

WATERFRONT CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"WAC"

MEETING SUMMARY

MAY 9, 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

Ashley Eckman

Paul Fearn

Charmaine Harvey

Sandy Krahn

Pat Sheaffer

Gary Simmons

John Svilarich

Roberta Tidland

Barbe West

Excused Absences

Casey O'Dell

Arnold Cogan, Facilitator, opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m., and welcomed everyone. He announced that the meeting was being recorded by the Port. Audience member Marianne Guetter stated she'd like to record the meeting.

Arnold then read a prepared statement in response to feedback from his comments at the April 25th WAC meeting regarding WAC representing public opinion. A copy of that statement was distributed to the WAC members, and is also attached to this Meeting Summary. Arnold asked WAC if they had any comments about the statement.

Larry Blaufus said he was pleased and that it reflected his thoughts, as well.

Roberta Tidland said she feels the public has been made to understand that WAC takes their comments very seriously.

Review:

The Meeting Summary from April 25, 2007 was approved.

[NOTE: After the meeting was adjourned, Charmaine Harvey brought to Mary's attention a change that should be made to the April 25th Summary: Top of Page 10 should be amended to read:

"Involving current business operators in development discussions"

Charmaine Harvey – Thought WAC's recommendations should include mention of businesses currently sited on Port property and that it would be a good idea to involve them in discussions 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.

After discussion, consensus was reached that a new recommendation should be added:

“Communicating with current business operators about the development”

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

End of amendment to April 25th Meeting Summary.]

[*NOTE: Changes added by WAC during this meeting are designated with an * below.]*

Discussion of Three Reports:

1. SECOND DRAFT - RECOMMENDATIONS FROM WAC– REVISED MAY 2, 2007

Arnold explained that this Draft contained only the recommendations from WAC and that the public’s comments were moved to a separate document. He also remarked that the same three headings were used in both documents: Built Development, Outdoor Features, and Aspirations.

*Barbe West – Suggested three new headings that would tie in the recommendations. She felt the current headings “separated” the features too much. She suggested *Economic Environment; Natural Environment; and Social Environment.*

Arnold asked Barbe to email him the three new titles with brief descriptions of each and he would share that information with the Committee members.

John Svilarich – If the Committee is able to finalize the recommendations tonight, there’s no need for a meeting to finalize the titles.

Arnold agreed and opened the discussion.

BUILT DEVELOPMENT

Unique restaurants / shops with access to or river view

- This rates high with WAC who express a preference for a variety of quality restaurants and shops with access to and / or view of the river.

Consensus: No changes.

Hotel with convention / conference center

- WAC is very supportive of a quality hotel with meeting / banquet facilities that fit the community's needs.

Consensus: No changes.

Services accessible from / on water

- WAC believes this is a high priority and favors access for both the local and boating communities.

Consensus: No changes.

Residential with retail below

- WAC gives this a high priority.

Roberta Tidland – Gives this medium priority. Said many are concerned that there has been the intention from the beginning to put condos with retail below on the far west end of the development. “I object.”

Consensus: No changes.

Office buildings

- WAC rates office space for businesses and services in the development as high and believes it will be popular.

Roberta Tidland – Thought the Committee had concerns about height.

John Svilarich – This is covered in the “public access and views” wording. We’re telling the developer that access and views are important.

Gary Simmons – Asked if there’s a code covering height in the zoning ordinance.

John McKibbin – Current zoning is Highway Commercial and allows 75 ft. In the efforts to have the zoning changed to Mixed-Use, height issues will be addressed.

There was a brief discussion on how many stories would create a problem, and the conclusion was that it would depend on the ceiling height of each floor and other factors before having an answer to that question.

Ashley Eckman – Are we allowed to give measurements in our recommendations?

Arnold responded that the Committee has tried to stay away from design limitations.

Ashley Eckman – Would it be too much to ask not to limit creative genius? Can we try to accommodate everybody? Don't want to step on anyone's toes.

Charmaine Harvey – No design limitations; just recommendations, such as 'keep the views.'

Arnold – If the architect was here, he would probably reiterate that 2/3 of the site would be open space, while 1/3 would be built development.

Gary Simmons – The 'Aspirations' section covers this.

Charmaine Harvey – It's important to keep views, like Mt. Hood.

John Svilarich – Less is more. I'd hope the Commissioners are wise enough to plan this project. Let's give them a little credit.

Charmaine Harvey – Could include wording such as 'We, as WAC members, feel we should preserve ___ and ___'. "We don't want to walk away without saying 'preserve.'"

