



## Washington Park Reservoir Improvements Project Community Sounding Board Meeting #5 Summary

October 2, 2013

6:00 to 8:00 pm

First United Methodist Church  
1838 SW Jefferson – Room 202

### CSB Members Present

Bill Welch – *Northwest District Association*  
Dave Malcolm – *Sylvan-Highlands NA*  
Terri Davis – *Portland Parks & Recreation*  
Nicolas Clark – *Neighbors West Northwest*  
Charlie Clark – *Northwest Heights NA*  
Chris Kent – *Goose Hollow NA*

Annie Mahoney – *Historic Group Representative*  
Eric Nagle – *Arlington Heights NA*

### CSB Members Absent

Patty Gardner – *Pearl District NA*

### Staff & Public Present

Tim Hall, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Jerry Moore, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Marie Del Toro, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Dan Hogan, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Alan Peck, *AECOM*  
Carmen Nale, *AECOM*

Marilee Hanks, *AECOM*  
Jeanne Lawson, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Sam Beresky, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Kristen Minor, *Peter Meijer Architects*  
Marshall Gannett, *Arlington Heights NA*  
Kathryn Notson, *Resident*

## Welcome and Introductions

**Jeanne Lawson** welcomed everyone to the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to present refined reservoir concepts and get feedback from Sounding Board members. She reminded the group of the role of the Community Sounding Board (CSB); the group is a sounding board to the Portland Water Bureau and the project team, providing feedback on concepts. Because of the historic designation of the area, there is a land-use decision that the Historic Landmarks Commission is responsible for. Ultimately, the Portland Water Bureau (PWB) will propose a single concept to the City Council.

### *Meeting #4 Summary*

There were no comments about CSB meeting #4 summary.

### *Project Update*

**Jerry Moore** from the Portland Water Bureau gave a brief update on the budget for the project. Overall, the budget is \$74 million with \$40 million allocated for construction and about \$34 million for permitting, inspections, design, and other associated costs. The project is considered a capital project and will be funded through bonds. All capital projects are combined into annual bond sales and a project like this will be allocated over several bond sales over a seven-year timeframe. The bond sale funds will not include maintenance funds. There will be rate impacts but it is unclear how much rates may increase. **Tim Hall**

from the Portland Water Bureau said that the PWB is currently working on the budget for 2014 and will need to keep rate increases low, less than 10% a year. **Chris Kent** let the group know that there could be cumulative rate increases of 35–50% over the life of the project to service debt. Cost estimates for the visible feature options will be shared with the group during the presentation.

**Jerry Moore** said that the PWB has decided that for public safety and to reduce the potential for liability that a barrier will be needed between any decorative water and the public. The team is not sure exactly what the barrier will look like at this point. **Jeanne Lawson** mentioned that this is a PWB directive from the administrator and the cost estimates for the visible features reflect the costs of different barrier options. Sounding Board members mentioned that Portland Parks & Recreation have water features throughout the city that are barrier-free; it was asked if an agreement can be reached for Portland Parks & Recreation to maintain any water feature. **Jerry Moore** said that the Portland Water Bureau will need to maintain ownership of all facilities for maintenance and access to the reservoir.

**Tim Hall** has been meeting with a number of area neighborhood associations, including a recent briefing to the Goose Hollow Neighborhood Association. He said that the group was mostly open to the proposed concepts and willing to participate in the process. Feedback included a request for the price of each concept. **Nicolas Clark** said that the presentation was well received, the graphics helped explain the need for the project.

**Kristen Minor** from Peter Meijer Architects reported that the project team recently met with the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Historic Resources Committee to get feedback on the concepts and to prepare for the upcoming presentation to the Historic Landmarks Commission. Overall, the five AIA members present liked the large expanses of water and felt that the water should connect with historic resources like the gatehouses and dams. They mentioned that the historic fence could be cut and re-used and adapted in new ways, including away from any water and in interpretive displays. **Annie Mahoney** was present at the AIA briefing and said that the AIA appreciated the briefing and the challenges the design team is facing; also, many were excited about the Lowland Habitat option for Reservoir #4.

**Kristen Minor** said the Historic Landmarks Commission will want to hear from all the groups and people that have been involved in the process; there will be public testimony offered at the commission meeting on October 14th. The Sounding Board members can write letters of support for certain concepts, whether they would like to do so individually or as a group. **Jeanne Lawson** said the Historic Landmarks Commission does have decision-making authority on the project and can ultimately trump the CSB, but they will listen to the views and opinions of groups involved in the process. She assured CSB members that their input is valued.

