Board of Directors Meeting  
Thursday, May 30, 2019  
Oregon Zoo – Sunset Room  
MINUTES

Attendees:
Kerry Ayres-Palanuk – TriMet  
Steve Cole – at large  
Joe Furia – World Forestry Center (“WFC”)  
Kathy Goeddel – Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association  
Anna Goldrich – Hoyt Arboretum Friends (“HAF”)  
Cynthia Haruyama – Portland Japanese Garden (“PJG”) via conference call  
Adena Long – Portland Parks & Recreation (“PPR”)  
Dave Malcolm – Sylvan Highlands Neighborhood Association  
Don Moore – Oregon Zoo (“OZ”)  
Ruth Shelly – Portland Children’s Museum (“PCM”)

Visitors:
Karissa Agabon – Explore Washington Park (“EWP”)  
Danny Dunn – EWP  
Hannah Bogenreuther – EWP  
Alex Page – EWP  
Victor Sanders – PPR  
Heather Back – Metro  
Utpal Passi – OZ  
Marcia Sinclair – OZ  
Ivan Ratcliff – OZ  
Chuck Wiley –WFC

Absent:
Heather McCarey – EWP

The meeting commenced at 8:04 am. Don chaired the meeting with a quorum present.

Announcements:
• Don intends to get the Board tickets to at least one Zoo concert this summer.

Transportation Survey Results
Alex went over highlights of EWP’s 2018 survey data. In July the 2019 survey will be conducted. There was an increase in attendance overall, while reducing private vehicles coming into the Park. There was a slight decrease in transit ridership this year but it seemed to be made up with car-share increase. EWP has the capability to look at each venue’s data specifically.

Looking at trips by origin there is nothing surprising. Tourists utilize car-share and locals tend to drive private vehicles. The City of Portland origin data mirrors what the Park sees. Another good trend is an increase in the number of visitors going to multiple venues. Alex attributed this to multiple variables – an increase in intrapark shuttle ridership and coordinated messaging efforts between the venues. PCM
and Rose Garden saw a decrease in transit ridership as opposed to the rest of the venues. In 2017, PCM had a 16% transit mode split which decreased to 13% in 2018. This decrease can be explained by decreased attendance.

Dave clarified that ‘active’ mode split meant biking and walking. Passi noted that because this was only a peak season survey there wouldn’t be any data for the rest of the year e.g., ZooLights. Alex noted ZooLights had its own separate survey. EWP’s peak season surveying takes place over one month.

Danny clarified 200 people per venue was the goal. EWP has budgeted off-peak season surveying for this upcoming fiscal year. Don noted that seeing how overflow parking fits into the survey would be helpful.

Alex reviewed mode split in terms of intrapark shuttle use. Data reflected that a third of Park visitors rode the shuttle and of those who did 41% drove to the Park. There were about 126,000 shuttle users. This year there’s been an increase almost every single day. MTR will have hard numbers.

Many domestic and international tourists ride the shuttle. 54.6% of shuttle users were nonlocal, domestic users. The majority of users rode the shuttle between 1:00-4:00 pm daily. This year, service times were adjusted from 11:00-15:00 to 12:00-16:00 to reflect that. Dave asked if the maximum amount of riders in an hour was dependent on the capacity of the shuttle. Alex said that sometimes it is dependent on traffic and that EWP sees back-ups that affect the shuttle maximum.

At the moment, five shuttles are the maximum amount on duty. EWP could do six shuttles but it would potentially add to the congestion problem. Generally, there are not more than three shuttles running at 9:00-10:00 am.

Regarding demographics, diversity of ethnicity is lower than the rest of the region. Specifically, African-American and Hispanic visitors are less represented in the Park. Family make-ups show a close-to-even split between adults and children. The private vehicle passenger count average is 3.5 people per vehicle.

Looking at our ratings, the Park has four (out of five) stars as a whole, this was broken down by travel experience according to the main venue that was visited. 1.6% of shuttle riders were dissatisfied. Alex asked that the Board let EWP know if any questions should be added, taken away or amended for this year’s survey. Alex is currently evaluating what the questions are, how they are worded, the tools used to ask, etc.

