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Harbor Drive closure now or later?

Is it wise to lay the foundations before the architects have provided the blueprints? This, in effect, is the question raised by a proposal to close Harbor Drive early in 1972, when the Fremont Bridge is completed, and to divert traffic to a Front Avenue-First Avenue couplet.

The proposal was made by the nine-member Harbor Drive Task Force appointed by Gov. McCall, Mayor Schrunk and Chairman Gleason of the Multnomah County Commission. A hearing was held on the proposal by the State Highway Department last week. Glenn Jackson is chairman of both the task force and the Highway Commission and is a principal proponent of quick action on closing Harbor Drive.

Meanwhile, a 15-month study of the downtown area that began last November is expected to result in a comprehensive plan for that area. Two private firms, working with city and county planners, are compiling data on possible land uses, traffic flows, parking, mass transit, pedestrian facilities, etc. An open area on the core-area waterfront is a fundamental factor in the planning. This might be developed as a park or as a center with various attractions for the public.

Closure of Harbor Drive would be necessary and there is hardly any objection to eventual closure. Opposition stems from the proposal to speed up such action before the core-area “blueprint” is ready and before the data can be studied to determine whether there is a better alternative than the Front-First couplet.

The Task force idea is to order closure of Harbor Drive after 120 days of study by city, county and downtown planning groups and to make ramp connections between the Front-First couplet and the Steel Bridge at the north and Baldock Freeway at the south so that Harbor Drive can be closed simultaneously with the opening of Fremont Bridge. This, said Assistant Highway Engineer F. B. Klaboe, would permit establishment of traffic patterns with a minimum of confusion. Much of the heavy traffic now using Harbor Drive presumably will use the Stadium Freeway-Fremont Bridge loop.

It also would present core-area planners with a “land bank” of 34 acres of open waterfront property which should permit them to do a “superior job.” Assuming a value of $25 a square foot, said Mr. Klaboe, the land bank, owned largely by city and state, would be worth nearly $37 million and would serve to match substantial federal aid development funds.

There is some concern, too, that delay in closing Harbor Drive and establishing the Front-First couplet might result in commercial development at the south end which would bar construction of the ties to Baldock Freeway at a later date. Those favoring fast action feel the time is ripe now for clearing the downtown waterfront of Harbor Drive traffic and that undue delay might result if action is not taken.

Testimony of planners, civic groups and individuals at the Highway Department hearing was overwhelmingly in favor of allowing more time for consideration of the proposal in the light of what the studies for the comprehensive core-area plan may develop. Evaluation of that data would barely be starting at the end of the 120 days.

It has been pointed out that the south-bound, one-way traffic on First Avenue would pass through the historic Skidmore Fountain district. Parking would be banned on that street and some widening under bridge approaches would be necessary on both Front and First. A spokesman for Portland Center expressed concern that traffic would spill over into that residential and commercial area.

Rough estimates of the cost of the diversion from Harbor Drive to Front and First range from $2 million to $4 million. In 1975 or 1976, when the Mt. Hood Freeway is expected to open, some other provision will be required for handling traffic in the north-south corridor. A second Marquam Bridge is contemplated, as well as new west side accesses and possibly changes in the East Bank Freeway, in this multi-million-dollar development.

There are sound arguments against piecemeal construction of traffic facilities, especially when a comprehensive plan for downtown development is in prospect for the first time. The ramps which now connect Jefferson and Columbia streets with Harbor Drive will come down if he latter is closed. If the Ash Street ramp had been built a few years ago it would now have to be razed.

The City Council has the final say on the proposal. It must approve street closures, connections and couplets. It has taken no stand for or against, except that Commissioner Lloyd Anderson has asked for more study time. A thorough study obviously is called for.
OBSERVATIONS ON CLOSURE OF HARBOR DRIVE

The closure of Harbor Drive means the elimination of access to and from the Steel Bridge and N.W. Front Avenue on the north, and Barbur Boulevard, Ross Island Bridge and Baldock (Salem) Freeway on the south.

Access to and from Downtown is not altered, except that movement from Oak Street southbound must use Front Avenue as a result of the closure.

The same access for the above-mentioned traffic desires can be provided by 2-way Front Avenue, but at a much lower standard of efficiency. This solution will cause less disruption to First Avenue and to the blocks between Front and First than the previously suggested solution of a Front-First couplet.

This solution can easily be adapted to the existing highway system and bridges. Front Avenue already connects to all the arterials noted above.

