

Portland State University

PDXScholar

City Club of Portland

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

3-23-1951

Portland Municipal Zoo

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.)

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

City Club of Portland (Portland, Or.), "Portland Municipal Zoo" (1951). *City Club of Portland*. 147.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/147

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in City Club of Portland by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible:
pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Report on PORTLAND MUNICIPAL ZOO

INTRODUCTION

To the Board of Governors of the City Club of Portland:

Your committee was authorized to study and report on the problems that relate to the continuance and maintenance in Portland of a municipal zoo.

Your committee purposely refrained from making this report a mere welter of statistics or, on the other hand, an *ex cathedra* pronouncement of a long range plan complete in all details. Numerous topics are sketched in outline, the hope being that the respective discussions may contain suggestions that will evoke, stimulate and assist more detailed investigation and study on the part of the City's committee. Beyond this point your committee lacked the ability and capacity to go.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It seems that like Topsy, Portland's Zoo just grew. It had its beginnings about 1885 when John Gates was Mayor and the city's population was some 22,000. In that year Charles M. Myers became the official head of Portland's park service. At first his little collection of fauna consisted of rabbits, pigeons and a few deer. As he could, he supplemented them with monkeys and parrots which sailors from foreign ports supplied him. An early-day local druggist, Richard B. Knight, was keenly interested in animal life and in 1887 bought a grizzly for \$75.00 and an Alaskan bear for \$50.00, giving them to the city for Myers' collection.

To house this collection, a compound was built in the ravine later occupied by the main west side reservoirs of the City Water Works. This compound was expanded from time to time as the collection grew in size. From the beginning the local zoo has occupied three different sites in what is now Washington Park.

By 1894 there had been constructed an animal house, a bird house, sheds for elk and deer, a bear pit and an owl castle. The inventory of animals included elk, deer, bears, mountain lions, wild cats, coyotes, foxes, lynx, a kangaroo, monkeys, rabbits, coons, guinea pigs, badgers, skunks, a pea fowl, swans, ducks, wild geese, Mongolian pheasants, a Japanese golden pheasant, Mandarin ducks, quail, pigeons, sparrow hawks, canaries, magpies, crows, cockatoos, and a blue jay. In 1895 two alligators were added and in 1905 an African lion, polar bear, a leopard, and a pair of Yellowstone bison.

So much for the first vigintennium of the zoo, a period which was marked by steady and well-planned growth under the sympathetic, talented management and supervision of Park Superintendent Myers who continued his direction up to the time of his death in 1901.

The second score of years is quite another story. The personnel of the Park Commission (created in 1901) was not zoo-minded. In 1905 Dr. Harry Lane on his election as Mayor became *ex officio* chairman of the Board. He opposed as inhumanitarian the confinement of living creatures and pronounced against the acquisition of any new specimens for the zoo, although he did not insist on freeing the animals, birds and reptiles then on hand. Outright abolition of the zoo would not have set well with the people. His policy apparently was to let it dwindle and die a lingering death. But public interest in the zoo did not wane. It continued to wax, and the animals and birds did not stop reproducing their kind. After Lane's term expired in 1909 a pair of cougars was acquired. Too, bear, deer, raccoons, monkeys, birds, and all kinds of pets continued over the years to be donated to the zoo or to be loaned and never reclaimed. Sufficient appropriations, however, were not made even for adequate upkeep and no funds whatever were provided for expansion. Despite the little that was done for the zoo in the second score of years it managed an existence of sorts.

In 1925 at the beginning of the third score of years the zoo was again shifted to a new, higher and more remote site at a cost of some \$40,000. From that time to the present it

has made at the new site passable but undistinguished shift, procuring a good many new specimens through donation or purchase, improving its facilities to some extent, and seeking as best it could with the funds available to meet what seems to have been a steadily growing interest and patronage on the part of the public.