Dave asked if EWP would do an off-peak survey. EWP has budgeted off-peak season surveying for this upcoming fiscal year. Don noted that seeing how overflow parking fits into the survey would be helpful.

Ruth mentioned that PCM is trying to figure out what is preventing people from coming to the Park at all, whether it is traffic, access or other reasons. She asked if the travel experience question was door to door or specifically within the Park. Alex said it was very general – something like ‘how is your travel experience getting to the Park’. Ruth asked if there was a way to correlate city-wide traffic with attendance numbers.

Don pointed out that Dave and Ruth are asking the same questions that were asked last year. It’s great to ask people about their experiences when they are already here but across the cultural institutions the data is flat. Trying to figure out why people are not coming and who isn’t coming are questions no one has been able to answer well. Ruth said that it doesn’t necessarily have much to do with the survey as the problem goes beyond the Park. Alex said that he was looking into Metro data and also hopes the DEI committee can help to answer those questions.

Anna asked who conducted the survey. Alex said that EWP outsources with contracted surveyors and flaggers and hopes to have more seasonal in-house staffing. Anna reminded the Board that if it desired...
the survey done at different times of the year, more resources need to be allocated.

Adena suggested looking into PBOT’s data in regard to juxtaposing traffic counts with survey results. There may be a correlation between heavy traffic days and how people are surveyed. Dave said Oregon Department of Transportation (“ODOT”) data might be a good source as well. Adena said that sometimes ODOT only does it periodically; however, EWP may be able to request ODOT to do it at the same time as the survey.

Marcia thought that Heather was working with Metro transportation staff. She wondered if it would be worthwhile to partner with other Portland cultural institutions (e.g., OMSI or the Chinese Garden) to see if they are having similar issues.

Alex noted that the survey could be given to venue members year-round but the most useful data would come from asking people who have never been here or have only been here once or twice. Joe asked if EWP used a tablet that auto-generates or auto-uploads survey results. When discussing limited resources and time constraints tablets would be a little more expensive on the front end but might be worthwhile. Alex said that EWP uses tablets, but the current software is slow and difficult to set-up on the back end. They are looking at other data collection options. It operates off-line so data upload is not automatic.

Passi asked if EWP has thought about having a static link, perhaps on the shuttle or with Parking Kitty. He mentioned that OZ does a biweekly survey. Through its website, OZ gets qualitative data as well. They also had focus groups with members who chose not to renew or people who bought a membership but only came one time. The OZ survey is 21 questions and they get so many responses they do not need anymore.

Don wanted to do the survey more as a group because this difficult question is bigger than the Park. He mentioned that the Metro regional research team is partially responsible for looking at Highway 26 and that EWP doesn’t have to do it alone. Alex noted that the Transportation Advisory Committee is meeting soon and to give any feedback about the survey questions to their representatives.

**EWP Opportunities**

EWP attended the Greater Portland Tech Challenge which was an opportunity to discuss EWP’s data collection methods with partners. While there was no direct partnership from the Challenge, there is a potential partnership with University of Oregon (“UO”) who heard EWP’s pitch and is interested in applying for a National Science Foundation grant. UO would be the primary and EWP would deliver data to them for analysis (vehicle, Uber and Lyft, e-scooter, bike share etc.). Heather will soon ask for letters of support to apply for this grant. EWP is particularly interested about data surrounding Transportation Network Companies (“TNC”) like Uber and Lyft. Such date might give insight as to if reduced parking revenue is a side effect of TNC growth. Knowing if there is a correlation between such data will help the Board to reevaluate if EWP needs to diversify its revenue streams. Don asked where the administrative costs would go if EWP worked with a university. The University of Oregon has a 45% administration fee.

Ruth asked for clarification on Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”). Victor explained that TDM included the programming to help reduce demand for private vehicle trips and increasing it for other transportation options.
Don asked if TDM work in the Park was mostly looking at peak pricing changes or if it encompassed more. Victor said that TDM covers much more than just pricing and include things like transit frequency, transit capacity and other things.