Minimal changes in alignment and no land acquisition are needed to implement this plan. These alterations are:

1. Eliminating parking along both sides of Front Avenue between Ash and Market Streets.
3. Widening of Front Avenue to 3-lanes each direction where necessary between Ash and Market Streets.
4. Providing new connections to the Steel Bridge ramps from Front Avenue.
5. Providing a U-turn for northbound traffic destined for the Import Plaza area.
Grade separated pedestrian crossings should be provided at the following locations:

1. Between Salmon and Main Streets for access to the Park Bureau office and South waterfront area.
2. At Morrison Street; an underground crossing exists here now - should this be made more attractive, or should a new overhead crossing be built?
3. Between Pine and Ash Streets for access to the pumping station and north waterfront area.
Traffic Engineer
Public Works
Commissioner Lloyd E. Anderson

Proposed Closure - Harbor Drive

Dear Commissioner Anderson:

As requested, the following is my report concerning the proposed closure of Harbor Drive:

The closure of Harbor Drive has been the subject of a $75,000 study by the consulting firm of DeLeuw, Cather & Company, plus review of their findings and additional studies by both the Oregon State Highway Department and this bureau.

In the period from 1972 to 1977 it has been the joint findings of all three that the closure of Harbor Drive will significantly adversely affect traffic access and service to the Central Business District, and on all street and freeway facilities in the corridor bounded by the Stadium Freeway on the west and as far as Union and Grand Avenue on the east.

The Consultant stated that **"In summary, the major impact of Harbor Drive closure in 1972 would be to increase peak period congestion on the Marquam Bridge and the East Bank Freeway. Diversion of Harbor Drive traffic to these and other elements of the central area street and highway network would be marginally tolerable and would remain so until completion of the Mt. Hood Freeway. At that time, modification of elements of the central area freeway system or other improvements would be required in order to maintain a reasonable level of traffic service on the Portland area freeway network."**
The Highway Department analysis reads "So that there will be no misunderstanding resulting from this analysis, it should be emphasized that the proposed connection to Front Avenue is not intended to provide a substitute for Harbor Drive. It will, in fact, accommodate less than approximately one-half of the traffic utilizing Harbor Drive today."

Our findings agree with these; however, I don't feel that either the consultant or Highway Department have made a strong enough statement. In my opinion delays and congestion will be serious and the motorists will find these conditions unacceptable, and that as a result both the City and the State will be subjected to severe criticism. Neither the Consultant nor the State Highway Department were asked directly "Should Harbor Drive be closed?" Had this question been asked I am convinced that their answer would have been "Harbor Drive should not be closed".

Our studies indicate that the loads and traffic congestion that will develop on S.W. Front Avenue will present a serious problem to pedestrian traffic to and from the waterfront area. A solution to this problem would require installation of traffic signals at practically every intersection from the Hawthorne Bridge to the Burnside Bridge which would then further increase the traffic movement problem on Front Avenue.

The traffic problem will deteriorate to the point where from an environmental standpoint the conditions will be as bad as the closure of Harbor Drive is aimed at solving.
After the Mt. Hood Freeway is opened in 1977 and connected to the Marquam Bridge, it was recognized by the Consultant, the State, and us that conditions would be impossible without Harbor Drive and as a consequence the Consultant and State have indicated a new eight-lane river crossing in the vicinity of the Marquam, widening of the East Bank to six lanes from the Marquam to Fremont Bridge, and other changes along the Stadium Freeway that will at least include closure of the 4th and 5th Avenue on-ramps, and possible closure of Broadway-6th, and the 12th and 13th Avenue on-ramps.

Here again analysis was that without Harbor Drive serving traffic in this corridor even without the addition of the bridge, widening of the freeway, and closure of ramps, traffic conditions on these facilities will be at a level service of "E", the scale being from "A" to "F".

Recognizing this, the Consultant, in one of the alternates studied, showed Harbor Drive being retained as a six-lane facility and being designed on a multi-use basis with the waterfront development.

Again, I feel, if asked, both the Consultant and the State would recommend that Harbor Drive be retained.

The question of mass transit has been raised. I have asked the Consultant, again the firm of DeLeuw, Cather & Company, and they indicated that by 1975 or 1976 Tri-Met will not have the capability of providing the traffic service now being taken by Harbor Drive. Actually most of the traffic using Harbor Drive is through trips by-passing the Central Business District, and therefore mass transit would not be an alternate to this type of traffic.