BROAD POLICY OF PRELIMINARY PROCEDURE

That Portland should create and maintain an adequate zoo is hardly debatable. Some educational and recreational values may inhere in the present zoo notwithstanding its inadequacy. But such values would be greatly enhanced by even a modest and gradual reconstruction of the existing zoo on a suitable new site. Your committee considers a zoo a proper and desirable municipal enterprise, even if it can never be made self-sustaining to any considerable extent. In the creation and maintenance of an adequate zoo for the future your committee recommends a policy of *festinate lente*, make haste slowly. A scheme too grandiose in conception for early completion might easily defeat itself. A process of gradual evolution in accordance with a long range plan envisioning the ultimate goal sought would seem best. Such a plan as a starting point is indispensable but it should not be formulated merely to be pigeon-holed. It should have an official *status* also. So it is recommended that the City Council pass an ordinance promptly, directing the City Attorney, the City Engineer, and the Superintendent of the Bureau of Parks as a committee to prepare such a plan in the form of a project recommended for adoption by the Council and to report it to the Council within three months thereafter.

The City's files and records undoubtedly contain ample material for adequate documentation of the project to be recommended by the City's Committee to the Council. Other pertinent material would be available to the City Committee from the City Club's files and from other sources. The ordinance well might authorize the Mayor to appoint a public advisory committee of at least ten and not more than fifteen persons (including a naturalist) who would be fairly representative of the local citizenry, whose functions would be to study and to make from time to time recommendations in writing to the city on any matter having to do with the zoo. It is conceivable that such a public advisory committee might evolve in time into a local zoological society.

SOME OTHER ZOOS

This topic's surface can only be scratched here. But some of the methods followed elsewhere and the achievements of others in the creation, development and maintenance of existing zoos are enlightening and may serve as partial patterns at least for Portland to adopt.

By way of background for this report it seems quite necessary to find out how certain typical American zoos have been organized and what they are like today. Accordingly, the following summary of a number of zoological parks is presented.

Bronx Zoo

One of the largest zoos in the world is the park at Bronx Borough, New York, opened in 1899. It occupies some 264 acres of ground, being nearly a mile long and three-fifths of a mile in width. It is controlled by the Zoological Society of New York with representatives of the municipality of New York City. The Society is responsible to the city authorities for the care and welfare of the animals and the upkeep of the gardens. The zoo is financed largely out of municipal funds, but about one-fourth of the expenses derived from subscriptions, gate receipts, and the sale of guide books is contributed by the Society. The collection of animals consists of approximately 3,061 living creatures, made up of 363 mammals, 2,103 birds, and 395 reptiles, representing some 1,083 different species. The park is open free to the public every day except Monday and Thursday, unless these days happen to fall on a bank holiday, when a small admission is charged.

National Zoological Park

The National Zoological Park at Washington, D. C., was founded by Congress in 1890 "for the advancement of science and the instruction and recreation of the people." The site was purchased by the National Government, and all the expenses come from government funds, the management being vested in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The park consists of about 265 acres of undulating land with natural woods and rocks, traversed by a gorge cut by Rock Creek. There are 3,000 animals, birds, and reptiles, representing over 500 species. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, a total of \$359,453 was expended for all purposes.

Brookfield Zoo

In 1920 Mrs. Edith Rockefeller McCormick offered the Cook County, Illinois, Board of Commissioners a large tract of land in Brookfield, approximately 14 miles south and west of the Chicago Loop. This land, augmented by additional acreage supplied by the County Board, now constitutes the Chicago Zoological Park or what is popularly known as the "Brookfield Zoo".

The President of the County Commissioners at that time felt that a citizen body such as the ones successfully operating the Chicago Art Institute and the New York Zoological Park should manage the zoo. He emphasized that the project should be "supervised by a non-political board". The Chicago Zoological Society, a citizen body, was formed, operating under the authority of the Forest Preserve District Commissioners of Cook County by virtue of a contract between the two bodies.

A tax levy, approved by a referendum of Cook County voters, provides funds for construction and maintenance. The collection of animals is financed by private gifts, by exchange, and by funds supplied by the society.

The Park is open every day. Admission is free on Thursday, Saturday and Sunday, and on New Year's Day, Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Columbus Day, Armistice Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas. Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays are pay days, when an admission charge of 25 cents is collected from each person 15 years of age or over. Children accompanied by adults, and teachers with pupils, are always admitted free. Members of the armed forces, when in uniform, are admitted free.

