

WATERFRONT CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"WAC"

MEETING SUMMARY

MARCH 14, 2007 - 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Port Representatives (Support)

Sheldon Tyler
Byron Hanke
Mary Murphy

Riverwalk LLC (Support)

Mark Benson
John McKibbin

Committee Members

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator
Larry Blaufus
Jennie Brown
Russ Chambers
Ashley Eckman

Paul Fearn
Sandy Krahn
Casey O'Dell
Pat Sheaffer
Gary Simmons

John Svilarich
Roberta Tidland
Barbe West
Excused Absence
Charmaine Harvey

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator, opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m., and welcomed everyone.

Review:

The revised Meeting Summary from February 14, 2007 was approved.

The Meeting Summary from February 28, 2007 was approved with no changes.

Discuss Visual Representations:

Arnold introduced Jack Miller, of MCA Architects, and Dave Sacamano, of The Illahee Group, who planned to present new materials to help WAC digest the concept boards. The architect has been working on WAC's recommendations to integrate them into a waterfront plan. Arnold encouraged WAC members to look through the boards to 'find a set of features that works for you. Ensure it's a list you feel comfortable recommending to the Commissioners.' The end result: have we arrived at where we want to be? If so, we'll schedule an Open House on March 28th? If not, we are flexible and can reschedule. No urgency. WAC's comfort level is paramount.

Jack Miller introduced Ted Grund, Project Manager, from MCA, and commented that their work is geared to how WAC wishes to present their ideas to the public. They hope to set up a "flow" for people at the Open House to view and understand the concept boards. Jack, then, reiterated what a great site this is and what a great thing the development would be for the community.

Dave Sacamano focused on the site, itself. His points were:

- How RiverWalk relates to Camas and Washougal, the main access via SR-14, and the proposed interchange at Union Street.
- 6th Street's future is unknown.
- Connectivity to Camas, Washougal, Lacamas Trials, neighborhoods.
- Site has many connections, both pedestrian and vehicular. Accessible to both cities.

An aerial photo was displayed to identify businesses and locations. Dave then presented:

Section A Elements:

- Public access to waterfront
- 16' wide pedestrian walkway running along the entire site.
- Structured terraces with lawn panels
- Three elevations used for design: 32' elevation (100' year flood level); 19' elevation (ordinary high water); 10' elevation (low water)
- Vegetation along bank; furnishings, lighting, hanging plants
- Create a semi-public area, such as a building's outdoor eating space
- Would not fill below ordinary high water zone. All proposed fill is above that level.

Gary Simmons – Creates a natural amphitheater

Dave – takes advantage of natural cove

Section B Elements:

- “Armored” above 32' elevation
- Buildings and walkway fairly close to water
- Semi-public space
- Vegetation on the bank
- No access to water itself, but close
- Art pieces along water's edge, or in plazas
- Efficient to have buildings close to water's edge
- Banner along trail
- Site furnishings, vegetation, marina in background
- Idea: scale model of Columbia River as an educational piece

Section C Elements [East end of site]

- Less intense development
- Existing grade is shallow
- Series of different pathways
- 16' wide walkway
- Residential area with view corridors
- Idea: smaller trails to beach designed so not drastically impacted
- Going from rigid structure to softer look
- Section of the historic park – tell when built; give full story
- Idea: seasonal market spaces
- Capture views toward Mt. Hood and Columbia River

Q & A

Ashley Eckman – Have we purchased all land necessary to do this project?

Arnold - Land acquisition not WAC's task. Architect will proceed as if 65-acre area is available.

Sandy Krahn – Likes the way the concepts are situated to work with the land. Unsure if exterior look is what people want.

Kelly Puntaney – Want indigenous feel so Washougal is part of design.

Gary Simmons – Likes to see workable options. Feels Open House may bring out questions about the history of area. What percentage of project is going toward art and history?

Kelly Puntaney – A requirement for art and history could be part of a policy statement.

John McKibbin – All the developments they researched had art. From a marketing standpoint, and from a community standpoint it has to be there. (No law mandates it. State budget projects require 1% allocation.)

