

WATERFRONT CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"WAC"

MEETING SUMMARY

APRIL 25, 2007 - 5:00 – 7:45 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Port Representatives (Support)

Sheldon Tyler

Mary Murphy

Riverwalk LLC (Support)

Mark Benson

John McKibbin

Committee Members

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator

Larry Blaufus

Jennie Brown

Russ Chambers

Paul Fearn

Charmaine Harvey

Sandy Krahn

Casey O'Dell

Pat Sheaffer

Gary Simmons

John Svilarich

Roberta Tidland

Excused Absences

Ashley Eckman

Barbe West

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator, opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m., and welcomed everyone. Audience member Marianne Guetter announced she was recording the meeting.

Review:

The Meeting Summary from April 11, 2007 was approved, with specific mention of WAC's appreciation of Mary Murphy's work to support the Committee, including detailed reports provided to Arnold.

Discussion of WAC Recommendations Report & Unresolved Issues

Arnold commented on the Draft Summary of Recommendations he had prepared (hereinafter referred to as "Draft"):

- Arnold explained that the Open House topics are included in the draft of WAC's recommendations.
- He clarified that "public comment," as referred to in the Draft, included the 91 Comment Forms received, the emails received both before and after the March 28th Open House, and comments written on the flip charts at the Open House. The on-line survey information from RiverWalk's website has been discussed at WAC's meetings, but was not included in the public comments. WAC member Sandy Krahn stated that they had received material from the survey "over time." In addition, Arnold said that he had reviewed the report from the July 12, 2006 RiverWalk Public Forum, and that "there was a lot of comparability between the results of WAC's Open House and the Public Forum."

Arnold reported that he had attended the April 16th regular meeting of the Port Commissioners and had given a status report on WAC's meetings and the Open House. He also informed the Commissioners that he estimated WAC's final report would be to them in early June.

Discussions then ensued on the Draft, itself. Arnold asked the Committee for their feedback on the phrasing and layout of the document.

John Svilarich said he wanted to be sure they were all clear on what WAC's final work product should be. Knowing "where is the target?" would help to be more efficient in working through the Draft.

Arnold went through the Draft, and explained the format to the satisfaction of the Committee members.

John Svilarich clarified that the document would contain WAC's recommendations *with* descriptions.

Arnold responded that John was correct, and asked the Committee: "Do you want more?"

Gary Simmons said that as a Committee he felt time should be spent on each subject to make sure everyone is in consensus. He noted that the historic piece was missing from the "Built Development" section.

Arnold responded that he moved it to "Unfinished Business" for further discussion. When consensus is reached, it will be moved to its rightful place.

Paul Fearn disagreed with the word "prioritization" in the Draft. He said that no importance should be assigned. "They're *all* important."

John Svilarich and Gary Simmons agreed and said all the recommendations should "interflow."

Larry Blaufus asked if *all* were considered 'must haves' or if some items could come off.

Pat Schaeffer responded that the recommendations are not the 'law of the land.'

Sandy Krahn said we need to know what is going to fit.

Russ Chambers said that is not WAC's charge. 'We're to make recommendations on things that we'd like to see.'

John Svilarich said “These are all valuable, viable and of proper use. If they don’t fit, they’re not economically sound.”

Sandy Krahn said everything will be considered when the mix comes into play, and the requirements will affect the outcome.

Arnold elaborated on the use of the word “priorities.” He reminded the Committee that they all prioritized these features, and asked if they now wanted to treat them equally.

Larry Blaufus responded that there were ‘nice to have’ and ‘must haves’ – and they may all be equal, but “some were more equal than others.”

Roberta Tidland remarked that the public feels that the land should dictate what’s on it. People have different ideas, but it should be governed by the lay of the land. Ask: what can we have on it? What will the land support? She said she will continue to insist that the 4 acres cannot be built on.

Sandy Krahn said that decision is up to the developers.

Roberta Tidland responded, “Yes, but they won’t have designed something we disagree with.”

Pat Schaeffer said he disagreed.

John Svilarich said all prioritization needs to have *guiding* principles. “This is a compromise, and a compromise is when no one is completely happy. The public has said ‘don’t pave over the park and don’t block the view.’ We should give the Commissioners guiding principles and, after that, specific things we like.”