San Diego Zoo

One of the most popular and successful American zoos is the San Diego Zoo in Balboa Park. According to the 1940 census, San Diego had a population of 203,341. The Zoological Society of San Diego was founded by five men in 1916. Dr. Harry M. Wegeforth, its first president, was manager, promoter, planner, financial advisor, and much of the time in the early days he was its sole financial support. He raised, practically alone, all the private funds with which the Zoo was built.

The grounds, consisting of a series of canyons, amount to almost 200 acres in the roughest part of Balboa Park.

In 1934, for the support of the zoo, the people of San Diego voted a special tax which is part of the city charter. This money goes into an operating budget, which is augmented by admission charges and other earnings of the Zoological Society.

The Society operates the Zoo under an agreement between the city officials and the Zoological Society. By the terms of this agreement the Society will have control of the development and operation of the zoo so long as it maintains a creditable zoo.

The Society provides the animals, the buildings, the equipment, and approximately two-thirds of the money for the operating expenses.

An innovation is a group of sightseeing busses which make trips through the grounds of an hour's duration. The bus drivers are trained lecturers and guides. Another unusual feature is a small amphitheater. In this, animal acts and other attractions such as pictures, lectures, and operas are presented.

Membership in the Zoological Society of San Diego is open to everyone. The Society says that it is better to have a few hundred members who are really interested and who will retain their memberships than to make intensive drives for large membership, securing thousands of members who are not interested in the zoo individually but who answered the call because they felt a public obligation to do so. Annual membership of \$5 includes free admission into the zoo for one year and provides guest passes for the members. It also entitles the holder to publications and a voice in the affairs of the society.

An admission charge of thirty cents is made for adults. Children are admitted free. The Zoo has a cafe and refreshment stands. Trained animal acts are provided every day except Monday in the Wegeforth Bowl. The Society brings classes of school children to the Park in busses provided for that purpose, under the guidance of an instructor employed by the Zoological Society.

San Antonio Zoo

San Antonio, Texas, a city of 253,854 (1940 census) has a park of 70 acres. It is owned by the city and is maintained for zoological purposes and exhibits. The first zoo

was established in 1910 at what is now known as San Pedro Park. Shortly before the outbreak of the first World War, the city established a Zoological Garden at the present site near Brackenridge Park; but not a part of Brackenridge. This site was chosen because of its natural beauty and because its high limestone cliffs made a superb location for outdoor cages.

Believing that San Antonio should have the best zoo possible, a group of San Antonio citizens, in 1928 formed the San Antonio Zoological Society, Inc. The city accepted their offer of help and cooperation. In 1929, an agreement was entered into between the city administration and the Society, whereby the city was to equip and maintain the zoo grounds, and the Society would agree to acquire birds and animals of all kinds to be placed in the park, at no cost to the city, for propagation and exhibition.

Upon the consummation of this arrangement, the Society initiated a comprehensive plan of building and expansion for the zoo. Work started in February 1929 on the construction of Monkey Island and the Barless Bear Pits; it was completed in November of that year. In 1930, the Anthropoid Ape House and the large outdoor aviaries were finished. In 1931, the Hippo House and outdoor pool were completed.

In 1929, when the Society took over the responsibility for the exhibits, the collection consisted of 344 birds and animals. Half of these were common doves, pigeons, and animals valued at \$11,226.

On exhibit today are 2,500 birds, animals and reptiles from all over the world. Their value amounts to well over a million dollars. Many of the purchases of exhibits have been made possible through the financial support of the Society president, Mr. R. H. Friedrich.

St. Louis Zoological Garden

The St. Louis Zoological Garden is located on 83 acres of rolling ground in Forest Park, a 1,380-acre municipal park. The Garden is free to the public every day in the year.

In 1915, the legislature of Missouri passed an enabling act giving the citizens of St. Louis the opportunity of voting on a mill tax. In 1916, the citizens overwhelmingly voted a mill tax to give 2 cents on the \$100 valuation of taxable property to the Zoo Fund, for the purpose of building and maintaining a Zoological Garden. This tax amounted to approximately 25 cents per year for each resident of St. Louis.

Administration of the Garden is vested by ordinance in the Zoological Board of Control, the membership of which consists of five ex-officio members, namely: the Mayor, Comptroller, Commissioner of Parks, Vice-President of the Board of Aldermen, the President of the Board of Public Service, and four elected citizen members.