For the above reasons I strongly recommend to the Council as follows:
- That they do not approve the closure of Harbor Drive at this time.

- That no action be taken until the Downtown Comprehensive Plan is completed, including a land use plan for the waterfront area.

- That the land use plan for the waterfront area include provisions for the Harbor Drive facility.

- That the Highway Department be requested to specify what highway, freeway additions and changes will be necessary in the vicinity of the Central Business District in order to provide for 1990 transportation needs.

In summary, I feel that if Harbor Drive is closed then the asset to the Central Business District that would be created with the redevelopment of the waterfront area would be overshadowed and outweighed by the liabilities to the central area in terms of traffic congestion and delays.

Respectfully submitted,

D. E. BERGSTROM
Traffic Engineer
April 29, 1971

TO: City Council
FROM: Lloyd E. Anderson, Commissioner of Public Works
SUBJECT: Proposed Harbor Drive Closure

At your request, I have studied the proposal to close Harbor Drive. In this connection I have requested and received evaluations of this proposal from various city and other agencies. In addition, I have conferred with the Governor, the Chairman of the State Highway Commission, and with the Tri-Met Board of Directors.

Two basic factors are involved: (1) the potential for new uses of the land along the river to provide a form of use that is more compatible, and (2) our ability to otherwise handle the traffic that is presently carried by Harbor Drive.

Based on the staff review and the above meetings, I recommend that:

1. By resolution, the City Council, Multnomah County and the State Highway Commission agree that Harbor Drive will be closed as it is presently designed. That the Council endorse the re-use of the Harbor Drive area for waterfront-oriented activities compatible with the development of the Central Business District as a whole.
2. Before the closure takes place, the following must be accomplished:

a. Council adoption of detailed development plan and management program for the downtown riverfront property and a schedule for immediate initiation of redevelopment to accomplish the plan.

b. Council approval of a plan for the revised use of Front Avenue and its north and south access.

c. Construction of the Industrial Freeway connection to the Fremont Bridge, including ramps and access to the Northwest industrial and harbor area; and approved plans for the completion of the Industrial Freeway, all to be funded by the State Highway Commission.

d. Council approval and Tri-Met agreement for an improved bus circulation system for the downtown area.

e. Highway Commission commitment to fully fund, design, and construct two park-and-ride facilities adjacent to I-205 with interstate funds. The 8% local match to be supplied by the State Highway Commission if legal, by Tri-Met if not; Tri-Met commitment to construct three park-and-ride facilities designed by the Oregon State Highway Commission; and Council approval of the schedule for this construction.

3. The City Council establish ____________ as the time by which the above must be accomplished.
4. The City Council schedule a public hearing during June 1971 to seek citizen views and comments.

Discussion

The Waterfront Task Force has recommended that Harbor Drive be closed in order that the downtown waterfront can be redeveloped for other uses. The State Highway Commission has indicated that if Harbor Drive is closed, the closure should coincide with the completion of the Stadium Freeway and the new Fremont Bridge. The chairman of the State Highway Commission has asked the City Council to evaluate the proposed closure with respect to (1) whether Harbor Drive should be closed and vacated; and (2) what specific steps should be taken to handle traffic flow as a consequence of the closure.

The City Council requested the Commissioner of Public Works to examine the recommendation of the Waterfront Task Force and Highway Commission plans for the closure of Harbor Drive and to report back. Appropriate agencies were asked to comment on this matter, and a summary of their response is attached.

The main thrust of these comments raises serious questions regarding traffic, public safety, air pollution, and land use.

The Bureau of Police and the Fire Department point out that public safety will be diminished.

The Air Pollution Authority indicates increased air pollution in the downtown area.

The City Planning Director believes a decision should wait on completion of a waterfront development plan.
The Downtown Planning Staff, while approving the proposed closure, wants traffic diversion problems solved first.

The comments of these officials should be balanced against the advantages of the proposed closure in determining if and when the facility should be closed. The plans for the re-use of the area have not yet been prepared. They will be developed in guideline form early in 1972. More detailed planning and actual development will follow. The beginning of such development on the sections of land which are now Harbor Drive are at least three years and more likely five years away.

This raises questions with respect to the timing of the proposed closure. Harbor Drive is an important traffic carrier and represents a substantial public investment for that purpose. If Harbor Drive is closed in 1972, the problem of the redevelopment of the riverfront immediately thereafter is raised. At the present time nothing more than the grassing over of the area as a temporary measure can be offered. If that is all that is done, then Harbor Drive should remain open until a more ambitious and imaginative plan for use of the riverfront is developed.