Sandy Krahn – Liked the use of the word 'preserve.'

John Svilarich – Hates 'preserve.' The Committee talked about this last time and came up with extra verbiage. We're muddling up the work product and taking away from the hard work we did last time. Asked, 'If anyone can tell me *what* to preserve...?'

Sandy Krahn – Asked Charmaine, 'What do we want to preserve?'

Charmaine Harvey – Suggested it be discussed since it keeps coming up.

Russ Chambers – What view are we talking about? Hwy 14? Oak Park? From a new building on site? Can't see the Columbia River now from Hwy 14 between Union and 15th. That's not going to change. Said he's personally having trouble with 'value the view.' Said, "It's way too ambiguous. Anyone can come along once the project is complete and say 'you said this, and look what happened.' There's nothing keeping people from building a 6-story building whether this goes forward or not."

Arnold – Views are dealt with under 'Aspirations.'

John Svilarich – Elaborated on Arnold's comment and said 'views' are mentioned several places under 'Aspirations.'

Arnold – This conversation seems to be bigger than the view of the River, itself. Seems to be about Mt. Hood and other vistas – the larger view. ‘View’ doesn’t really fit under the section.

Gary Simmons – What we’re really talking about is high-density buildings. If we include ‘views’ that would block high-density buildings.

Arnold – Could add ‘protect ability to view mountains and surrounding areas.’ Does this express your views?

John Svilarich – Suggested putting ‘maximize view opportunities’ under ‘Aspirations.’

Gary Simmons – Maximize for who?

John Svilarich – This whole thing is a compromise – where no one gets exactly what they want. Enhanced views are part of the guiding principles we already came up with.

Larry Blaufus – It just makes economic sense for the developers because more views mean more money.

*Consensus:

Add ‘maximize view opportunities’ under Aspirations.

OUTDOOR FEATURES

Natural surroundings with trails, amphitheatre, park, picnic facilities

- WAC wants parks and green spaces included as visible parts of the development.

Barbe West – Asked, ‘Are we being clear about amphitheatres?’ Larry Blaufus responded, ‘Yes.’

Consensus: No changes.

Connectivity for pedestrians, bikes, autos and transit

- WAC supports connectivity to Washougal and surrounding areas for pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles and various modes of transit.

Russ Chambers – Add ‘Washougal *and Camas* and surrounding areas...’

*Consensus: Add ‘Camas’ to wording.

Trails on water side of development

- Natural connections to the river area are popular with the WAC.

There was discussion on changing the wording to emphasize the importance of this.

*Consensus: Change ‘popular with’ to ‘very important to’.

Marina and supporting services

- 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.

Roberta Tidland – Don’t feel comfortable promoting dry storage as a high priority.

Sandy Krahn – We’re talking long-term.

Arnold explained that the dry storage was ‘supported’ by WAC.

Paul Fearn – What happened to WAC’s discussion about a 50-year plan? Thought we were going to recommend to the Commissioners that they come up with a 50-year plan for a boat launch.

John Svilarich – WAC decided that they should plan for long-term and maximum capacity, not a ‘50-year plan.’

Paul Fearn – Current marina is overflowing; don’t we want some sort of growth plan for the marina to be included in this development, as opposed to dry storage?

John Svilarich – I think we would be negating the plan if we try to define ‘long-term.’

Paul Fearn – Would like to see it in the recommendations. We have not really commented on the water side. There’s a high demand for wet storage. Should we also be talking about expansion of the Marina?

John Svilarich – A huge plan for the marina is needed. That’s a bigger job than WAC can do.

Pat Schaeffer – Can’t plan my business for 5 years, let along 50 years.

Paul Fearn – Use ‘long-term.’

Pat Schaeffer – Ten years from now, Lady Island might be the marina.

Paul Fearn – Need to be working on a solution if we take away all the parking.

Sandy Krahn – There could be 2 marinas.

Paul Fearn – It's possible.

Jennie Brown – Isn't that a function of the Port Commissioners?

Paul Fearn – We need to recommend it if the parking goes away.

Pat Schaeffer – I would be satisfied if it provided for adequate growth.

Paul Fearn – It's our duty to recommend it.

John Svilarich – How about, 'long-term planning for adequate marina capacity and services is imperative'?

Paul Fearn – If this development fails, I want it on record that we recommended it.

Barbe West – *All* of what we've done should be long term. Can we frame it that way in the introduction?

*Consensus: Add 'Long-term planning for adequate marina capacity and services is imperative.' Also, include language in the introduction that addresses the issue that all of WAC's recommendations are made with long-term use of the area in mind.