Normally, there are approximately 2,000 birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians in its collection. The avowed purpose has been to exhibit a balanced, representative collection, showing animals in pairs or family groups when possible, and emphasizing those species which are of greatest interest to the visitors.

The physical plant includes eight major buildings: Tropical Bird House with wing for flightless birds, Primate House, Anthropoid Ape House, Reptile House, Small Mammal House, Antelope House, Lion House and Elephant House. There are also a chain of lakes, bear pits, small mammal pits, barless units for hoofed mammals, arenas for animal training shows, and outdoor bird cages.

The St. Louis Zoo has particularly pioneered in the construction of replicas in lasting materials of natural geological formations. Visitors often mistake the bear pits for natural rock formations.

In training periods, from approximately May 15 to October 15, three animal training shows are given daily in three separate arenas. Each arena is equipped with a loud speaker apparatus, so that the observer may hear the trainers' explanations to him and the directions to the animals. Each of the shows is staged like a Broadway production. They move swiftly; musical recordings are synchronized with the action; and stage properties are used.

What animals of such varied talents and temperaments as the big cats, chimpanzees, and elephants can learn and how they are taught are shown. Training starts when the animals are young and continues only so long as the animals are receptive to learning. When they become too proficient, making for a routine act, or reach the point where discipline rather than learning must be stressed, they are retired and the training of others begins. Leopards, lions, and tigers have been trained in the past, while the present program includes training jaguars, lions and leopards together.

Chimpanzees work with ponies in the "Chimpanzee Circus Revue," a circus in miniature. There are chimpanzee equestrians, trapeze performers, acrobats, and clowns. The elephant training reveals that "Elephants are patient, obedient animals that must work for both the idea and the feel of a trick. They cannot grasp an idea as chimpanzees can, nor do they have the highly developed kinesthetic sense of the cats. Visitors who see these shows, not only are entertained, but also gain in their understanding of animal psychology."

ESSENTIALS OF AN ADEQUATE ZOO

The requisites to be considered are numerous. Some which seems to be prime in importance are sketched *seriatim* below.

I. Organization, Control and Management

No drastic innovations in these respects are suggested. The zoo should remain a municipal enterprise—at least until the wisdom of another course has been amply justified. In the future desirable and efficient cooperation between the city and a local zoological society (organized in the form of a non-profit corporation) might be found warranted in some aspects of control and management. Supervision of the operation in detail of the zoo should be vested in a competent and experienced naturalist. The less such a person is hampered (in the performance of his duties) by regulations, restrictions and prescribed methods of procedure imposed from above, the more justly he can be held responsible for final results.

A survey of American zoos discloses that the organization, control and management of these enterprises may be grouped into a comparatively few types. In the cases studied, the city or the county owns the capital investment. The question then becomes: Who is going to finance, maintain, and have the major share of control of the zoological garden?

The organization of Portland's zoo is an illustration of the type in which all of the ownership and functions are controlled by the city government through its Bureau of Parks, as representatives of the public. Contrasted to this set-up is that of the Chicago Zoological Park, which was built and is operated by a non-political board of citizens under a contract with the Commissioners of Cook County. Occupying a middle position is the St. Louis Zoological Garden, which is administered by a Board of Control consisting of city officials and elected citizen members. A fourth type is a combination. It is used in such cities as San Antonio, San Diego and New York City. In these places, the city owns the zoo and helps in varying degrees to maintain it; a Zoological Society operates the Zoo and hires a director.

It is believed that the best type of organization is represented by the fourth grouping.

II. Physical Aspects

That Portland's zoo (as it now exists) is a problem can hardly be gainsaid. If that problem is to be solved with vision toward the ultimate creation of an adequate local zoo in which the city and its people can justly take pride, sound and thoughtful consideration of these factors is fundamental. The undersigned committee's suggestions in respect of these factors follow.

A. The area devoted to the zoo should be large enough to meet not only present needs but also those of the reasonably foreseeable future, should be sufficiently level to permit of its full utilization without undue expense, and be so located as to be readily and conveniently accessible both by public and private carriers.*

B. The topography should be such as to afford a maximum of light as well as protection from the elements and to afford proper drainage of water and circulation of air, these being considerations not only for the comfort and health of the animals but also for the enjoyment of visitors to the zoo.