The Committee came up with the following ideas for ‘Guiding Principles’:

- Public Access
- Capitalize on water access
- Tasteful / Aesthetically pleasing
- Adequate marina facilities
- 18-hour community access

Gary Simmons said the Committee should try to reach consensus on statements and ideas.

John Svilarich asked, “Do we have general consensus?”

Sandy Krahn said it’s too difficult to prioritize.

Arnold then steered the discussion to the content of the Draft: NOTE: During this discussion, Charmaine Harvey suggested that all public comments be put into a separate document and become the cover page of the Public Comment packet. The Committee came to consensus that only WAC's recommendations to the Commissioners should be included in the Draft Summary. All public comment will be included in an Appendix to the Draft.

BUILT DEVELOPMENT

“Unique restaurants / shops with access to or river view”

Russell Chambers said that from an economic standpoint, the area needs to be developed in such a way so that it draws people. Needs a brand name.

John Svilarich reminded the Committee that Jack Miller stated that the development needs a brand name.

Sandy Krahn said while an ‘anchor’ is okay, we need a balance.

Gary Simmons – Doesn't want fast food. Need to add the word “quality” to the recommendation.

John Svilarich – Addressed big box stores, fast food, and strip malls. The concepts look at what's the best use. “It's not our job to look at Subways, etc.”

Sandy Krahn – Consider “quick food” for boaters.

Charmaine Harvey – Need to broaden the verbiage: “variety of quality shops.”

Final descriptive wording: “This rates high with WAC who expressed a preference for a variety of quality restaurants and shops with access to and/or view of the river.”

“Hotel with convention/conference center”

Gary Simmons – “If people want a convention center, Skamania Lodge is close by.” Need a quality hotel with conference and banquet facilities, large enough to fit the community's needs.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC is very supportive of a quality hotel with meeting / banquet facilities that fits the community's needs.”

“Services accessible from/on water”

Casey O’Dell – Heard it’s very important to maintain a boat launch.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC believes this is a high priority and favors access for both the local and boating communities.”

“Residential with retail below”

John Svilarich – Need guiding principles. “How much minutia do we want?”

Final descriptive wording: “WAC gives this a high priority.”

“Office buildings”

Gary Simmons – We want an 18-hour community.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC rates office space for businesses and services in the development as high and believes it will be popular.”

“Dry Storage”

Gary Simmons commented that demand would drive the need for dry storage.

Sandy Krahn said they should look 100 years down the road, and anticipate the possible need, and allow for it in the development.

Pat Schaeffer – Economics is going to drive it. Our message is already loud and clear: boats; launch; parking; and supporting businesses.

Paul Fearn – Propose to Commissioners that they need to come up with a viable 50-year plan with growth addressed.

Arnold – “I included dry storage in this category because it would be a prominent built feature.” Asked WAC: “Would you recommend it?”

Gary Simmons – This could be included under ‘marina related services.’ “Will the Washougal Marina be ready in 20 years? Probably not needed now.”

Sandy Krahn – We know *this* is overcrowded now.

John Svilarich – We’re talking long-term capacity. In other words, adequate recreational capacity now and in the future.

Gary Simmons – Consider wet *and* dry storage.

Paul Fearn – A more aesthetically pleasing Marina?

Final descriptive wording: Strike Dry Storage from list.

OUTDOOR FEATURES

“Natural surroundings with trails, amphitheatre, park, picnic facilities.”

Larry Blaufus – Do we want ‘centerpiece or gateway’ in the wording?

John Svilarich – Take out *all* explanatory language. Just leave the heading.

Arnold – Since the park, itself, seems to be a particular issue, we will discuss it in depth under ‘Unfinished Business.’

Roberta Tidland – A park as a ‘centerpiece’ in the hotel area would be a small park.

Paul Fearn – A ‘centerpiece’ might be on the edge of the development.

Arnold – Wants the WAC to come to consensus on this issue.

Gary Simmons – “Something like an ‘Olde Town Square’ could be a focal point; something to draw people to the area. If the park could be part of that focal point..., but unsure if we need to say that.”

Sandy Krahn – The park could be a multipurpose area / amphitheatre.

Paul Fearn – I envision a small amphitheatre, holding 100 people.

John Svilarich – We’re right back to where we started. The words ‘focal point’ should be the entire development. “I feel we’re telling them how to design it.”