An alternative to the State Highway Commission proposal should be a clear commitment by the City, County and State Highway Commission to the closure of this facility, after several necessary actions have been completed. Those actions are: (1) approval of a detailed land development plan and management program for the riverfront area including a plan for the revised use of Front Avenue; and (2) the construction of the Industrial Freeway connection to the Fremont
Bridge, including ramps and access to the Northwest industrial and harbor area, to be funded by the State, plus approved plans for the completion of the Industrial Freeway. Further, we have found that it has not been possible to develop adequate freeway systems to satisfy the transportation needs of a highly urbanized area. Transportation is going to have to be provided through other means. It is obvious that we must look to expanded and strengthened public transit capabilities to satisfy future transportation needs in the Portland area. We just cannot continue building one freeway after another and expect that they will solve the traffic problems. Public transit capabilities have to be a significant factor in our planning for the closure of Harbor Drive. This is especially true with respect to the core area of the City. The solutions needed for these problems include early provision for improved transit service in the downtown area and the development of strategically located regional bus park-and-ride stations. These facilities should exist prior to the closure of Harbor Drive.
INDEX AND SUMMARY OF COMMENTS REGARDING THE CLOSURE OF HARBOR DRIVE

1. Oregon State Highway Department

For the most part the closure of Harbor Drive will result in lowering the serviceability of the street and highway system in the immediate area. The traffic consultants report indicates that traffic will operate without Harbor Drive, however, it will operate at a marginally tolerable level of service.

2. Downtown Planning Staff

There is agreement with the Harbor Drive closure as proposed by the Task Force provided traffic diversion problems are physically resolved prior to the closure.

3. City Engineer

Closure is opposed on the basis of construction and re-construction costs, traffic diversion and impact on the environment.

4. Traffic Engineer

The closure is opposed on the basis that trucks and other traffic problems have not been and probably cannot be solved.

5. Fire Bureau

Harbor Drive closure will affect overall efficiency of central fire station adversely, but it is felt that service can be maintained adequately if Front Avenue remains available.

6. Bureau of Police

Generally opposes Harbor Drive closure; recommends that any closure be delayed until the Fremont Bridge and the Mt. Hood Freeway are completed so that 1977 traffic patterns can be appraised and further judgment made of the effect of the proposed closure.

7. Columbia-Willamette Air Pollution Authority

The closure of Harbor Drive will not significantly affect overall air quality in the Portland metropolitan area; however it will probably degrade air quality through the 1970's along major thoroughfares experiencing greater congestion because of the closure.
8. City Planning Director

The closure of Harbor Drive should be postponed until those responsible for planning the downtown area have developed a specific waterfront development plan. The design is yet unknown therefore the decision on what to do with Harbor Drive, Front Avenue or First Avenue should be deferred until the riverfront space is designed.

9. City Water Bureau

No recommendation regarding Harbor Drive closure. Reports alterations that would be required.

10. Tri-Met

Tri-Met did not submit a written report. The situation was discussed on the telephone with Mr. Harvey Thompson. Mr. Thompson said that closure of Harbor Drive would only affect Tri-Met's operation during the Rose Festival period; specifically during the Merrykana Parade. However, if Front Avenue remains available the situation will be tolerable.
1. The traffic traveling in a north-south direction on the major arterials within the corridor located between the Stadium Freeway and Union and Grand will, when considered in total, increase by approximately 10% between 1970 and 1972 and will further increase by an additional 20% between 1972 and 1977. This, therefore, is an increase of approximately 32% between 1970 and 1977.

2. The amount of traffic which will utilize the streets during the peak hour as a percentage of the total daily traffic will remain constant between 1970 and 1977. This percentage ranges between 12 and 14% depending on the characteristics of the individual route in question.

3. The usage of the mass transit system will remain at the same level in 1977 as it is currently. This assumption was made in order that the worst possible traffic conditions would be indicated for this analysis. It is sincerely hoped that mass transit will play a much stronger role in the future than it does presently. The introduction of exclusive bus lanes and the use of certain streets for exclusive bus service is contemplated by 1977 in order to make mass transit a more acceptable mode of travel.