Heather is trying to broker a deal with MTR and PGE, to obtain a grant via PGE to bring electric vehicles/shuttles to the Park. MTR’s president visited from Seattle to meet regarding this potential opportunity. Pursuing this concept may mean adding a couple years to EWP and MTR’s contract.

EWP just received the last incentive for the Metro RTO grant marketing campaign. The bandanas and tote bags have gone out to members and the new Washington Park postcards will follow soon. Members of all the venues sign-up to receive information about different experiences and events around the Park as well transportation options and updates.

**Budget, Financials, and Minutes**

Steve reviewed the draft EWP 2019-20 budget, including high level notes regarding significant revenue changes. He noted that the expenses were not entirely accurate on this particular draft version. Total revenue has increased, both through meter revenue and shuttle reimbursement. In notes, Heather clarified the programmatic areas to show specifically where those resources are spent (i.e., administration, marketing, operations, etc.). This year’s data is more detailed than last year’s data.

Steve noted the RTO Grant expires this year; however, there is another grant that provides $37,000. Personnel increased due to more in-house staff instead of contracting out. The administrative position changed from part-time to full-time and a few more full-time employees were hired. The shuttle budget increased with the addition of weekend service. Dave asked what the cost difference is between more in-house staff and outsourcing. Victor said there was a small savings with in-house staff. Alex clarified with flagging specifically there was a savings.

Steve said that EWP is looking into doing either an audit or a review and noted $10,000 is allocated for the audit. Don mentioned the six-parties had an estimated top-line budget. This draft needs a little more work because it has some expense inaccuracies. Joe mentioned that the handout is wrong but the revised version that Heather sent out later is correct and includes salaries and wages.

Don said that Line 17 for ‘traffic management’ might still need to be reconsidered. Regarding surveying, EWP might want to increase amounts in the proposed budget. In the Washington Park Transportation and Parking Management Agreement (“WPTPMA”) amendment meeting, it was agreed to fund EWP’s office location change to a larger facility by increasing next year’s budget.

Steve mentioned that one significant increase was occupancy. EWP does not have enough room in its current location at WFC. Don mentioned that EWP is considering moving out of the Park. Steve said that an EWP office in the Park is always be preferred but the space issue is significant issue.

Ruth suggested as the budget evolves to include the net revenue so the Board can see what the bottom line is. Joe asked if there was a narrative to accompany the proposed budget. Don mentioned that Heather did this and probably does have an accompanying narrative.

Don mentioned that everyone has a limited amount of space and though it is not as convenient as dedicated EWP space perhaps the venues could show which spaces are available to be ‘donated’ for meeting. Ruth asked how that would be quantified budget-wise. Adena suggested measuring it by what the hourly rate would be. Dave wondered why it had to be quantified monetarily in the budget; there could just be a simple note as an explanation.
Steve asked if anyone had any questions about the budget's programmatic breakdown. Cynthia asked if the Board was clear that this budget reflected the ‘blue-sky’ budget or the prior budget. Steve said it reflects the ‘blue-sky’ increased budget that the six parties approved.

Ruth asked how capital expenses are defined. She noticed that computers and furniture are classified in the capital expenses category but wanted more clarification on how it was defined. Dave said the Board previously discussed depreciation but in terms of an exact definition, one hasn’t been established. Part of the discussion was to determine whether or not to show depreciation on the budget.

Cynthia wanted to make a few comments regarding the EWP office and rental options. In lieu of Heather actually being present she mentioned that Heather is ‘really good at weathering things that are unacceptable’. One of those things would be moving the EWP office outside of the Park. EWP, HAF and JPG are talking to PPR about rebuilding a building by the Holocaust Memorial, which is included in the Washington Park Master Plan (“Master Plan”). That’s a long-term goal and Cynthia noted if EWP moved it would not be at all ideal and should only be a short-term fix. Don mentioned that he also spoke to Heather about their office space. There are obvious advantages to being in the Park and Heather has experienced working outside the Park and it is not ideal. Victor said that rebuild was way down the road and there is no number associated with it yet. It would definitely need a champion to get started. Cynthia said the timeline could be influenced by the advocacy from the Board. If the Board can really get behind it the timeline could be advanced.