Arnold – Hearing there are choices here to be considered by WAC. Will hold off on final wording for Outdoor Features for now, and will draft two versions.

Roberta Tidland – “We’ve talked about green areas throughout our discussions. I want to emphasize that *I’m* talking about the historical site.”

Charmaine Harvey – Feels the word ‘park’ should really be ‘park(s)’ in the Draft.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC wants parks and green spaces included as visible parts of the development.”

“Connectivity for pedestrians, bikes, autos and transit”

Gary Simmons – What about ‘alternate transportation’? We’re talking about connectivity to Camas and Washougal. A need for wide enough trails for street cars. If it’s not done now, it never will be. We really want to try to draw Washougal, Camas and the Port together. No specifics, just add ‘alternate transportation.’

John Svilarich – Disagree with ‘street cars’ because it’s a late add. There are greater venues for transportation issues.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC supports connectivity to Washougal and surrounding areas for pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles and various modes of transit.”

“Trails on water side of development”

Sandy Krahn – Add ‘with a natural connection to the river.’ A member responded that it already says ‘on water side of development.’

Final descriptive wording: “Natural connections to the river are popular with WAC.”

“Marina and supporting services”

Paul Fearn – Needs some wording added.

Sandy Krahn - Everything that’s done should be ‘environmentally friendly.’ Discussion ensued that State and Federal regulations already govern environmental standards.

Gary Simmons – Took exception to the wording ‘WAC understands the marina could be moved from its present location.’ He said that is well beyond WAC’s charge.

Russ Chambers – We need a launch ramp and essential parking. Both are mutually important, but not co-dependent. The launch ramp and the boat trailer parking could (and should) be some distance from the Marina and associated parking. Therefore, adequate launch ramp parking and visitor parking are two separate needs. Others joined in the discussion regarding ease of access to the Marina and services by people coming in with their boats.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC gives a high priority to the marina, with adequate parking for both launch ramp users and visitors as essential components, and ease of

access from boating public. WAC supports adequate wet and dry storage, along with capability to accommodate kayaks and canoes.”

ASPIRATIONS

“Year-round in/outdoor activities – weather friendly”

After a brief discussion, consensus was reached.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC supports activities that create an 18-hour community which encourages people to live, work and play year-round.”

“Signature development that reflects local flavor”

WAC had no changes to wording in Draft. [See “Aesthetically pleasing design” below for final descriptive wording.]

“Public Access to/from river”

WAC had no changes to wording in Draft.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC understands the importance of continuing public access to the river, as well as maintaining the public’s ability to see the river.”

“Aesthetically pleasing design of tasteful facilities, lighting, signage and landscaping”

WAC felt this should be combined with ‘Signature development’ topic.

Final descriptive wording, combining the two topics:

“Aesthetically pleasing design of tasteful facilities, lighting, signage and landscaping, with a theme that reflects local flavor.”

“WAC believes the project needs a signature theme that is well-thought-out, executed in a world class way, reflects elements of the local area, and complements the surrounding communities.”

“Fun, safe, comfortable place with recreational opportunities on water and land”

John Svilarich – As long as there are economic and cultural benefits; public gathering and events.

Final descriptive wording: “WAC favors a development that enhances the entire community and brings economic and cultural benefits, such as public gatherings and events.”

“No big box stores, strip malls, or fast food”

Pat Schaeffer – Objects to use of the wording “fast food.” Says economics will drive whether or not it’s in the development.

The Committee discussed the definition of “big box stores.”

Final descriptive wording: “WAC members urge this, although some say that brand name stores will draw people to the development.”

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

“Taking privately held property against the will of the property owner(s).”

Arnold – Asked Committee if they felt this was part of their charge.

Gary Simmons –. Thinks WAC *should* make a statement as to public and private property owners. If not, WAC would not be doing their job.

John Svilarich – Understood that any development would be done with whatever property the Port has at the time. “It’s not WAC’s determination, and we shouldn’t make a recommendation. The legislature is currently dealing with this very issue. This is not part of our mission statement.”

Roberta Tidland – “Well, I have an opinion and I will express my opinion.”

Gary Simmons – “I think we should express our opinion. WAC *should* express an opinion on the issue of forcibly ‘taking’ property.”

Arnold – Asked WAC if any agreed with Gary.