4. For the analysis concerning the first two alternatives, it is assumed that the following facilities will be open to traffic by 1972.
   a. Fremont Bridge
   b. Stadium Freeway completed to the Fremont Bridge
   c. Connection from Fremont Bridge to 21st Avenue at Thurman and Upshur

5. When the Mt. Hood Freeway is open to traffic in 1977, the Marquam Bridge will become extremely overloaded. It should be noted that the current difficulties experienced on the Marquam Bridge result from the ramps leading to and from the Bridge and not with the Bridge itself. In addition to the Marquam Bridge being overloaded, additional traffic from the Mt. Hood Freeway to the East Bank and Stadium Freeways will require substantial redesign on these facilities. It should be made clear that whether or not Harbor Drive is in existence has little bearing on the need for additional capacity on the freeway system. The impact of the Mt. Hood Freeway is, in itself, sufficient to require improvements on the Inter Freeway Loop. The following assumptions are, therefore, made concerning additional facilities and ramp closures on the Inter Freeway Loop.
   a. Mt. Hood Freeway completed.
   b. Industrial Freeway completed.
Based on the foregoing assumptions, the level of service which may be expected at various locations throughout the Portland Central Business District area are shown in Table 1. Figures 1 through 4 illustrates the level of service which may be expected at each of the locations listed in Table 1.

In summary, it may be seen that for the most part, the closure of Harbor Drive will result in lowering the serviceability of the street and highway system by one level of service. In other words, with Harbor Drive closed, it may be expected that the level of service would drop to the next lower level. Some locations will experience rather heavy congestion during the peak hours which will result in traffic diverting to alternate routes. As was indicated in the DeLeuw, Cather report, traffic will operate without Harbor Drive, however, it will operate at a marginally tolerable level of service.

So that there will be no misunderstanding resulting from this analysis, it should be emphasized that the proposed connection to Front Avenue is not intended to provide a substitute for Harbor Drive. It will, in fact, accommodate less than approximately one-half of the traffic utilizing Harbor Drive today.
REPORT ON HARBOR DRIVE CLOSURE
1-21-71

A public hearing was held on January 14 by the State Highway Division to establish the corridor within which future designs could be made to solve traffic, environmental, social and economic problems, which will face public and private organizations in the near future. These problems will be brought about by several scheduled and unscheduled events, which are either taking place or are projected to occur within the next 90 days, 15 months, two years, six years and 20 years.

The first of these may be the 90 to 120-day period that the chairman of the Highway Commission has set as the time necessary to arrive at a workable solution for the Harbor Drive problem. This time announcement was made at a meeting of the Waterfront Task Force Committee held one week prior to the public hearing and was directed to the City Planning Commission. As of this date, the Planning Commission has not been directed to take any action toward this 120-day study period. This 90 to 120-day period is somewhat short of the minimum completion date set for the downtown plan, which is being prepared by the City Planning Commission. This plan was originally scheduled for completion within an 18-month period beginning last November, but has since been cut to a possible 15-month schedule.

A plan was presented at the hearing by the Highway Division as an interim solution pending the completion of the downtown planning study. A separate study of the Harbor Drive problem was conducted by DeLeuw, Cather & Company for the Harbor Drive Task Force Committee, to determine current and future traffic impact of alternate types of facilities required...
to replace the surface capacity of Harbor Drive, in order to provide a "landbank" on the Portland Waterfront.

A review of this report indicates that the six alternates proposed for the closure of Harbor Drive can be reduced to a basic three proposals.

Proposal No. 1 of these three envisions the replacement of the present facility with a cut and cover complex along the present alignment of Harbor Drive and creating an area for the development of a park setting or "landbank" on the surface between the Harbor wall and the east edge of Front Avenue.

This scheme would have adequate capacity to handle traffic projected into 1976, and with proposed upgrading of the Eastbank Freeway by:

1. The Eastbank would be widened through the Banfield Freeway.
2. Additional Willamette River crossing capacity would be provided by I-80 N.
3. The 6th Avenue westbound and the 5 Avenue eastbound entrance ramps and Broadway eastbound and 4th Avenue westbound exit on the Stadium Freeway would be crossed. Access to the 12th and 13th Avenue ramps may possibly also be restricted.
4. The Water Avenue ramp on the Eastbank freeway would be closed.
5. The proposed 7th and 8th Avenue ramps on I-80 N would be omitted.

With these changes this proposal would handle projected traffic at a tolerable level through the year 1990.

It appears that this scheme would have no adverse affects on what is presently known about the downtown development plan now under intensive study by the Planning Commission.