Ruth didn’t want to share half-info but thought that the upcoming Metro Bond might be relevant. Each county gets a project and the first phase of the Master Plan could be Multnomah County’s project, especially if the Board were to act as an advocacy group. The Burnside entrance is also in the first phase of the Master Plan. The Board has the opportunity to rework the Master Plan priorities.

Adena said that PPR is not poised to talk about specifics about projects yet but there is an open dialogue with Metro regarding the bond. However, there is a very long list of projects. When the campaign does eventually happen there could be an opportunity there. She suggested asking John Blasher to come to a Board meeting and speak about the bond logistics. PPR is one of the beneficiaries but the project is not very public yet. The bond has changed and there are opportunities to fit into different categories. Don said that what he heard from Metro Council is that they are looking for some OZ link, because any project having to do with OZ is likely to get more public support.

Steve said that the EWP budget will be voted on next month. Heather provided a paper overview between the differences between an audit and a financial review. Don preferred that Heather be in attendance before a vote on either occurred. Dave provided some insight on the differences: with a financial review they will evaluate EWP’s records at face value to determine if the math balances out. An audit goes deeper with verification of the information and will be more work and expense. He asked if there was a reason EWP wanted to do an audit now. Steve is unsure about the timing and also does not know if Heather favors one over the other.

Don asked if Cynthia has heard differently from Heather, but when Don had a discussion with Heather the desire to have either done came from the growth and complexity of EWP and what the model for other companies is. There was also a question on how often one should do an audit, or if it made more sense to do a financial review every year and do an audit every five years, etc. An audit costs more than a review, roughly $7,500 and $5,500 respectively.

Adena asked if the audit might be part of a tax obligation that comes with being 501(c)(3) tax exempt
organization. Chuck mentioned that some grant organizations are particular about financial reviews and audits, especially federal grants. However with the RTO, coming through Metro might be enough to forgo an audit or financial review as they have a strong relationship with EWP.

Dave asked if any of the stakeholders on the Board have to do audits. Everyone said that they do one or more every year.

The Board discussed Board positions for the next term, which begins July 1st: Don as Chair, Anna as Vice Chair, Steve as Treasurer and Dave as Secretary.

**Motion:** Joe moved to approve the new positions, Ruth seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Cynthia commented that the Board meeting at PJG will be in the fall.

The Board discussed the April financial report.

**Motion:** Ruth moved to approve the financial report, Kathy seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

The Board discussed the April minutes. Dave commented that he sent out the updated minutes out the night before and that the minutes in the packet sent out the prior week were different.

**Motion:** Dave moved to approve the edited minutes, Kathy seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**EWP Highlights**

Alex shared EWP’s info-graphic which provides a quick look at last year’s survey data. Passi noted that the intrapark shuttle had 130,000 users and asked how that was calculated. Alex explained that the data was collected both manually and via automatic counters on the shuttles. The counters recorded every time someone boarded, not how many people were moved. Passi asked if the count was the same for Overflow parking. Alex said for overflow parking only trips to the Park were counted, not returns. Kathy asked if there were any updates on the Transportation Management Plan (“TMP”). Don said that there is a draft WPTPMA amendment to guide the TMP. The legal documents are now with the attorneys. It will take past June. Currently the six parties are moving forward on other categories in conjunction with the attorneys so the process goes faster.

Ruth asked if the six parties could push the TMP portion faster as a subset than the WPTPMA amendment as a whole. Cynthia mentioned that in the past there have been one-off approvals. Theoretically they can approve $400K for the TMP to get it started but it would have to be put it in writing. Anna asked if the EWP budget was in the same category. Cynthia said yes and so is the intrapark shuttle. Don said he will ask the attorneys how it can be done. Cynthia clarified that the six parties want to finalize the EWP budget and the TMP funding by June 30, ahead of the WPTPMA amendment.

Marcia noted that the WPTPMA amendment requires both City Council and Metro Council approval so end of June doesn’t seem like enough time. Victor noted that he had a discussion with Linda and the way it is written in the ordinance allows the PPR Director to authorize any amendments so it does not have to go back to City Council. Adena said that should be included in the legal language so one would not have to do a deep dive into the archives to find the amendment.

The meeting adjourned at 9:24 am.