

**May 2, 2006**

**Riverfront Board Meeting  
Minutes**

Members present: Wall, Green, Martin, Stacey, Klein, St. Clair, Darling

Staff: Herrigel (late)

Visitors: Gill Williams, David Evans Associates

**Minutes:**

The minutes for both the March and February meeting were approved 7-0.

**Concept Plan discussion:**

Dave Green asked Board members for their impressions of the boat ramp facilities and parks visited over the last few weeks. Discussion included permeable paving for parking areas, scale of regional boating facilities (OR City, Willamette Park, etc) vs the Riverfront Park, terraced seating and pavilion in Lake Oswego, etc.

Gill Williams described the four concept plan drawings (Options A-D) that he had drawn.

Comments and concerns from board:

- Green: we could loop parking to the north, similar to the concept shown on last fall's survey, rather than looping toward McLoughlin Blvd.
- Klein: What are we to do tonight? Green, response: pick the park elements that are critical to communicate to Council on May 16.
- Klein: I think we should close Jefferson access (and use only Washington) to decrease pedestrian car interaction along Trolley Trail.
- Wall: Can we just close Jefferson? Will ODOT let us? Green: ODOT would likely prefer fewer access points on McLoughlin, and the traffic light controlled intersection at Washington Street would be safer for trailers entering McLoughlin.
- St. Clair: Let's move all parking toward McLoughlin and have Washington access only (described a loop road with parking up close to McLoughlin). Also- put amphitheater between the parking lots to use that space or have the lower lot BE the amphitheater. Whatever we do should be usable year round (multi-purpose.)

Gill Williams then sketched a loop road on the south side of the existing boat ramp to illustrate how that might look and the space required. Gill also explained his concerns regarding the slope and grades in that area and how they might be addressed. (This option became known as Option E.)

Green: let's focus on parking between the creeks – how many spaces should we have?

- Green: is there enough parking in option B?
- Stacey: Not enough spaces because you can't get that many at the log dump
- Klein: The highest day use of the Jefferson St. ramp lately was 53 cars (3 out of 5 of which had trailers) and that was 2-3 weeks ago. (There are 40 actual spaces at the lot) (Klein counted cars at the lot for several weeks)
- Green: we shouldn't design for worst case parking that can accommodate all potential users on the days when recreational and fishing boats are all trying to use the boat ramp
- Wall: can cars use the trailers spaces? (Group: the signs say trailer use only but that is not enforced)
- St. Clair: Maybe spaces should convert from trailer to car use during the off season
- Darling: I like Option C. I like the amphitheater and we could use it as a parking lot seasonally. I like the multiple docks but want them to point north.
- Stacey: I like the modification that St. Clair came up with (loop road and parking up near McLoughlin Blvd.)

Green: Let's tally what everyone thinks we need:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Trailer Spaces Between the Creeks</u>	<u>Trailer Spaces at Log Dump</u>	<u>Car Spaces</u>
Darling	15	15	
St. Clair	10-12	16	2-4 (@Log dump)
Stacey	25	cars	
Wall	10	16	
Martin	12	8-10	8-10 (@Log dump)
Klein	13	15	cars somewhere
Green	8-10	12	cars (@Log dump)

Darling: We could average spaces and see what we have (average is 13.5 spaces)

St. Clair: I like the turning and parking aspects of the loop road idea.

Stacey: That's what the survey said people wanted – more parking.

Green: It eats up most of the greenspace on the south side of the ramp

Martin: The loop road does pull parking off the river.

Green: If that's what you want – it will be very similar to what you have right now!

St.Clair: I disagree. I think this provides multiple amenities and meets many goals. I think it's more usable than we have right now.

Klein: I concur with Shane – it's more functional.

Green asked if all were supportive of St. Clair's concept to put lot with loop road near McLoughlin. Most agreed. Then there was some discussion regarding the possibility of moving this parking to another location in the future. Green noted that if you build this extensive parking lot and ramp, you've built a boating facility, and it will never be relocated.

St. Clair: I think you can do a lot with this space.