Paul Fearn – “We don’t know the background; we weren’t asked to do that. I have my own opinion, as well. Our recommendations apply to property owned by the Port, and to other parcels if and when they become available.”

Pat Schaeffer – Commented that WAC members could always go *individually* to the Commissioners with their opinions, but it wasn’t WAC’s place as a Committee to opine on this issue.

Consensus: Remove from recommendations.

“Communicating with current business operators about the development”

Pat Schaeffer – What does “involve” mean?

Paul Fearn – This is not our charge.

Gary Simmons – Feels strongly that it should be the Port’s place. Not our charge.

Consensus: “WAC feels the Port should communicate about waterfront developments with businesses now sited on Port property and with the Camas/Washougal business community.”

“The viability of the overall concept.”

Jennie Brown – Stated that all the recommendations translate into WAC’s belief in the viability of the project.

Paul Fearn – Agreed with Jennie, and said that all the studies that have been done, and all the other input that’s been received is part of the recommendations. “That means we believe the project is viable.”

Consensus: Remove from recommendations.

This concluded discussion of the first part of the Draft Summary.

Arnold then asked WAC if they wished to defer discussion of ‘History’ until their next meeting when he would have a fresh draft for them. Alternatively, he asked if they’d like to go beyond their usual 7:00 p.m. deadline. The consensus was to stay until they had finished the agenda.

Arnold next reviewed the sign-in sheet to determine how many people signed up to speak, and asked if anyone who wished to speak needed to leave before the Committee finished their discussions. One person raised his hand, so the Public Comment period was opened to receive his remarks.

Public Comments

Robert Guetter – Thanked WAC members. “I’m trying to be involved in the discussions. When we signed a lease, we signed it with the Port, now we have a lease with the developer. Why can’t current businesses have the option to buy the property they occupy? Why am I now under the thumb of the developer?” He then invited people to come and eat at The Puffin Café.

Casey O’Dell responded that he wanted Robert to stay. The audience clapped.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (continued)

“Most WAC members favor integrating the history of area into the design, rather than preserving the historic site itself.”

John Svilarich – Felt the statement was accurate in its intent, but misstated.

Russ Chambers – “What ‘history’ are we preserving?”

Roberta Tidland – “When you look at the frontage road to the center of the launch ramp, *that* equals the acreage on the historic register. That’s what has to be preserved.”

Arnold – Roberta is defining the 4-acre site as the ‘history.’ Is the Committee saying the 4-acre site is the ‘historical site?’

Paul Fearn – “The spot needs to be recognized. If what Roberta is saying is true, will the public want it improved? I’m confused. Roberta said the site was completely of historical significance. Roberta says the land, a small part, is of significance, when really the whole area is significant.”

Roberta Tidland – “It doesn’t follow that. The Port owns the property. The question is: Can we do this? Or that? The Port says ‘anything.’ For 27 years an ad hoc committee has worked to develop the historical site. Items put on the register were gotten rid of by the Port: artifacts, and the house torched. We have Port-owned property, and the Port has worked with people for 27 years. It *must be held* as historic evidence for all of Clark County to enjoy. We need ‘history of the area’ as the theme.”

Gary Simmons – “There are two very important aspects here: (1) the footprint that has been improved, which would be a great gateway to whatever is connected to it; and (2) the 3.88 acres. The park, itself, is still very much virgin land.”

Paul Fearn – To Roberta: “You said the Port destroyed artifacts.”

Roberta Tidland – “When the Port bought the land they bulldozed it. Now, there *is* an old silo base there. There are 6 apple trees left out of the original 13 trees. The original rose arbor was destroyed, and the current arbor is a replica. There are also some ornamental trees, and that is all that is left.”

Gary Simmons – Discussed the historical footprint. “We should figure out how we can preserve it and also develop the theme of Parker’s Landing, etc. We have 65 acres of historical significance.”

Arnold – First is the site, itself, and integrating it into the overall project. Secondly, is respecting the history of the entire area, which would be expressed not in a ‘site specific’ way, but in the *overall* project.

Paul Fearn – Believes history is the most important piece. “It can be so much more. The whole community knows the importance of the history of this area.”

Larry Blaufus – “The fact that it’s on the Registry is very important, but I can’t say ‘don’t touch it.’ Let’s enhance it. The Registry is a real big drawing card.”