Other pros for this scheme are:

1. It would provide a limited access facility to the industrial areas to the north.
2. It would retain the route continuity, Highway 99-W and Interstate Avenue, as a major north-south arterial.
3. It would provide an alternate north-south emergency route for interstate highway traffic when these facilities are blocked by accidents, maintenance or other emergency problems. Some of the more obvious deterrents to this alternate are:

1. The initial 16 million dollar cost.
2. Anticipated high maintenance cost in the tunnel section.
3. The disposal of vented gases from the tunnel section.
4. Some restrictions within this, or type of development of the surface area remaining.
5. The increase of traffic in SW First Ave. due to the addition of a new ramp from the Steel Bridge which would possibly conflict with downtown planning.

Alternate No. 2 proposes the development of a one-way couplet system utilizing Front Avenue as a northbound three-lane arterial with First Avenue being widened in the necessary areas, to carry three lanes of traffic southbound. All of these streets would have revised connections to the Steel Bridge and the Baldock Freeway. This plan is basically the one presented at the corridor hearing by the Oregon Highway Division.

The Alternate No. 2 plan if used as the ultimate solution would adversely affect the downtown plan by:

1. It creates a condition between First and Front Avenues which is adverse to the Urban Development goal of providing pedestrian walkways bordered by greenery, vs asphalt and traffic congestion.
2. It would increase the traffic through Urban Renewal development to an intolerable level.
3. It creates a barrier to orderly development of the blocks between Front and First Avenue by establishment of a traffic moat on either side.
4. This would necessitate the immediate solutions to the overtaxed Stadium Freeway.
5. Would place additional stress on the Union-Grand Avenue arterial.
Alternate No. 3 calls for establishment of a six-lane arterial with
left turn median and parking on the present alignment of Front Avenue,
as a direct replacement of Harbor Drive.

The traffic load diverted to other facilities by this plan would be
comparable to that diverted by the Alternate No. 2.

This plan would not have a severe adverse affect on what is known
of the downtown plan and could with proper planning be compatible if not
complementary to the envisioned park setting of this riverfront.

Adverse affect to the riverfront development and downtown-plan are:

1. It would leave only a 160-foot wide strip for riverfront
development.

2. Traffic volume and noise could detract to a degree from
   the benefits achieved by the removal of Harbor Drive
   from its present location.

Regardless of the route chosen there will be the necessity of updating
portions of the central freeway loop to provide additional north-south
capacity, as a direct result of the completion of the Mt. Hood Freeway,
proposed for 1976. With the arrival of 1990, the extended traffic volumes
indicate that it will be necessary to implement the previously stated five
items for updating the central freeway system, regardless of what changes
might be made of the Harbor Drive facility. It is, however, believed that,
if Alternate No. 3 was properly designed, the facility could be constructed
to very closely approximate the carrying capacity of the present Harbor
Drive.
Harbor Drive Parkway Task Force
Portland, Oregon

Gentlemen:

This is in response to your invitation to submit a proposal for undertaking comprehensive planning and related economic and engineering studies of the Portland Waterfront.

Portland has always had a unique and enormously valuable asset in its downtown waterfront. However, the opportunity to take advantage of it did not exist until very recently. The elimination of the Oregon Journal Building was the catalyst that created the possibility and the proposed closure of Harbor Drive made it an exciting reality. What the citizens of Portland have anticipated in five separate plans over a 50-year time span now has the opportunity of taking place almost overnight. What the Journal Building site and the Harbor Drive land produced was the potential to connect the central core to the highly successful South Auditorium by way of the Willamette Waterfront which has unlimited desirability in every way. The traditional center of the urban core is moving south toward the Government Center area and with even modest encouragement on the part of the City and County this area can form a strong link to the waterfront. The South Auditorium Extension area with the Auditorium Forecourt, the First National Bank, Crown Plaza and Portland Commons continue the new development to the north. Additional private development between these areas on the waterfront itself, such as the Portland General Electric Company's proposed new headquarters, demonstrates the continued confidence that the waterfront's time has come. Therefore, it is the charge of the public officials to take advantage of this opportunity for the lasting benefit of the entire metropolitan area. We are privileged to make this proposal for the initial planning studies which will lead toward this goal.
The following is an outline of studies to be made of the study area bounded by the Steel Bridge and the Hawthorne Bridge, and by the Willamette River and S. W. Front Avenue. Areas beyond these present boundaries will necessarily have to be considered as they relate, influence or are influenced by the waterfront. These studies will assume the vacation of S. W. Harbor Drive by July, 1973, and that the schedule which has been established will enable the first phases of the redevelopment to begin at that time. It is understood that a major objective is to finance the development of the total area, including planning funds advanced by the City, through revenues generated by private sector development in selected areas, thereby making the waterfront development as self-sufficient as possible. It is also understood that the plan should be capable of development by more than one developer. For the purposes of these studies the following firms have formed an association:

Robert J. Frasca, Partner, Principal in Charge. Besides providing primary design input, Wolff Zimmer would be the principals in charge of the project and would coordinate the activities of all members of the team for the client.