## Review and Evaluate Reservoir Concepts

**Marilee Hanks** gave a PowerPoint presentation (handout) that included:

- Project Schedule
- Updated concepts, including:
  - Addition of fence around water features
  - Updated cost estimates
  - Updated key metrics

Marilee said there are many options for barriers or fences to separate the public from water features. The consulting team has only had preliminary discussions with PWB about barrier metrics. Options include reusing the historic fence where appropriate, a simpler fence, or other designs that make it clear that accessing the water is not an option but without impairing the visibility of the surface water features. The project team is working with a pools expert to understand different options.

*General Committee Discussion*

**Nicolas Clark** said the concepts being shown depict a perspective that is not realistic – from the road a person can see dam #3 and dam #4 only at certain points. He asked if other perspectives can be shown in presentations. **Marilee Hanks** replied that the 3D files are too large to distribute, but the team will work on imagery of the requested perspectives for the next meeting. She also said that the proposed paths will offer more views in the future than are currently available.

**Chris Kent** responded to the cost estimates for the design options, saying the difference between the concept cost estimates is not large enough to make a difference. He had been prepared to judge the concepts primarily on costs, but with the negligible differences the costs will become a minor issue.

Many Sounding Board members disliked the addition of fencing to the options. In particular, members felt that they liked the Water Over the Divide concept without the fence, but did not like it with a fence. A suggestion was made to consider adding elements to the bottom of the water to make it unattractive to waders. Plexiglas or narrow gauge wire were also suggested as fencing alternatives.

Many Sounding Board members liked the Cascades concept because it would provide the sound of falling water to the park.

## Evaluation Matrix Discussion

The group discussed and filled in the Evaluation Matrix that was handed out and discussed at the previous Sounding Board meeting. While no formal vote was taken, the group generally agreed on much of the matrix:

### Community Sounding Board Evaluation Matrix:

Rating Scale	Reservoir No. 3			
	Water Over the Divide	In the Ravine	Landscape Terraces	Cascade
Superior: S	The option has significant benefits over other options for this goal			
Acceptable: A	The option meets the goal			
Inferior: I	The option is significantly less responsive to this goal than other options			
Neutral: N	No difference between options			
<b>Goals and Objectives</b>	<b>Reservoir No. 3</b>			
<b>Be Good Stewards of Public Funds</b>	A	A	A	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure costs provide the greatest community benefit</li> <li>Prudently spend public money &amp; limit impact on ratepayers</li> <li>Keep maintenance and operating costs low</li> </ul>	Cost is not a differentiator between options			
<b>Respect Historic Resources</b>	S	I	A	S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize impacts to historic structures and features</li> <li>Maintain historic character of the site</li> <li>Honor the historic function of the reservoirs in the context of the overall Portland water system</li> <li>Retain the sites reflective &amp; tranquil character that is now created &amp; heightened by the visual connection to an expansive water.</li> </ul>	Closely follows original extents of visible water and maintains the relationship between a water surface and the gatehouse and dam	Does not maintain original extent nor water/dam & gatehouse relationship	Additional paths at the upper elevation provide numerous opportunities to view the water surface from above without the fence obstructing views of the water or the gatehouse & dam.	Closely follows original extents of visible water and maintains the relationship between a water surface and the gatehouse and dam
<b>Be a Good Neighbor</b>	N	N	N	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce use of neighborhood parking by park visitors</li> <li>Avoid attraction of nuisance &amp; illegal activities into the park &amp; neighborhoods</li> <li>Enhance the quality of the park as an amenity for neighbors &amp; visitors</li> <li>Minimize construction impacts</li> </ul>		Cannot be used as a wading pool given shallow water depth		
<b>Enhance Park Experience</b>	I with fence	I	4 preferred w/fence	3 preferred with fence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide public access &amp; opportunities for low-intensity recreation</li> <li>Retain the sites reflective &amp; tranquil character that is now created &amp; heightened by the visual connection to an expansive water.</li> <li>Enhance views into and from the area</li> <li>Provide people with ability to connect with nature in the city</li> <li>Maintain security of the park and water facilities</li> <li>Ensure the new visible features enhance current park uses and are compatible with future park uses</li> </ul>	Superior without fence		1 preferred w/o fence over Cascade	Prefer Cascade over In the Divide instead since it has less fence. Like the sound of water falling.
	Great option without the fence but pointless with it when it goes along the divide. Prefer Cascade over In the Divide instead since it has less fence. Like expanse of water & ability to walk between water, but fence eliminates that advantage.			
<b>Support Sustainability</b>	A	A	A	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create sustainable landscapes that provide habitat for birds and other native wildlife</li> <li>Minimize climate change impacts due to construction, operations and maintenance.</li> <li>Promote wise use of our water resources through design, maintenance and education.</li> </ul>				