Jennie Brown – “I’ve heard from Roberta Tidland that the site can’t be touched. She is adamant about it. If the developers create something interactive on the site and draw people to it, would that be amenable to the historic group? It’s a wonderful story and could be told in more expansive ways. Make it a focal point. If the park were razed, the whole thing would tank.”

Roberta Tidland – “I was surprised to be put on this Committee. It was at the 9th hour. Why?”

“In 1976, when the Port bought the property, the Port took 50 feet off the site with a bulldozer. The Marina Park buried the pilings of the original landing. After the Port took over the land and destroyed it, 1200 people signed a petition to save the site.”
[Roberta continued.]

John Svilarich – “The first sentence on this topic says it all: ‘Most WAC members favor integrating the history of the area into the design.’ The history is critical to us. To Roberta: If you had to give up a small part to get an enhanced park, would you agree?”
Roberta nodded.

Arnold – Summarized by saying he will integrate the two aspects of (1) overall history of area, and (2) enhancing historical understanding. He told Roberta that *all* the information provided by her and other WAC members would be part of the packet of material for the Commissioners’ consideration. He said he has a reasonably good handle on what WAC can say about the history, without getting prescriptive or into the design details. “I think we have enough to express a statement that will express the bulk of what we have to say.”

Consensus: “Most WAC members favor integrating the history of the area into the design and finding ways to preserve most, if not all, of the historic site and enhance public understanding of its importance.”

Public Comments (continued)

Gregg Warren – Chose to pass and would speak at a later meeting.

Gary Cole - Said, “Mainly, Marina and boat parking are two different things. Trailer boaters want the ability to travel elsewhere. Dry stack is not an option for travel trailer boater. We need plenty of trailer parking. I don’t trust the developer to understand that.” He said the BPA has land available, and golf cart corrals were an option. “You

plug them in at night and ride them during the day. It would mean enough parking to go well into the future.” He also stated that the three options shown on the website don’t address boaters.

Bill Ward – Concerned. He understood that WAC’s mission was to represent the public. He sees a dichotomy in the Draft report. “The public’s comments are buried in footnotes. I feel the public comments should be foremost. These (referring to the Draft) are all the opinions from WAC. The public has yet to be heard from.”

Arnold – Public comments are going to be included in the packet. WAC was appointed to make *its* recommendations to the Commissioners. They held the Open House to solicit public comments.

John Wagner – Thanked Roberta Tidland for all her work on the park over the years, and said, “I hope it doesn’t get paved.” He said, “I’m sorry to hear that WAC is not here to represent the public. The Commissioners are elected by the public. I feel WAC should have done this before 2005. Then, it was our land. Reading from the Option Agreement: ‘The exercise of this option shall be at the sole discretion of the developer.’” Asked WAC to read the public commentary. “When we were invited here, the pictures showed nothing. The developer serves to make money off public land. Been around here all my life. Why has our heritage been sold to the developers to pave over. Hope you will recommend that the business owners should have had bids on this.”

Marianne Guetter – Said that John Wagner said it all, but asked, “Does everyone know that the Marina Park is part of the Historic Park? 1200 signatures say ‘leave the park alone.’ I can’t see why WAC can ignore that. I don’t believe you speak for the public.”

Richard Hamby – “Wasn’t WAC appointed as a representative / cross-section of the public? Are you representing us or not?”

Bruce McCown – To Arnold: “You are paid by the developer, are you not?” Arnold replied: “No. By the Port.” Bruce continued: “I have one question: when should this development be done? The answer: Not now. Maybe 30 years down the road. What’s the rush? It’s because of the developers, the cronies of the Port Commissioners. I’m confounded that WAC is blatantly ignoring the public. You’re about to commit the worst blight on this area. This is the worst display of highhanded arrogance I’ve ever seen.”

Schedule of Upcoming WAC Meetings:

Wednesday, May 9th – 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Wednesday, May 30th – 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Next Steps:

Arnold said he will provide the Committee with another draft of the Summary of Recommendations to the Commissioners. He also said that the Committee's work will be very close to a conclusion at the next meeting.

Adjournment: Arnold adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

H:\RIVERWALK\WAC APRIL 25 07 Mtg Summary.doc[3/26/2009 11:12 AM]