Royston, Hanamoto, Beck and Abey - San Francisco, California, Landscape Architects.
Asa Hanamoto, Partner, Principal in Charge. This firm would collaborate on all aspects of the design and planning. Because of their specific orientation and experiences, they will compliment the other disciplines and give the design effort the broad capabilities necessary to accomplish this task.

Larry Smith and Company - San Francisco, California, Economic Consultants.
Michael Marston, Vice President, Principal in Charge. This firm will provide economic consulting services to the design team. They will identify the full range of public and private land uses for which market support is available and which meet community needs in order to establish the optimum development program capable of providing community services and generating revenues.
In addition, the above multi-disciplined team would call upon the specialized resources of other firms or individuals as may be required throughout the course of these studies (e.g., meteorology, civil and structural engineering, soils, hydraulics, etc.).

SCOPE OF WORK

A three phase work program is recommended of approximately three months each totaling nine months. Each phase will involve the full and integrated resources of each member firm acting as a team, the selected resources of other specialized consultants noted above and thorough involvement of the Task Force and the several citizens advisory groups.

Phase I will establish basic methodology for the study, broad community goals and objectives, detailed planning, design and economic guidelines, and basic research.

Phase II will explore and test several alternative design/development concepts and implementation programs including detailed economic investigations and community benefit evaluations. Active participation by the Task Force and the citizens advisory groups will be especially important in these first two phases.

Phase III will involve definitive design, planning and market analysis for the area. This will include basic documentation, recommendations for phasing, funding and finance, management, disposition, influences beyond the study area and public presentation.

PHASE I

A. Establish liaison and working relationships with existing planning groups, public agencies, and citizens advisory groups including a program of continuing public information.
B. Establish review and evaluation procedures and techniques. It is possible that various planning alternatives might be evaluated by using a technique such as a weighted point system matrix of criteria to be developed including such things as physical, social and environmental impact, basic design, public use and interest, economic value, e.g., land value, tax ratables, return, etc. This evaluation process could also be adapted to subsequent developer proposals.

C. Develop basic goals and objectives. A series of group meetings will be held, particularly with the Waterfront Citizens Advisory Group, the Downtown Citizens Advisory Group, its subcommittee for the Waterfront, the Harbor Drive Parkway Task Force, as well as related planning groups and public agencies. This will serve to establish basic objectives including such things as public use and access, environmental goals, basic program of uses and activities to be considered, desired relationships to the downtown, etc.

D. Inventory and documentation of existing conditions including:

1. Basic planning data, pedestrian and vehicular movement patterns, land use data, etc.

2. Visual survey of assets, related historical assets, e.g., Front Avenue, Skidmore Fountain area, etc.

3. Detailed land use study of adjoining areas to establish primary benefit area, with special emphasis on blighted areas between the waterfront and the downtown core.

4. Investigation of traffic, transit and parking to uncover opportunities to integrate with downtown planning, traffic and transit studies, parking, etc.

5. Research of past and present experiences of other major cities with similar problems, opportunities and assets of a waterfront.
6. Existing environmental factors, climate and meteorology, pollution, river behavior and water quality, landscape.

7. Economic inventory of all new development in downtown between 1945-70 including development trends by area, land use and magnitude.

8. Identify planned and proposed downtown development 1970-75 with projections of market demand for various uses e.g., retail and specialty commercial, hotel, office, residential, etc.


10. Review major private and public projects in the Portland Metropolitan Area to determine basic direction and magnitude of economic growth and the relationship of downtown Portland to that growth.

11. Establish land value benchmarks for economic analysis of private and public land uses. The economic consultant will undertake a generalized appraisal of the study area assuming that the land is cleared for development using the market data method of value estimation to indicate: 1) present value as cleared land, 2) recent land value trends in the general area of the waterfront, 3) factors that could affect long term investment decisions.

12. Identify economic criteria affecting highest and best use potential consistent with other goals and objectives and resultant development strategy.