Rating Scale	Reservoir No. 4		
	Reflecting Pool	Lawn	Habitat
Superior: S	The option has significant benefits over other options for this goal		
Acceptable: A	The option meets the goal		
Inferior: I	The option is significantly less responsive to this goal than other options		
Neutral: N	No difference between options		
<b>Goals and Objectives</b>	<b>Reservoir No. 4</b>		
<b>Be Good Stewards of Public Funds</b>	A	A	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure costs provide the greatest community benefit</li> <li>Prudently spend public money &amp; limit impact on ratepayers</li> <li>Keep maintenance and operating costs low</li> </ul>	Cost is not a differentiator between options		
<b>Respect Historic Resources</b>	S	I	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize impacts to historic structures and features</li> <li>Maintain historic character of the site</li> <li>Honor the historic function of the reservoirs in the context of the overall Portland water system</li> <li>Retain the sites reflective &amp; tranquil character that is now created &amp; heightened by the visual connection to an expansive water.</li> </ul>			Showcases functional aspects of the water system which supports historic context
<b>Be a Good Neighbor</b>	A	I	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce use of neighborhood parking by park visitors</li> <li>Avoid attraction of nuisance &amp; illegal activities into the park &amp; neighborhoods</li> <li>Enhance the quality of the park as an amenity for neighbors &amp; visitors</li> <li>Minimize construction impacts</li> </ul>		May draw larger crowds seeking to use lawn; have more neighborhood impact	
<b>Enhance Park Experience</b>	A	I	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide public access &amp; opportunities for low-intensity recreation</li> <li>Retain the sites reflective &amp; tranquil character that is now created &amp; heightened by the visual connection to an expansive water.</li> <li>Enhance views into and from the area</li> <li>Provide people with ability to connect with nature in the city</li> <li>Maintain security of the park and water facilities</li> <li>Ensure the new visible features enhance current park uses and are compatible with future park uses</li> </ul>		Use low height plants to maintain view	City adopted Watershed Management Plan - goal to protect and restore native habitat throughout the City; bird document states document to restore habitat; acquire/restore grasslands & meadows; great place to achieve goals
<b>Support Sustainability</b>	A	I	S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create sustainable landscapes that provide habitat for birds and other native wildlife</li> <li>Minimize climate change impacts due to construction, operations and maintenance.</li> <li>Promote wise use of our water resources through design, maintenance and education.</li> </ul>		Lawn provides little benefit for wildlife and requires mowing.	

### *Discussion:*

- **Kristen Minor** said that an area may become historic for many reasons; its architectural significance, engineering, context of elements, and use are all considered. The historic fence around the Washington Park reservoirs should not be recreated but should be used differently where possible.
- Many Sounding Board members want to be able to touch the water but also understand the need for a barrier.
- It was generally felt that the Water Over the Divide concept is “superior” without a fence and “inferior” with a fence.
- Many felt that the presence of a fence with the Cascades concept was not as bad as on some of the other options.
- Others felt that the Landscape Terraces concept was also a good concept regardless of the fence.
- Generally, Sounding Board members liked the combination of: the Cascade concept (Reservoir 3) with Lowland Habitat concept (Reservoir 4); or Landscaped Terraces concept (Reservoir 3) with the Reflecting Pool concept (Reservoir 4).

### **Public comment**

**Marshall Gannett** said that larger expanses of water are better. He said that most of Washington Park is shrubs, grass, and paths so more of this type of landscaping is not needed, as proposed in the Landscape Terraces concept. He felt that the In the Ravine concept is a little silly. Overall, he thought that the fences are not just a barrier but can be visually interesting, especially including the historic fence and light posts; modern and historic elements can be blended. He recommended keeping fencing short enough so as to not block the views. He thought the fence should not necessarily eliminate the Over the Divide concept, and that the Cascade concept could potentially create too much noise, depending on how far the water falls. He recommended keeping Thumper as a museum or interpretive piece. He preferred the Lowland Habitat concept for Reservoir 4.

### **Wrap up and next steps**

The group requested to see all the combinations of concepts for both reservoirs and meeting details for the Historic Landmarks Commission briefing.

**Sam Beresky** let the group know that the online open house will begin on October 11<sup>th</sup>; the in-person open house will be on October 16<sup>th</sup>. The team will be canvassing neighborhood businesses and residences in an effort to push people to visit the virtual open house. Sounding board members took flyers announcing the events to distribute to their constituents.

The next CSB meeting will be held on October 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Jeanne Lawson** adjourned the meeting.