ASPIRATIONS

Integrate history of the waterfront area into the design and preserve the national historic site.

- 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.

Roberta Tidland – We've just been discussing building. We want to be sure they don't build out. I've invited the architect that PLPAC has been using, Terry Harder, and he will present also. We've discussed and 'cussed' this historic site. I want to give you a brief history.

Arnold – Is this the same material we have heard before?

Roberta Tidland – I've added to it.

John Svilarich – This sounds like a separate agenda item.

Pat Sheaffer – We've already heard the history.

Roberta Tidland – You may or may not be able to discuss it.

John Svilarich – That's not up to me. This is not an appropriate time on the agenda, if it were up to me.

Arnold – Is this for additional consideration? To change the wording?

Roberta Tidland – Mentioned use of the words 'integrate' 'preserve' and 'most of site.' She doesn't approve of their use.

Arnold – We need to keep with the agenda; do you want to modify the language?

Roberta Tidland – It could change.

John Svilarich – I would want to hear the changes suggested *before* I hear the evidence that supports the changes.

Arnold – If you have new wording to suggest, that's okay.

Roberta Tidland – I would like to change your understanding of the historic site by telling you again of the history, briefly. [Roberta continued.]

Arnold – Interrupting. Having the history repeated is not fair to other members of the Committee.

Roberta Tidland – It is *your* national historic site. It is *not* Port property. Your job is a lie. Paul (Fearn), you asked for the truth. It's only fair that you understand that people have worked for 30 years to preserve that historic site. I asked Terry Harder to build the Van Vleet Plaza that commemorates the pioneers of this area.

Arnold – Interrupting. What language do you want to change?

Roberta Tidland – I have an issue with 'integrate the history into the design' and 'finding ways to preserve most, if not all, of the historic site'. Would like to add 'exclude Parkersville National Historic site' to the wording.

Arnold – What is the Committee's thinking on this?

Gary Simmons – To clarify: You want to exclude the historic site?

Roberta Tidland – Yes. It is absolutely necessary.

Pat Sheaffer – I won't agree to that.

Arnold – You are proposing to exclude Parkersville Historic Site?

Gary Simmons – Are you talking about the 3.88 acres? Roberta nodded.

Gary continued: We had quite a bit of discussion on this. Were we not in consensus that we would not touch the 1.49 acres? We were talking about the overall 65 acres to be developed, with a historical aspect brought into the whole project. The most important historical piece has been left out, and that's the Native American history. That should also be included.

Arnold – I see that we have two issues here: Integrate history into the whole site by (1) making it part of the development; or (2) having a separate site.

Roberta Tidland – There are not two different choices. Integrating the history into the development is important. The National Historic Site is very prized and special.

Arnold – We're trying to understand.

Roberta Tidland – I would like to leave out the 'exclude' language, if WAC understands that it is not to include it.

Pat Sheaffer – What *is* the 'national historic site'?

John Svilarich – What happened to our discussion at the last meeting? We reached a compromise. Now, we're talking about changing the whole dynamic. I cannot agree.

Paul Fearn – I can't go along with it.

Sandy Krahn – We talked about moving the park.

Paul Fearn – When given a boundary like we 'can't touch it', I have to back off.

Pat Sheaffer – What's wrong with the current wording?

Arnold – I think I understand what Roberta is saying.

Ashley Eckman – I don't understand what the problem is.

John Svilarich – We're going to be here a long time if you are looking to change this. We worked hard on this. Aren't the words fine?

Arnold – I’m hearing a consensus that what is here is what the WAC’s going to support.

Consensus: No changes.

Year-round in/outdoor activities-weather friendly

- WAC supports activities that create an 18-hour community which encourages people to live, work and play year-round.

Consensus: No changes.

Public access to / from river

- WAC understands the importance of continuing public access to the river as well as maintaining the public’s ability to see the river.

Consensus: No changes.

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.

Consensus: No changes.

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

- WAC favors a development that enhances the entire community and brings economic and cultural benefits, such as public gatherings and events.

Consensus: No changes.

No big box stores or strip malls

- WAC members urge this, although some say that brand name stores will draw people to the development.

Consensus: No changes.

Communicating with current business operators about the development

- WAC feels the Port should communicate about waterfront developments with businesses now sited on Port property and with the Camas-Washougal business community.

Consensus: No changes.

2. DRAFT APPENDIX TO WAC RECOMMENDATIONS – SUMMARY OF PUBLIC OPINION / INPUT – REVISED MAY 2, 2007

Next, Arnold introduced a new draft document entitled ‘Appendix to WAC Recommendations – Summary of Public Opinion / Input’. The Committee went through this document, which was outlined using the same three categories: Built Development; Outdoor Features; and Aspirations.

