



**Washington Park Master Plan
Champion Committee Meeting #3
March 22, 2017
Metro, 600 NE Grand**

Meeting Outcomes

- Respond to requested amendment to Vision/Goals
- Review Draft Concepts
- Receive information on public outreach

Meeting Notes

Attending

Committee Members

Michael Wallace (in place of Joe Angel)	Kimberly Bown
Sam Baraso	Ernest Hayes
Ozzie Gonzalez	Laurie Mathews
Joey Pope	John Russell
Charlene Zidell	Christie Galen
Gretchen Holland	Octiviano Merecias

PP&R Staff

Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong	Emily Roth
Rachel Felice	
	Seth Menser

PLACE Consultant Team

Charlie Brucker	Robin Wilcox
-----------------	--------------

Guests

Craig Stroud, Oregon Zoo

I. Welcome

Reviewed committee role -input at the 20,000-foot level and to carry on the vision into the future – that role includes:

- Monitoring the development of the master plan, including equitable and inclusive public involvement.
- Establishing goals and objectives for the Master Plan



- Advocating for the implementation of the vision.
- Provide their perspective on plan options and weigh-in on the selection of a preferred option for Washington Park with a broad focus including equity and social justice.

II. Washington Park Master Plan Goals –

Discussed friendly amendment suggested from the February 10th meeting of the Explore Washington Park Board and staff (those suggested changes are included at the end of these notes). The **attached** Visions and Goals were approved by the Committee.

IV. Master Plan Concept Review

Charlie Brucker went through the presentation on the master plan concepts (attached). The presentation covered:

1. Key strategic issues developed from the technical investigation.
2. Big Ideas: examples include moving autos to the edges; circulation as part of the experience; visitor center(s); new amenities; and recreation zone. Independence from automobiles would happen over time.
3. Approach: Access to the park, Unify the park, and Link the experiences
4. World class park case studies focusing on size, urban edge, miles of trails, roads into the park, number of venues/attractions. Compared these parks to Washington Park – 6% urban edge, large percentage of natural area, has many destination attractions for out of town visitors and Portlanders.
5. Approach – two concepts: single hub at the south entrance off of Highway 26 and then connect to a robust internal park circulation, like a people mover. Build a parking garage as shown in the South Entrance Vision Plan. Multi-hub approach that distributes arrival to 3 main areas – south entrance, Hoyt Arboretum, and the International Rose Test/Japanese gardens area. Potential to re-open the entrance off of Burnside through Stearns Canyon. Possibly two parking garages – one at south entry and a private/public partnership outside of the park to the north.
6. Details of the concepts in the single hub approach:
 - a. Close SW Fischer to cars
 - b. Canopy walk/bridge
 - c. Visitor Center for the entire park
 - d. Conservatory (indoor garden) with food of the world
 - e. People mover loop throughout the park from south entrance to Stearns Canyon.

- f. Parking structure with around 900 spaces (same number as presently in the park)
 - g. Convert Kingston to a parkway
 - h. Close Rose Garden Way to cars
 - i. Expand the recreation facilities at the present soccer field location.
 - j. Move the tennis courts to recreation area.
7. Details of the concepts in the multi hub approach, many of the proposed changes are the same as the single hub approach. The differences are:
- a. Three hubs with smaller visitor center/information
 - b. SW Fischer remains open to cars
 - c. Parking structure at the south end for 750 cars
 - d. Multi-modal trail on or near RR alignment
 - e. One-way entry drive at Stearns Canyon
 - f. Increase connectivity to Goose Hollow and King Street MAX stations.
8. Showed examples of possible improvement/enhancements

Committee comments – the committee was invited to provide overall feedback and impressions. They were not asked to develop agreement on their feedback.

- The multi-hub scheme is less overwhelming. Easier to travel through the park to where you want to go.
- Is there a continuous trail connection from Forest Park to Council Crest through Washington Park?
- Like the single hub scheme.
- How are tour buses accommodated to the International Rose Test Garden?
- Would like a hybrid – single hub in the south and multi-hub in the north.
- Applaud unifying the gardens by removing the tennis courts and creating more garden space.
- Prefers the recreation component as shown in the multi-hub.
- What are the impacts to the neighbor from commuting traffic if the roads through the park are closed?
- Want to like the single hub but still need easier access to the north; there needs to be a “release valve” at the north. Need more accessibility to all and connectivity. Likes the multi-modal transportation options.
- People will want to access the park from the north.

- Perhaps seasonal road closures.
- Like both as cars are discouraged inside the park.
- North side suffers in both schemes.
- Need better accessibility from MAX from Goose Hollow to the park.
- Income inequality with pushing everyone to the south end of the park. Lack of empathy for low income people. North end is the elite part of the park. Need a connection from MAX to the Garden end of the park.
- Pay attention to equity.
- Single hub would create a long experience to the Garden Area, even with a shuttle or people mover.
- Make it simple.
- Multi hub approach as this connects the northern part of the park to the City and gives people more options.
- Highlight areas that are free to the public.
- Highlight the multiple connections to the City by public transportation, creating a strong connection to the northern end of the park.
- Advocate for a W. Burnside entrance - easy to walk to from the City.
- Celebrate anywhere you enter from park, letting people know they are in the park.
- W. Burnside entrance should only be for pedestrians, bicycles and public transportation, not private cars.
- Sort out the parking by the tennis court area.
- Rails to trails use of the present Zoo trains alignment.
- How would a parking structure at the south end work with the topography and landslide susceptibility? Also, they are very expensive to build because of the topography and the water at the site (lots going on underground).

V. Community Engagement

Staff shared information on public involvement to date and future efforts.

Next event is the: Open House, April 8th, 10:00 am to 2:00 pm, World Forestry Center

VI. Adjourn

8:15 PM