

**Minutes of March 18, 2014 Meeting
Nichols Basin West Edge Trail Planning
Marina Center Commission Room
5:30 p.m.**

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL until approved by the Project Advisory Committee at the next meeting.

Present: Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Members: Todd Anderson, Arthur Babitz, Larry Brown, Steve Gates, Pepi Gerald, Jaime Mack, Rich McBride (Commissioner, filling in for Hoby Streich), Bob Naito, Jeff Pickhardt, Heather Staten, Greg Stiegel, Lori Stirn, Cindy Thieman, Brett VandenHeuvel

Port Staff: Michael McElwee, Laurie Borton

Walker|Macy Consultants: Christopher Miller, Mike Zilis

Commissioners in the audience: Jon Davies, Fred Duckwall, Brian Shortt

Absent: PAC Members Cindy Walbridge, Hoby Streich

Public: Sign-in Sheet Attached

Port Executive Director Michael McElwee opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m. and reviewed the agenda for this third meeting of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). Committee and public comments have been incorporated into two conceptual plan designs that will be presented by Christopher Miller and Mike Zilis of Walker|Macy. A summary of public comments received through February 27 was provided to the PAC for their information, and a reminder was provided that project materials, including public comment, can be found on the Port's website (<http://www.portofhoodriver.com/NBP.php>).

McElwee reviewed the schedule of upcoming meetings, as follows: the Port Commission will review and provide feedback on the two trail designs March 20; refinements to the preferred plan will be reviewed by the PAC at a final meeting on April 16; Commission discussion continues at meetings on April 1 and 15 with final input on May 6 and a final plan presented for approval at the May 20 Port Commission meeting.

Action was then taken to approve the minutes from last month's meeting:

Motion: Move to approve minutes of the February 20, 2014 meeting.
Move: Naito
Second: Gates
Vote: Unanimous vote of PAC members present.

Christopher Miller, project consultant, provided information on a structural review of the bulkhead (sea wall) that was prepared by KPFF Consulting Engineers. Although the report indicates the wall is generally in stable condition with no visible signs of impending failure, if a failure were to occur the report suggests the wall would lean out and the soil behind would unravel when the loading on the wall is temporarily increased due to an event such as heavy rainfall saturating the retained soil; high river level; an earthquake; or high winds acting on floating structures moored to the wall. The report recommends structures should be held back at least 16 feet from the wall and floating docks should be independently anchored away from the face of the wall.

Mike Zilis, project consultant, then presented a PowerPoint presentation reviewing key issues, the February 20 concept plans and the resulting refinements in two alternates presented for further discussion and refinement. The alternates were summarized as follows:

Items Common to Both Alternates

- N. 1st Street adjusted; however, because of ODOT right-of-way the street cannot be pushed any further to the west
- Event Site access is relocated
- Tuck-under, non-inhabitable storage space (flood plain should not be a hurdle; this availability helps address concerns about water access issues)
- The southern-most water access is about 10 feet wide
- The gangway has a flatter slope, the length is 80 feet and the width is 8 feet
- Beach is shown at ordinary high water

Alternate 1

- More parking is available at the south end
- Commercial buildings are located on the south half only and the number of buildings have been reduced
- The deck area is now half the dimension from the previous plan (300x40 feet) and the building on the deck is smaller
- Roundabout on the north

Alternate 2

- The deck is enlarged, as is the building on the deck
- One additional commercial building
- Less parking at the south
- Lawn is terraced

The following comments and/or questions were provided from PAC members:

--Slackwater beach: Is more work needed for equipment/water access?

--Which alternate best addresses access by people who aren't recreationists? [The response was that both were good, but possibly more green space on Alternate 2 but there's an overlook on Alternate 1]

--Equipment: Unloading at the south parking area is good because it's less wind-affected. Should uses be delineated? Should some type of rack system at the drop-off points be used to prevent a problem with equipment blocking the pathway?

--Event Site: if access is relocated, will there still be one way in and one way out? Will concessionaire space still be provided?

--Parking: still looks to be an issue, especially if current vehicular access is eliminated. A suggestion was made that there should be a charge for all parking. Is there any additional property that can be identified for parking? [The response was that the triangular Barman property (now commonly referred to as the "porkchop") is zoned commercial; and there will be 9 dedicated public parking spaces associated with the Naito development. A shared parking strategy could be implemented as development occurs.]

--Commercial Buildings: Are there assurances of types of use, and how will that be memorialized? [The response is that zoning will dictate; however, a sense from the Committee is important now.]

--Restroom: should be considered in the plans as the Event Site facility is busy!

--Geese: Could the use of raptor poles be incorporated for control? A canopy of trees at the water's edge may also help.