*The general location of Portland's Zoo is now rather definitely established.

The city has acquired to date approximately 100 acres in the triangular section north and west of Canyon Road and south of Washington Park.

This acquisition brings Washington Park, the Arboretum, Hoyt Park and the West Hills Golf Links into one almost solid area. The additional land has been acquired largely from tax and assessment delinquent properties held by the county and city. One small tract was purchased from the Maccabees Lodge. The city hopes to purchase from private owners a small intervening strip of property now dividing Washington Park and the newly acquired area from Hoyt Park and the West Hills Golf Links.

A map of this area, furnished by the Bureau of Parks and Public Recreation, City of Portland, is on file in the City Club office.

C. Ready availability of water, sewage, and electric power are, of course, prerequisites both to the development and to the operation of the zoo, and for the benefit of surrounding privately owned property there should, if possible, be a buffer area around the zoo, utilizable for pasturage and exercise of such of the animals as may be allowed a considerable amount of freedom in properly fenced enclosures.

D. The area should be so developed as to provide adequate access by automobile and bus, and parking space for the automobiles of visitors, with complete elimination of vehicular traffic within the actual zoo area for the safety, comfort and peace of mind of visitors, adult and minor.

E. The terrain should afford such stability as to make safe the erection of substantial structures upon the premises without risk of damage by earthquake or slides.

F. The housing of animals should be such as to produce and maintain, artificially when necessary, as nearly as may be the conditions obtaining in the natural habitat of the particular animals there kept for display, with adequate room for exercise at all times of the year and in all types of weather, and yet so arranged as to display the animals to advantage. The groupings of animals and compactness of arrangement should, of course, be such as considerations of economy, of development and maintenance, of the relative popularity of the animals with visitors, and of the convenience of spectators, and as the needs of the various animals for pasturage, exercise in the open air, hothouse conditions, etc., may require.

III. Site for Zoo

A. The essential characteristics of a desirable site are (in part at least) attractive and interesting terrain, satisfactory exposure with respect to sunlight and protection against storms and changes of weather, drainage, space for future expansion, general accessibility in relation to public and private means of transportation, convenient parking room, natural pasturage, suitable buffer areas, and ample resources for needed housing.

The area occupied should be relatively level and of sufficient size to accommodate not merely present needs but also those in the foreseeable future. While all the parcels of land included in the site need not be contiguous, the distances between them should not be great enough to prove tiresome to patrons or expensive of time on the part of attendants.

The need for sunshine and protection from severe weather should be borne in mind for the comfort both of the animals and of visitors.

Adequate transportation facilities provided by public carriers are essential to any satisfactory and useful enjoyment and patronage of the zoo.

Suitable parking facilities for those who come by automobile should be provided.

Ready availability of water, sewage, and light is necessarily indispensable.

Separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic within the zoo's area is imperative in the interest of safety.

B. *Objections to the present site:*

The ground on which the existing zoo is located is unstable and slips one-half inch or more annually. A permanent site should not be subject to this defect.

No relatively level area adequate for eventual expansion of the existing site (were there no other objections to it) is available.

Separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic is now practically impossible because utilization of hillside areas with narrow approaches to the enclosures is unavoidable.

Public transportation facilities are presently inadequate and the future holds no hope for improvement in this respect.

Present parking facilities are grossly inadequate and necessarily so, and the inadequacy is incapable of being remedied.

Its topography is such that sharply sloping ground surfaces interfere with satisfactory display and exhibition of animal groups and view of them is restricted to one side of the enclosure. For the same reason the access roads for considerable stretches can be utilized on only one side for such purposes of display and exhibition.

In short and without further specification Portland's zoo lacks about every characteristic essential to a desirable site.

C. A suitable new site is available, that has a desirable location and many advantages for the purpose. There may be and probably are others. If there were not at least one such new site available, there would not be much purpose in this report. The committee intentionally omitted, however, to investigate further the matter of possible new sites. Much less does it feel it can advocate fittingly the acquisition and utilization of any particular new site. The city's Bureau of Parks is adequately informed already in this connection.

