



**Forest Park Entrance & Nature Center
Project Advisory Committee Meeting #3**

December 13, 2016

5:00pm – 7:00pm

Portland Building

2nd Floor, Room C

1120 SW 5th Ave., Portland, OR 97204

PAC Members Attendance

Carol Chesarek (CC) – Forest Park Neighborhood Association

Greg Madden (GM) – Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association

Michael Karnosh – Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde

Chrissy Larson (CL) – Coordinator for Environmental Education, PP&R

Rachel Hill (RH) – St. Johns Neighborhood Association

Sheryl Sackman (CS) – Forest Park Conservancy

Monica Smiley (MS) – Friends of Tryon Creek

PP&R Staff Attendance

Britta Herwig (BH) – Project Manager

Stefanus Gunawan (SG) – PI Coordinator Lead

Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong (EKW) – PI Manager

Design Team Attendance

Steve Dangermond (SD) – Dangermond Keane Architecture

Christopher Keane (CK) – Dangermond Keane Architecture

Tom Ancona (TA) – Ancona and Associates

Lara Rose (LR) – Walker Macy

Matthew Crampton (MC) – Walker Macy





Meeting Summary

I. Eat & Socialize **SG** **[4:30-5:00pm]**

II. Agenda Review & Meeting Outcomes **SG** **[5:00-5:10pm]**

SG Made introductions and reviewed the agenda and desired outcomes for the meeting.

III. Proposed Vision **Britta** **[5:10-5:15pm]**

Project Manager read aloud the Draft PAC Vision Statement for the project. Question-is art important enough to merit mention in the vision statement? After discussion

The Project Advisory Committee approved by consensus the following Vision Statement

“The Forest Park Entry and Nature Center project will create a timeless, versatile, easy to navigate place for all Portlanders that fits within the aesthetic of Forest Park; a safe place to connect to and engage with the park, nature, and other people through learning, recreation, play, and stewardship – a place to make great memories.”

IV. Community Input Up-to-Date **SG and Steve** **[5:15-5:35pm]**

Consultant and Community Outreach staff reviewed the outreach efforts to date, summarizing who we’ve met with, what we’ve heard, what major themes have emerged, and what programmatic themes have emerged. There have also been some strongly negative reactions to some of the preference images, some surprising, some not.

V. Programming Based on Input **Britta/Steve** **[5:35-6:00pm]**

Consultant played several videos that were taken on site to demonstrate the existing noise levels. The outreach has identified some activities which, while they may be desirable, will be difficult to achieve on site, particularly outdoors. For example, group picnics have been identified as something that would be an attractive activity for many, but it’s not certain that this particular site will be conducive to picnics because of the noise levels.

CL raised concerns over holding large group teaching sessions outdoors because of the loud noise levels.





SD reviewed the other site constraints that have been identified. Topography, the single entry point, the wetlands, specimen trees, the powerlines, and the noise are the most impactful constraints. Wetland areas that are disturbed must be mitigated – replaced elsewhere in the same watershed – at a 3:1 ratio.

VI. Site Design and Architecture Steve/Britta [6:10–6:30pm]

SD and LR presented five site diagrams. These early diagrams demonstrate that because of the site constraints, the developable area is limited, and there will be tradeoffs. PAC members were not asked to choose, but to consider what was presented and give feedback on the pro’s and con’s that they saw – what should be explored further, what do people dislike, etc.

- a. Scheme A - Maximizes parking – assumes mitigation of wetlands offsite. Building located to the Northern edge of the site. Building could be split as shown or joined into one.
- b. Scheme B - Carves into the slope to increase parking - probably can’t mitigate all of the wetlands on site. Could be ceremonial approach to building. 2-story building allows bridge element to top of waterfall
- c. Scheme C – Less parking, but minimizes impact on lower wetland area. Shows a tower, but is there anything to see? Maybe a tower could just serve as a beacon or marker. Building shown as a cluster but could be joined into one. Separate wetland experience tucked away.
- d. Scheme D – Provides more outdoor space. Less parking. Lower wetland is consumed, but allows the most site area. Could be a “plaza” or “green space” area for gathering; diagram shows path right through the middle, could go around; building makes a gateway to the park.
- e. Scheme E – Stands the best chance of mitigating as much of the wetlands as possible on site; maximizes natural area. Same parking approach as “D”. Building shown split but there are other options.





VII. Committee Feedback

Britta

[6:30-6:50pm]

Feedback based on the diagrams:

- Visitors should not need to cross a parking lot in getting from a visitor/education center to the trails. Should be able to access the park without interrupting gatherings, events, or having to go through building.
- Chrissy - Parking question; there needs to be space for Parks activity busses; Short bus - 2 vans - 3 mini vans.
- Is there analysis that tells us about parking counts? What is reasonable?
- 30 does not seem like enough.
- GM – Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association (NINA) will bristle at too much parking. 30 is enough
- Parking is a huge issue. Environmental Education will be tough on this site. Short timeframe for the programs; can't park, orient, and then get deep into the park in a short amount of time. Need a solution to the noise issue.
- Need to be very clear on parking capacity (30 is not enough) and off site alternatives, must have small bus parking.
- Offsite parking will need to be investigated.
- CC - Keep buildings small. Emphasize green spaces and wetlands. Site Not sunny. Concerns about maintenance costs and costs of project. Keep it simple and frugal.
- Staffing; will be difficult in a solution that breaks the building into too many parts. Not a great site for typical/traditional outdoor education programs. Could there be an outdoor education program tailored to the site? May need to alter the model. Need more discussion on merits and/or location of outdoor activities for this space due to lack of natural elements to teach about as well as noise impacts. Perhaps this space is better suited to individual pursuits than for groups?
- Spaces should be multi-functional to avoid wasting money on locked up or seldom-used areas.
- Trees are a precious resource, must work around as much as possible
- Can the architecture take inspiration from native precedents? Longhouse design? Chinook pole? Ethno Botany?





- What kind of curriculum is right for this site?
- Use space to let folks share their own stories.
- Need to research in greater detail the mitigation of wetlands
- Definitely need to create a way for short looped walk
- Bring the creek, the wetlands, and the waterfall to the forefront
- Get back to the 'must haves' which include natural systems and education around Forest Park but find new and creative ways to tell the stories
- Have the Nature center prepare visitors for what they will see in the park both orientation and education

Closing: Meeting Schedule: PAC meeting #4 will be in January (rescheduled to February due to inclement weather.)





Meeting Outcomes

- Present proposed vision
- Share outcomes from the community open house and other stakeholder inputs
- Introduce recommended program that results from the outreach
- Share approach to site design concepts and thoughts about architecture
- Hear committee feedback