--Roundabout: does it need to be as large? Instead of wall leading to beach area, could that be changed out for graduated steps?

At 6:47 p.m. McElwee opened the meeting to public comment, calling first on those who had signed up to speak. The time limit was 2 minutes per person, 30 minutes maximum.

Kate McBride: Likes the Event Site access relocated. Angled parking on both sides of N. 1st should be considered. Likes the additional parking shown on Alternate 1. The south water entrance needs to be enlarged. And the path from N. 2nd by the Barman property should be bigger and more grand.

John Hart: Prefers Alternate 1 with the maximized parking at the south. Is concerned about the gangway length of 80 feet--can it be shortened (it's now 20 ft.). A makeshift submersible dock is now in use at the sea wall--can this be considered in the plans? A better path from town to the southwest corner can have an impact on reducing vehicles and agrees the path should be nicer and more inviting.

Susan Crowley: Either plan is fine. Her reaction, as an unskilled SUP'er and kayaker is that a dock launch is intimidating. She also has concerns about the security of expensive equipment that is dropped off and then having to park a block or two away. How will storage be managed? Are there any plans for motorized boat access? [The response to her question about motorized boat access was functionally none.]

Josh Sceva: Prefers Alternate 1 because of the additional parking and launch at the south end. SUP is the fastest growing sport and canoeing follows right behind; neither is addressed in the plan. Another growing segment is community clubs and the need for storage space for large equipment, such as rowing shells, should be considered. Sceva also said the Nichols Basin is the safest place to get long watercraft out of the water and onto a vehicle.

Chuck Gehling: He is looking at the plans from a habitat and riparian perspective and commented he appreciated these pieces staying in the plans. He also noted the Port has shown a commitment in developing the east side of the Basin and the Spit.

Linda Maddox: Prefers Alternate 1. She thanked McElwee for considering suggestions, especially moving the development line to the west and buildings to only the southern portion as shown on Alternate 1. She voiced concerns about parking and the loss of vehicular access to Slackwater Beach. She is not a fan of roundabouts and questioned why it was so wide. Equipment drop-off at the north could be problematic because of the wind and she said SUP boards are getting longer. She likes changing the Event Site access for a separation of traffic flow. Parking is still a concern, and she asked if the "porkchop" (Barman property) could be used for parking.

Susan Froehlich: Asked that vehicle access to the beach be reconsidered. Offloading a kayak or SUP from a vehicle can be difficult and said, as she stood at the podium on crutches, that accessibility is important. She is also concerned with parking and inquired if the dock building could be moved more to the north to create additional parking. She believes the gangway is too long. Froehlich challenged the consultants to carry an SUP on a windy day to the beach.

Bonnie New: Prefers Alternate 1 and keeping retail to the south and not metastasizing. Also likes the idea of relocating the Event Site access. She suggested that there is an opportunity for an assisted equipment drop-off service by kids or non-profits, etc.

Chris Gann: Prefers Alternate 1. Feels she could not use the ramp; however the southernmost water access would not be her choice of launch. Gann also said she thought the roundabout was excessively wide and suggested designated 10-minute parking for equipment drop-off. She also suggested the use of angled parking at the roundabout. For the Alternate 2 north drop-off area she said additional plantings could help as a windbreak.

Public comment concluded at 7:23 p.m. A comparison of between Alternate 1 and 2 was reviewed by Zilis and he reiterated comments provided from the committee and public, as well as ideas developed from the discussion.

- Develop south in-water area; add more grass area at the south dock; provide equipment racks; embellish the trail from the 2nd Street overpass; turn gangway parallel to the dock and provide built-in storage docks; create a shallow water area by the dock that could provide more structure to the dock and support habitat. The shape of the lawn and beach in Alternate 2 was preferred, along with its north drop-off area with trees providing a windbreak. If a roundabout is in the next plans, consider terracing instead of a structured wall and reconsider the parking configuration for better maneuverability. The option of closing off the northern portion of N. 1st for event use will be a community benefit, especially if the Event Site access is relocated.
- A fence was installed to restrict jumping off the cruise ship dock. Will this be an issue for the Nichols Basin dock?
- A counterpoint was made regarding the additional building on Alternate 2 with the comment to not discount it before talking through what 'programs' might be there.
- Ensure the pathway is in a reasonable place for connectivity and for future flexibility.

The fourth and final meeting of the PAC will be held on April 16 at 5:30 p.m. in which refinements to the plan will be reviewed. The Walker|Macy team stated that minor tweaks can be made after April 16 but cautioned against anything major. McElwee reiterated the Port Commission would provide final input at its May 6 meeting, with a final plan and next steps including a Walker|Macy contract amendment for construction document phase would be taken to the Commission on May 20.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Prepared by Laurie Borton