify for funding per the foundations restrictions may be an issue.

3.13.2 Info

Victor asked if it would be acceptable to get a sponsor. An example would be Lafayette Park by Rob Dyrdek.

**3.14 Skatepark location in a park**

3.14.1 Info

A dad brought up the stigma that skate parks are unsafe places where children should not be close to, but why does this only occur when skate parks are in question? Why doesn’t basketball courts, baseball fields, soccer fields hold the same concerns? Skate parks are good/safe places. They should be located at a good site with good visibility, not tucked in a corner where it automatically makes it “sketchy”
and dangerous. Don’t isolate the skate park. Venice/Garvanza Skate Parks are good examples.

3.14.2  Info
Brian followed up with the comment that skate parks are now becoming anchors to parks. The times are changing.

3.15  General Comments
3.15.1  Info
Brian noted that we need to focus on what has been approved (pool site) and look at the area behind building (to its south) as a possible second phase.

3.16  Overall Site
3.16.1  Info
Mark S. stated that a secondary benefit to mitigating this eyesore and liability from the city and community is by activating this space so that it is safer to use. The area behind the rec. center has the potential to grow into a safe/secure/highly utilized space. Overall, we want this to be an asset to the community.

3.17  Community Participation
3.17.1  Info
Valentino suggested that people don’t know about the skatepark. Perhaps businesses would be willing to ask for a donation to the skate park from their customers once the word is out. Example – buy one drink, donate to the cause?

3.18  Lighting
3.18.1  Info
Mark S. noted that lighting will be provided.

Old Business (Only items requiring action are shown)

1. Site Relocation to Pool Side
1.1  LA City - CR
1.1.1  LA City - CR
- As-builts are needed – Craig Raines to ask CSY if as-builts exist.
1.1.2  LA City - RC
- Survey is needed – Richard Campbell to have site surveyed.
1.1.3  HMC
- HMC to check how this will affect our proposal.
- Mark noted that the relocated site may affect our proposal and will let William know.
1.1.4  LA City - CR
- The relocated site will require a larger budget.
- Craig to reach out for more funds

We are proceeding based on the above information. If there are any omissions or if any corrections are needed, please bring them to our attention in the next few days.

Submitted by:  Mark Schoeman, AIA

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be schedule in approximately four weeks. Three designs will be proposed based off of today’s feedback, project scope, and budget /site constraints. Voting on the design is scheduled for LVNOC Meeting #2. Can the pool site be opened for viewing at the next meeting?