Wall: What do you like, Dave?

Green: I'd move a limited number of trailer spaces up to McLoughlin and have an expanse of green between the parking lot and the water like we saw in Lake Oswego.

Martin: Question re: reorienting spaces near McLoughlin in the opposite direction.

Group agreed that Jefferson access should be closed. Stacey said he wasn't sure (?).

Williams: Having the amphitheatre between the parking lots is not advisable. It won't allow the amphitheater to become a destination for events.

Green: It's okay to watch the Christmas Ships but it won't be a draw for other events.

Group agreed that they wanted a dock at the log dump location and a pedestrian bridge from the log dump across Kellogg Creek.

Green: Looks like the pull through loop described by Shane is attractive to all?

So here's what I'm hearing:

- 13-14 trailer spaces between creeks
- 10 trailer spaces at log dump
- Close Jefferson access
- Attach dock for non-motorized boats to dock between the creeks
- All parking spaces should be made with pavers (not asphalt)
- Road should be paved
- Try to put bathroom underground

Some discussion ensued about the possible location of the Sunday market. Wall: Does Sunday Market have to be on parking area or could it also go on the green area along McLoughlin Blvd. north of the present day Jefferson Street ramp Access? Discussion concluded that there would be area available to accommodate the market.

**Darling: Motioned to approve the consensus of 13-14 spaces between the creek (with 2 ADA spaces for cars and two ADA trailer spots) and 10 trailer spaces and several car spaces at the log dump.**

Stacey: Second the motion.

Discussion:

- How many car spots? Minimum of 10.
- Trailer spots for trailers only and change the signs later in season (it was noted that this was policy decision that should be left to City)
- We should recommend a policy that 13-14 spaces be dedicated to trailers during the fishing season and that they be used otherwise during off season.
- Wall: When's the "on" season?
- Stacey: January to May from sunrise to sunset

**Motion was modified to be 14 spaces for trailers (including 2 ADA trailer spots) plus 2 ADA car spots between the creeks, 10 trailer spaces at the log dump and other car spots to be placed within the loop road between the creeks as feasible.**

**Vote was taken: 7 – 0**

Green: All are ok with closing Jefferson?

All agreed that closing the Jefferson access to McLoughlin was preferred if ramp could be connected directly to the log dump area through the park.

Green: So, Gill will draft this conceptual plan (Option E) and get it to us mid week next week. Herrigel will then send to Council and include in the agenda packet for May 16<sup>th</sup>.

Green then handed out a Consensus Scale, ranking degrees of support for the option selected. Green: Using this consensus scale (see attached), I'd like each of you to tell the group where you are with the vote we just took.

Stacey: 4  
Darling: 1  
St. Clair: 1  
Wall: 2  
Martin: 2  
Klein: 1  
Green: 3

Key: 1 Wholeheartedly agree  
2 Good idea  
3 Supportive  
4 Reservations about decision, but can set them aside  
5 Serious concerns, but will support majority decision  
6 Cannot participate in and will speak against the decision

Green: Let's talk about the Marine Board funding issue. Do we want to send a message to Council regarding limits or constraints regarding Oregon Marine Board funds?

Wall: The shorter the term of the agreement with OMB the better off you are.

Stacey: 20 years. That's the term.

St. Clair: If it doesn't hurt us (taking their money) why not take it?

Green: With the uncertainty of the Kellogg Creek WWTP and the possibility of relocating the ramp in the future, we don't want to box ourselves in again. If you had another option, would you really choose to put the boat ramp right there in the middle of the park?

Suggestion: maybe we could have OMB fund other amenities and not the boat ramp specifically.

Klein: I'd like to have the flexibility to move the ramp within the next ten years if we are able to.

**Motion: The Riverfront Board recommends a limit of 10 years term for any agreement signed for funding for the boat ramp in its current location.**

**Second.**

**Vote: 6 (yes) 1 (no) (Stacey opposed)**

Green: Thanks to all for your hard work and hope all will be present at the May 16 Council work session.