Roberta Tidland – Wants the architect to understand that 'history' should be the theme of the site.

Barbe West – Loves the concepts. Seems to all be views from the land. How do people on the River access the development?

Russ Chambers – This looks like a very successful waterfront development: a destination spot.

Jack Miller reiterated that as this project develops, we don't know what kind of architecture is going to be there. What we do know is that by using the list of features, all structures, lighting, architecture, vegetation – all hardscape and landscape – will tie together.

We are following WAC's list of features.

- Working with bubble concepts.
- Then tie together into relationships
- Relationships (i.e., open-air markets and parks) into massing
- Started with three access points off SR-14, now working with two.
 - Feels two is ample.
- Taking all issues – setbacks, 32' water level, etc., and working on how to mass buildings together: commercial, residential, boating.

- Working with both linear and curved linear concepts
- In one concept, there is too much massing of buildings to do a serpentine walk path design
- After looking at WAC's features list, came up with three headings:
- Very conceptual
- Site programming
- Features
- Three developments show (1) water access ; (2) mass of buildings; (3) all features.

The next step will be to develop one look. It has to be economically feasible. An 18-hour development for the people. Brought to the attention of WAC that all schemes have an open space at both ends as an 'anchor.'

Gary Simmons – Where is launch ramp? The ramp is a major component of the Marina.

Jack Miller – We don't know yet.

Russ Chambers – Need parking to go along with it.

Jack Miller – for the 'Aspirations' on the features list, we have examples of other built or planned riverwalks. All have mixed-use. All address what the people want. Everyone has a major road as access. Note: We need to make it clear to the Highway Dept. that we want two accesses.

We have a scheme that shows boat storage as a feature; 'Healthy Food' appears in a shop window; example of a brand-name restaurant, a historic park. All are creating people spaces for the community and economic viability.

Illustrations have mixed-use, open space, lighting, water access.

Q & A :

Barbe West – Illustrations show *relationships* of roads and buildings?

Jack Miller – Yes, just relationships. When you have a concentration of buildings, you need open spaces, including underground parking. Need to plan the infrastructure for largest potential site.

Arnold – Is this the direction WAC wants to go: Do you feel comfortable?

Byron Hanke – Clarified that WAC should be clear that they're recommending the features, not the final plan.

Jack Miller – These boards are just examples of features. Are we answering your questions?

Arnold – Are there any unanswered questions? If we're on the right track, we want to take this to the Open House.

Jack Miller - If we go very much further and propose it to the community, we'll hear it's a 'done deal.' It's not. It all depends on marketing and that's up to the developers. And we don't know how many living units can be supported.

John McKibbin – Let's invite everyone – WAC and audience – to look at the boards. Take 10 minutes to review them and then WAC can comment.

- - - Ten minute break for review of concept boards.

Arnold – How do you feel about what we've got? Pat Sheaffer needed to leave, but told me he feels these boards are good; ready for Open House.

Russ Chambers – If these are presented at an Open House – not to the point of detailing – there'll be a huge vocal minority asking 'where's the launch ramp and parking?' If it's not clear that there'll be a launch ramp and adequate parking, we'll get negative feedback.

Arnold – These boards are just to give an impression of where things might be located.

Jack Miller – We are not far enough along to show WAC that all features have been considered.

John Svilarich – Need to show a boat launch

Paul Fearn – Are we going to get a boat launch?

John Svilarich – Need to be clear that people know these are concepts.

Sandy Krahn – How do we be sure?

Jack Miller - As we present these boards to the public, the site will be explained by David Sacamano and Kelly Puntaney; the landscaping by David Sacamano, and I will explain the process.

Open House

Arnold reviewed handouts covering the Open House. He asked for volunteers for each station for a 1-hour period. Noted that he had added a fourth station: Orientation. This is so people can gain perspective as to where they are located on the development site.

John Svilarich – Will the architect set the tone?

Jack Miller – Difficult to present. We would move around to different stations. Our plan is to present only two boards.