IV. Fauna

Mammals, reptiles, birds, and amphibians constitute the specimens now on exhibition. Some reasonable provision for the addition of fish might well be made. Almost everybody seems to be fascinated by fish, whether specimens kept in private homes and offices or those to be seen in the pools at Bonneville hatchery or salmon going over the ladders at Bonneville dam. Even a superficial interest in natural history (with fish omitted) leaves a most attractive branch of the subject unexplored. The zoo's patrons will always represent a catholicity of tastes. That an exhibition of fish would get preferred attention from a considerable segment of the public is a certainty.

V. Native or Exotic Animals

Present specimens are both native and exotic. This is as it should be. A preponderance of the exotic (as such specimens can be acquired from time to time) would not be undesirable. Such preponderance exists at Brookfield Zoo (near Chicago) and doubtless at many of the other older zoos that have adequate financial resources. To picture what a drawing card an elephant added to the present local specimens would be needs no resort to the imagination.

VI. Methods of Exhibition

The exhibition of animals is the important function of any successful zoo. For its intelligent and most effective discharge the full-time services of a competent and experienced curator-naturalist would seem to be indispensable. The employment of haphazard or extemporized methods is bound to produce poor and disappointing results.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

On January 1, 1950 Portland zoo's capital assets amounted in book value to \$91,960.00, more or less. The principal items of such assets and their respective book values were:

Menagerie Building.....	\$40,000.00
Elk and Buffalo Barn.....	2,700.00
Bear Pits.....	17,000.00
Concession — Rest Room.....	10,000.00
Refrigeration and Kitchen.....	23,000.00
Deer Shelter.....	750.00
Bird Runs.....	1,050.00
Feed Racks.....	1,876.00
Animal Inventory.....	16,285.00

The expenditure chargeable to capital assets in 1949 amounted to \$2,486.98, the principal items being:

Fencing	\$ 2,041.75
Animals	445.23

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The expenditures for these purposes for Portland's zoo in 1949 were (with respect to the principal items) as follows:

Personal Service.....	\$29,481.26
Feed, Fuel, Supplies.....	14,391.76
Equipment	

\$43,873.02

FINANCING

Nature's zoos are unfinanced. When people want a municipal zoo, they have to pay for its establishment and maintenance.

It has been found difficult to get specific information on the financing of other zoos, which issue only general statistics in their reports.

The capital outlay of a zoo depends, of course, upon the size of the enterprise a city desires. The larger zoos in the United States have cost millions of dollars. Often a zoo gets its land and buildings as contributions of private donors. In 1949 the people of Seattle voted to spend \$1,000,000 for a new zoo. For a bird house in the new Seattle park, the directors plan a structure to cost \$120,000. Estimates of the cost of a new Portland Zoo run anywhere from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000. Mr. Harry Buckley, Portland's new Supervisor of Parks, foresees an expenditure of \$2,000,000 to complete a local zoological park.

Likewise, the cost for the operation and maintenance of a zoo is based upon the magnitude of the enterprise. As we have mentioned elsewhere in our report, the Washington, D. C. zoo spent \$359,453 for all purposes in 1946. The Seattle Zoo operated last year on a budget of \$60,000. The Portland Zoo has a budget of less than \$44,000.

SOURCES OF FUNDS

Up to now the City of Portland has provided the money that has gone into the establishment and maintenance and operation of the local zoo. That may have to continue to be the case in the future to a very large extent. It is not inconceivable that over the years an endowment fund might be built up from small beginnings, the income from which would be available for specific purposes such as the acquisition of new fauna. The realization of that possibility would depend upon private generosity, of which there can be no assurance. Other possible sources of financing, some of which are here mentioned, would appear to be worthy of recognition.

Municipal Funds

Almost all zoos are financed, if not totally, at least partially, by municipal funds. Where zoological societies work with the city government, the costs are divided. In San Antonio, for example, the city equips and maintains the grounds; the society provides the birds and animals. In San Diego, the society furnishes the animals, the buildings, the equipment and nearly two-thirds of the operating expenses.

As your committee has pointed out, St. Louis is an example of a city financing a zoo through a special tax voted by the citizens.