John Svilarich – Concerned that several of the comments are gross generalizations, and felt they should be clarified. His personal experience at the Open House was that some items ‘not supported’ by public opinion in the document were, in fact, supported by those he spoke with at the Open House.

Arnold explained that this would be discussed in the next document.

BUILT DEVELOPMENT

Russ Chambers – There is a difference between ‘dry stack storage’ and ‘dry storage.’

*Consensus: Under Built Development, change the heading ‘Dry storage’ to ‘Dry storage and Dry-stack storage’

OUTDOOR FEATURES

Consensus: No changes.

ASPIRATIONS

Consensus: No changes.

3. DRAFT FINAL WORK PRODUCT – REVISED MAY 7, 2007

At this point in the meeting, Arnold asked the Committee for their comments on the May 7th draft of the Final Work Product.

Arnold – This is what the Commissioners are going to get. Within the next 2 weeks, WAC will receive an email of the entire package that will ultimately go to the Port.

John Svilarich – Have you given any more thought to Barbe’s suggestion about the new headings?

Pat Sheaffer – I thought it had a good ring to it.

Arnold – She will send them to me and I will distribute them to WAC.

Next, Arnold explained what would be included in the bulleted items under ‘Appendix’:

- Committee meeting agendas and summaries – All will be included in their entirety.
- Reference materials – Undecided on how to include these; may be bibliographies.
- *Summary of comments, etc. – This will be changed to “‘Compilation’ of comments, etc.” and Arnold said this will include 100% of what WAC heard at the Open House, received through the U.S. Mail, and via email.

Russ Chambers – The Open House compilation – will that be 100% of what we heard from the public?

Arnold – Yes. And, now that I think about all the work that’s already been done using the three current headings, we will be continuing to use those, but can use Barbe’s suggested categories in the summary.

*Barbe West – Would like included ‘Everything should be looked at from a long-range point of view.’ She continued, ‘When I read a report, I like to know the point, the purpose at the beginning. An executive summary wouldn’t be appropriate.’

Sandy Krahn – Can we move No. 4 ‘Recommendations of the WAC’ to No. 2?

Arnold – Great suggestion.

Russ Chambers – Talking about the complete process and consensus, should we say ‘overwhelming majority’ or ‘consensus’? Or are we good?

Arnold – Other groups I have worked with have discussed the definition of ‘consensus’ at length. Consensus is a result that everyone can live with. You may not get 100%, but you got a large percentage.

Sandy Krahn – So, it’s the same definition as ‘majority’?

Barbe West – But we don’t vote.

Arnold – Voting is cumbersome and is generally not necessary. Outside of a few issues, everyone has been pretty clear.

Russ Chambers – Is everyone going to walk out of the room saying ‘I’m okay with this.’ Are we okay with the process?

Pat Sheaffer – That’s what consensus is all about: some people are, and some people aren’t.

John Svilarich – I think most people are happy with most of the stuff most of the time. There are other avenues to make my point if I disagree strongly. We've all been heard. Now we have to make a statement. We're not all 100%.

Sandy Krahn – To Russ: Are you asking for more time?

Russ Chambers – We are operating under consensus. I can walk out the door and say I'm okay. If everyone can't, then we're not finished.

John Svilarich – Russ is asking a rhetorical question.

Russ Chambers – I don't want to go out there and hear negative feedback from WAC members.

Arnold – If some one member has a serious issue with us, then....

Russ Chambers – Then they can use a different mode.

Arnold – Does this close the subject?

*Consensus: Changes to be made:

1. The second bullet under "1. Introduction" be corrected to read "WAC's mission".
2. Make 'Recommendations of the WAC' the new No. 2.
3. Use Barbe's suggested new headings in the Summary.

Public Comment

Bruce McCown – Can I ask WAC a question? If the developers ignore everything you recommend, what remedies do we have available?

Pat Sheaffer – You're asking the wrong people.

Arnold – the City and the Port would have to answer that question.

Bruce McCown – So, you have no 'teeth'?

Arnold – We're an advisory committee to the Port Commission.

Bruce McCown – Your final report is an abomination. Why are we rushing? This should be voted on by the citizens. My question: Is there any reason to *do* the development? You have completely given away the store and compiled a toothless document giving them complete and total control. The public is saying we don't want this at all. Greed is not a good reason to give away a public treasure.