John Svilarich – Suggested signage: “Possibilities.” “Examples.” “Ideas.” “Concepts.”

Larry Blaufus – Suggested 3 or 4 people at a station to let people know about the different ideas.

John Svilarich – Have people come in; hand out a guide; have a greeter. Written materials on handouts and boards would be similar, and be reinforced verbally by Jack and Dave.

Arnold – Suggested having Open House here at the Port. The consensus of WAC was that it would be a good idea to have the Open House on site. Good parking. Press release should be clear that people can come and go. Timing was discussed, and it was decided to hold the Open House from 5:00 to 7:30 p.m. Arnold asked if the Committee was comfortable that we had the right ‘stuff’ for the Open House.

Gary Simmons – People will want to see a sense of history and open space.

Jack Miller – We have a picture of Parkers Landing to show.

Arnold – Use of stickies would not work on the boards themselves. Too busy. Comment books and a flip chart can be tools to take people’s comments.

Gary Simmons – It’s important the people feel they can express themselves. Open House is a time for input. It would be wonderful if people would give us feedback.

Russ Chambers – If boards are behind the tables, people can put the stickies on the table.

Ashley Eckman – Asked for information so she’ll be prepared to answer questions.

John Svilarich – Need more than one or two pictures of history. Also, need to show ways to get to the water.

Paul Fearn – Will we have a concept of an improved marina?

Jack Miller – Showed examples of improved boat launches. The Committee’s consensus was to group like items together.

Arnold - Reminder: We’re not planning the details.

Barbe West – Suggested that on the handouts is spelled out ‘What this is’ as well as ‘What this isn’t.’

Byron – This Committee gave overwhelming support to a Marina.

Sandy Krahn – Will this Open House lead to another open house with more detail?

Arnold - After next two events, we’ll see where we go from there.

Jack Miller – Suggested that on the list of features, the two right-hand columns be removed before using it at the Open House. Arnold said that had already been decided.

Casey O’Dell – How do we volunteer? Arnold said via email.

Russ Chambers – I would not exclude any board presented tonight. It gives the whole story.

Ashley Eckman – Needs to attend a school function on March 28th for a while, but will still help at Open House.

Public Comment:

Marianne Guetter – Let the community know when you’re having an open house. The public wants to talk to WAC members, not the developers. Concerned that acquisition of some property on conceptual boards hasn’t been discussed with the property owners. Says people want an ‘open mike.’ They want information. People think whole process is a joke because ‘no matter what they say, no one is going to listen.’

Ashley Eckman – Said she hopes no one on the /Committee feels this is a joke. She feels privileged to be on the Committee. ‘Our work will benefit the community.’

Melissa Smith – Feels this concept on 65 acres ‘will freak people out.’ Can WAC show two concepts?

Jeanne – You plan for what you hope for, and then take away from that if necessary.

Ashley – A poster could be shown: if all land isn’t acquired, this is what you’ll have.

Jack Miller – Long-term goal is to develop all 65 acres.

Melissa Smith – Suggested showing phases: Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3.

Barbe West – Showing phasing is really important. It’s not about ‘all or nothing.’ Our job is to recommend what we feel is important on the site. Others will do the planning.

Jack Miller – Phasing could be a problem. We cannot plan a master plan without taking all acreage into consideration. Need to know how it all fits together.

Bev Howard – People will ask about Westlie’s, Hambleton, and Parker House. The public isn’t getting answers.

Barbe West – In response to Marianne Guetter: We had better be ‘super sensitive’ at the Open House. Gather information. Facilitate the conversation. Ensure people that their comments will be gathered and distributed to WAC for discussion at their next meeting.

SR-14

Sheldon offered a status report: An ‘in value engineering process’ is going on now. The results will be made known at 10:30 on Friday, March 16th.

Next Steps:

Arnold brought the ‘Final Work Product’ draft to the Committee’s attention and asked them to review it and give him their feed back.

Schedule of Upcoming WAC Meetings:

April 11, 2007 – 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

April 25, 2007 – 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Adjournment: Arnold Cogan adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.