

TAC Committee  
August 21, 2023, 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  
Meeting Notes

**Attending**

Keith Baich – Explore Washington Park (EWP)  
Erin Bird – EWP  
Ivan Ratcliff – Oregon Zoo (OZ)  
Jennifer Kent – World Forestry Center (WFC)  
Becky Schreiber – Hoyt Arboretum (HA)  
Jason Sipe – Portland Japanese Garden (PJG)  
Hallie Wilkerson – EWP

**Partner Updates**

- Jennifer (WFC): Staying up on public events and trying to update them on the current lighting situation. The big annual conference is occurring at the end of September.
  
- Becky (HA): Transitioning from summer to programming, which means field trips will resume. Buses will be dropping off near the shuttle stop so it would be helpful to alert shuttle drivers. The Annual Arborist event will be occurring on September 9<sup>th</sup>, which will lead to a very full parking lot.
  
- Jason (PJG): Two large Douglas Fir trees will be removed at the Garden, which shouldn't affect traffic operations. Some work may need to occur on Kingston, and they will continue to keep PPR and EWP updated as needed.
  
- Ivan (OZ): September has many walks and runs events occurring in the mornings, so lighting in the lots will be necessary. Ciderfest is happening on September 29 – 30, which should bring about 3,000 guests each night. Zoo Brew is scheduled for 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> of November and then ZooLights will start.
  
- Keith (EWP): Peak-season is ending September 4, meaning visitor service staff will no longer be in the field. The shuttle will continue to run its current hours through the end of September, where it will then transition to ending at 4 p.m., starting October 1. This also begins the transition of ZooLights preparation, which includes goals of attaining a larger traffic team and looking at current signage.

On September 29, Four Forces listening session participants will be coming to the Park to explore and ride the Free Shuttle. This will likely include 30-40 participants and EWP may reach out regarding the visits to each cultural institution.

### **South Entry Update**

The construction is on-schedule and paving of the roadway section should be cleared up relatively soon. These traffic lanes will be helpful during ZooLights. Starting September 22, there will be some night work and flaggers from 7 p.m. – 7 a.m.

EWP finally got the permits approved for three VMS signs. One of these lives on Highway 26, about a mile west of the Park, while the other two live near the ramps going both directions on Highway 26. ODOT has asked EWP to coordinate the locations of these VMS signs with the South Entry project to ensure there is no intrusion on the construction work. These signs should be out in their permanent locations by the end of October.

Actionable: Keith to share a recent email from Travis that gives some new S. Entry updates

### **Lots B & C Lighting**

EWP is renting 5 light plants and they will be placed throughout the parking lots as soon as possible. Currently waiting for the contractor to call and confirm the delivery date.

Ivan suggests one of the light plants to go near the sidewalk leading up to the Education Center as many partners and neighbors use this.

Keith wants to point out that EWP's small team may have a tough time managing the use of these lights on a daily basis. Help may be necessary from the partners, especially for events.

A general operating plan should be created to keep track of who will turn the lights on and off, as well as manage the light hours.

Actionable: Keith to let everyone know the arrival date and time of the light plants and create send out plan to administer lighting.

### **Transportation Access Plan**

Keith reviews the Transportation Access Plan feedback with the group line by line, in detail.

Keith began by summarizing the feedback received. Characterized the feedback as generally agreement from partners with deliverables plan, though often with many additions or additional suggestions. These were by-and-large accepted, added to amended deliverables and increased the scope, though in a manageable form. He also wished to explain feedback in another vein: the feedback received from PPR were concerns that the deliverables plan as written focused too heavily on parking solutions, and wasn't expansive enough in scope. EWP has been asked to consider the road patterns, traffic changes, and other transportation options in addition to parking and at a similar level of focus.

Ivan: Asked Keith to clarify PP&R position.

Keith: That PP&R feedback was that EWP should consider transportation as a whole in the park, creating a robust plan. That the methodology laid out to date seemed “parking or car-centric,” and did not focus enough on transportation as a whole.

Keith reviewed the response on deliverables by line:

In regards to data collection, there was general agreement that the annual transportation report data could be the basis of data sets, but some feedback that was heard from partners includes adding data or data analysis related to sustainability, off-peak data requests, and reporting on parking lot counts. Keith indicated these additions would be pursued.

Regarding attendance projections for venues: A specific request included a 10-year attendance projection for the cultural institutions. Group expressed that a 10-year projection would need to be revisited annually in order to stay realistic. The committee agreed that a 5-year projection seems to be more accurate and manageable, though allowed that the board could discuss this as well. .

The plan states that each cultural institution should provide EWP with their transportation and mode-split goals. Most of the feedback indicated that many of the institutions do not have individual mode-split goals, so the focus seemed acceptable to the group that parkwide mode-split goals would be utilized.

Regarding feasibility of offsite, and onsite parking handling demand as related to projections: Opinion expressed by many that parking is often currently an issue throughout the Park, and would likely remain so. Argument than agreement that the feasibility studies should separate into three separate areas of North end, South end, and Hoyt. Reasoning; improving parking in one area does not improve parking in another area.

Ivan suggests that the feasibility study should also look into parking requirements of each cultural institution, based on capacity and size, utilizing current mode splits (or perhaps even 0 mode split) to develop a baseline. Essentially, argued that there is no reason to only work with a projected capacity, where the current numbers will tell us some things. Voiced that these findings should be independent of the mode-split study and could be a parkwide parking capacity analysis based on industry trends for similar attractions throughout the country.

Keith answered that yes, there should be no problem working through a number of scenarios, including this one, once a methodology is created. He would add these numbers to the deliverables.

Regarding addition of emphasis on road studies in amended deliverables: The committee is in agreement that road concepts should be considered throughout the feasibility study. However,

Jason points out that a lot of bottlenecking traffic, especially in the North end of the Park, is likely due to visitors looking for a parking spot. In this sense, parking is still a concern and issue, even when looking at roads.

Keith mentioned, yes, this is likely true on busy days. Though, I can see a road study which perhaps assists us with this, by pinpointing bottleneck areas (I can think of one in front of Hoyt now, especially when the EWP Shuttle stops, and there are school group buses, and general traffic, etc.). So perhaps this is an opportunity to think globally and find solutions.

Generally agree that it is acceptable (and correct inclusion of feedback) to define part of this work as having a consultant look at the setup of the Park and recommend which studies will be done to receive the most information. Though PP&R suggested Rick Williams consulting, the group expressed that there is an advantage to looking into a consultant besides Rick Williams so as to have two sources of information. Keith pointed out that EWP RFP process requirements would likely dictate the need to have an open RFP process; i.e, to consider other candidates for the consultant work, regardless.

Ivan questions whether there is any point in the TAP that looks into the importance of the off-site shuttles and what the impact would be if those off-site lots were no longer available. Keith will take this action item into consideration and see how it can be implemented in the plan.

Keith noted that analysis of offsite is in the language already as provided in deliverables, but that he hears the thought related to inclusion in our analysis of the fragility of lot relationships (not internally owned properties) and other considerations. Those details will be discussable, as we have a long process ahead, should we get agreement on these concrete deliverables.

Keith thanked them for their feedback, outlined next steps (making small additions to deliverables chart, sending out to TAC Committee members so they can discuss with their leadership, and then can prepare to discuss at Sept board meeting).

Meeting ended