Richard Hamby – You're not giving detailed enough recommendations. Things with a lot of economic viability would not be good for the community. It could be a privatized marina. You need to correct one of your documents that reads 'natural historic site.' It should be 'national historic site.'

Bill Ward – Nothing to add.

Jeff Guard – Thanked the Committee for their work. It's a tough job. I sat here and watched an advisory committee get stabbed in the back. You do represent the public just as much as any elected official – elected by the people – and stewards of our tax dollars. You're never going to define 'view.' It's all individual perception. You're never going to be able to preserve every bit of it. As far as the historic site, I agree with Roberta. As a member of Concerned Citizens in Action, our main focus has been the historic site. PLPAC has already accommodated the Port by having the RV dump station and other things on the site. Move the site? You cannot move a national historic site. It would be like moving Plymouth Rock. I hope the Committee's work is done with the same degree of principle and integrity that was built into the Gorge Act. Make sure the public has something to enjoy. We're not against development. Everyone has a different idea of what is best for the area.

Margaret Tweet – I'm against eminent domain, but don't know if WAC is the body I should address with those concerns. It's interesting that the only people appointed to this Committee were the ones that were open to the idea. That was not a good idea to select people that were in favor of it. Your recommendations are already skewed. Rather than having a development committee, the least you could have done is put a sign out on the highway 'port for sale.' Why is there no bidding process here? More ideas bring a lot of refinement. No need for a vote? On this Committee? I read this will cost \$350 million. No need for a vote? If it was put to a vote, I believe it would go down in flames. What would \$350 million do to our tax bill? Own tax bill has gone up. When I shop, I don't ask 'what would I like?' – I ask 'what can I afford?' Is anyone asking 'What can we afford?' I don't see how you can answer that. Is the \$350 million all public funds? Will the public ever be able to vote on this?

Arnold – Both issues are not within the province of WAC. Can be directed to Sheldon, the Commissioners, or the developers.

Gary Simmons – As far as how the Committee was selected, I can only speak for myself. In no way, shape or form did I put on the application that I was in favor of the development. I had two reasons to apply: (1) I wanted to see what was being proposed; and (2) I was against it; absolutely not for the development.

Arnold – To Margaret Tweet: I'm sure you'd hear similar stories from other WAC members.

Joe Levesque – Eight weeks ago, I asked who took care of economics. I wrote a letter to the Port offering to save them \$10 million. They turned me down. I'm not against development. At your next meeting, or any other meeting, the first thing you should do is pledge allegiance to the flag. I wear this hat for buddies that didn't make it.

There are risks outside the box that you aren't addressing. That agreement is all in favor of the developers. The Port is giving a lot away. That agreement has to be modified. I met John McKibbin; he's going a good job. That agreement is like a noose around the neck and there are only three things you can do with it: tighten it, remove it, or modify it. Need to modify the agreement so it's a 50/50 deal. The developer has all the aces; calls all the shots. The historic site has support. The parking is crowded. I'm not against development. If it was my deal I could make this whole thing happen with no money, because the land is free and clear. Other risks are not being addressed. The attorney who prepared this either know exactly what he was doing, or he didn't know. I'm in favor of development.

Terry Harder – I apologize because this is the first time I have been to a WAC meeting and, looking at it from a designer's viewpoint, I'm a little concerned about the ambiguity. "Unique" – don't know definition; you could be more concise. Who are we developing this for? "Connectivity" – Need more information on vehicular traffic: consolidated or spread throughout? "Pedestrians" – Walk ways? Plazas? Outdoor seating? "Green space" – Need more detail. "Natural connection to the river" – No idea what natural or unnatural are. With the language specific to the historic park, I really take issue. Instead of 'integrate the history' I think you want to say 'incorporate' the history. Otherwise, you mean to have small wooden structures throughout. "Signature theme" – Don't think there needs to be a signature theme. We're not a Williamsburg. Don't create false history. I would strike 'integrate history into the design.' Don't think that's what you mean. I think you mean it should be sensitive to the historic site. I think you don't want to exclude the site. This development needs to be respectful of it; work around it; be sensitive to it; enhance the site. You guys finally did something right when you added 'strive to enhance.'

Arnold asked Terry for his written comments.

Marianne Guetter – Commented on Joe Levesque's statements, on the agreement, and on the gifting of public assets. "The Marina could be sold if it determines it's not feasible. Are you all okay with this? It's part of the deal."

Next Steps:

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

Arnold initiated a discussion about a special meeting with the Commissioners to present WAC's recommendations. While not everyone on the Committee will be able to attend, those that can, will do so. The meeting was confirmed for: Wednesday, June 6th at 5:00 p.m.

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