In addition to civic funds, there are other possible sources of money for the operation and maintenance of zoological parks. A number of zoos charge admissions on certain days. The sale of guide books is a common practice. Zoological Societies have dues or subscriptions for their members similar to those of our Art Museum. A society also helps to bring in special gifts. Zoos make money either by renting or by running concessions, such as cafes or refreshment stands. Some parks charge admission to animal acts, pictures, and lectures put on in an amphitheatre. Some charge for rides on ponies or on miniature railroads. These various sources of income prove that with organization and drive a zoo can become popular enough to pay a substantial percentage of its own expenses.

OPERATION AS GOING CONCERN

The pertinent phases of this topic are too numerous to treat here in detail. Short reference to some of them appears to be advisable.

YOUNG FOLK

Visitors to the zoo always will include persons of all ages. Its administration, however, may well cater at all times to the particular pleasure and edification of children and adolescents.

EXECUTIVE SUPERVISION

It would seem that close and immediate control of the zoo's functions should be vested in a person expertly qualified by training and experience to perform his duties and probably protected to a reasonable degree in the tenure of his employment. Such a person given ample discretion to choose and to pursue methods of performing his duties could be justly held to a strict responsibility for results.

A ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Some stirrings of interest in projecting such a local organization have been mani-

festated. It is believed that an organized group of that type in Portland could perform valuable functions. Close and harmonious cooperation between such an organization and the city's Bureau of Parks could hardly fail to be distinctly in the interest of the local zoo, for which in time it might become a sort of spark-plug in the capacity of a voluntary advisory adjunct along many lines.

Study of the organization of a number of American zoos seems to indicate that the most successful zoological gardens are those operated by a zoological society in the position of a responsible trustee, guarding and developing the zoo to the best advantage of the community and especially of the children. An agreement between the city officials and an organized group of interested citizens for a set-up similar to those in San Diego, Chicago, or San Antonio would seem distinctly desirable. Such a set-up should be non-political, and it should be vested with authority and charged with the duty to control the development and operation of a creditable zoo.

To this end a meeting of concerned citizens should be held, and at that time a board of trustees with the usual officers be elected. The organization would be similar to that of the Portland Art Museum. By arranging such classifications as governing members, life-governing members, life members, benefactors, patrons and members, there could be developed a perpetual source of funds to supplement those of the city government.

CHARGE FOR ADMISSION

The practice in this regard of all municipal zoos is not uniform. Some charge no admission at any time. That has been Portland's practice in the past. Others charge admission (25 cents at Brookfield for adults). Others have certain free days. Others admit children (under specified conditions) free at all times. Such a charge should be nominal in any event and should not be imposed in such manner as to exclude anybody (from visiting the zoo some time) for lack of the price of admission. Whatever policy Portland may adopt in this regard, certain free days should be designated.

PUBLICITY

Complaints about the zoo and about its real or fancied defects have been rather widely aired in recent months. Criticism, though it may tend sometimes to be unfair, is not to be deplored or deprecated. If it stimulates correction of real faults, it serves a useful purpose. As and when the zoo deserves favorable publicity, it should get it. The management should see at all times that the zoo is duly kept in the public eye.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee's conclusions follow:

1. A new zoo should be built on a new site.
2. The required capital outlay should be financed from the proceeds of a special levy to be submitted to the voters. Seattle has done this.
3. The new zoo should be administered by a competent and experienced curator-naturalist.
4. A local zoological society to cooperate with the city in every possible way should be created and promoted.
5. More fauna of new species should be selected carefully and acquired.
6. In order to start the implementation of the suggested project the broad policy of preliminary procedure advocated herein should be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

HAROLD KING

ERNEST MARKEWITZ

M. M. MATTHIESSEN

WM. C. MCCULLOCH, *Chairman*

Approved on April 29, 1950, by Dr. Martin A. Howard, *Section Chairman*, Education and Recreation. Presented to the Board of Governors August 21, 1950, and on January 15, 1951, again received by the Board, ordered printed and submitted to the membership for discussion and action. Information on present status of zoo site and map (on file in office) received February 14, 1951. Since this material had to be added to the report, printing was delayed per the footnote on page 192.