E. Presentation for the Task Force, citizens advisory groups, existing planning groups and public agencies.

PHASE II

A. Major alternative planning and design concepts will be
explored which respond to the goals, objectives, parameters and criteria established in Phase I. The intent in this phase will be to test several concepts which represent various, ever contrasting viewpoints, all the inherent opportunities, as well as several advanced concepts of development — for example:

1. A megastructure-type development including concepts of multiple developers for integration of compatible and mutually supporting activities, air-rights and condominium ownership, integration of public and private ownerships, etc.

2. Elevated pedestrian systems.

3. Integration of public transit systems and/or a major transit center re: the current mass transit studies.

These and other concepts will be explored with the Task Force and the Citizens Advisory Groups in an effort to gain the broadest possible participation in the planning process.

B. Evaluation. The more promising concepts will be thoroughly evaluated with techniques established in Phase I. This will include community benefit studies which will provide a detailed analysis of environmental, economic, social, aesthetic and function benefits. Special emphasis will be given to a primary benefit area. The currently neglected zone between the downtown core-area and Front Avenue.

For example: the relationship of the study area design/development plan and implementation program alternatives to this primary benefit area and the downtown core will be evaluated in terms of impact on these areas and the possibility of obtaining additional revenues from these areas to assist in the public portions of the waterfront development. This might also include recommendations for expanding the study area, selected public acquisitions beyond its immediate boundaries and/or modifications to the basic Harbor Drive relocation plan. Development of attractive environmental and useful public facilities in
the study area could substantially enhance private sector opportunities in the primary benefit area. Specifically, the concepts should be evaluated to:

1. Maximize benefits to adjoining areas and further identify how these benefits can be translated into revenues to finance public sector development in the study area.

2. Identify sources of funding for the public portions of the study area from local, state and federal programs. This could include proposals for new legislation.

C. Specific economic analysis and evaluation of alternative concepts will include:

1. Comparative evaluation of construction costs, income generation and developed land value. Basic data for these evaluations to be provided by the other consultant team members.

2. Economic impact of various disposition techniques with special emphasis given to land base.

3. Present value of the income stream (as in the case of a lease) as well as the achievable base rent and overage percentages.

4. The estimated fair market value for the total site study area and/or selected parcels for each alternative plan and implementation program.

5. Comparative evaluation of marketability of land on the waterfront with land in the core area for various proposed uses.

D. Alternative management concepts will be investigated which will best respond to various implementation programs. This will include review of existing metropolitan area agencies and the experiences of other cities with comparable programs.
E. Presentation for the Task Force, citizens advisory groups, existing planning groups and public agencies.

PHASE III

Based upon the work program outlined in Phases I and II, the planning team will establish the study area, design/development plan and implementation program for the final round of presentations, evaluations and subsequent implementation.

A. Prepare design/development plan to include:

1. Basic land use plan (and/or air-rights use plan), public and private mix, land use concepts beyond immediate study area boundaries.

2. Circulation network, pedestrian and vehicular access, mass transit, relationships to the downtown and the region.

3. Specific and detailed connections and relationships to primary benefit areas and the downtown core.

4. Basic building system, building mass and distributions, heights, landscape development, relationships to existing and proposed buildings across Front Avenue, e.g., PGE development, historical preservation, etc.

5. Planning and design controls and review procedures, parcelization plan, utility corridors, parking and building ratios, height restrictions, building limits, etc.

6. Phasing plan with possible alternative phasing techniques.

B. Economic studies in this phase will determine near term developer interest and commitments to the private sector developments of the first phase of the design/development and implementation plan. This will include:
1. Proposed alternative management systems, e.g., City or City/County agency, separate single purpose commission and management staff, review boards, etc.

2. Establishment of disposition program parameters including basic methods of disposition (lease or selected sale, timing, means, e.g., open or selected bidding, selective negotiations with limited number of developers, rights of first refusal to one development group).

3. Preparation of marketing documents based on factors such as those outlined above that would clearly outline development opportunities and maximize near term potential of the site for high quality development.

4. Interviews with selected local real estate and development organizations to acquaint them with the project and also to review the disposition programs, identify problems and opportunities, etc.

C. Prepare final presentation material, e.g., models, perspectives, reports, etc., extent and costs for same to be determined at that time.

FEES

The fee for the above outlined three phase program is $120,000 and would be completed nine months from the date of authorization. This does not include the price for finished models, perspectives, and promotional material. It is recommended that at the end of Phase II this be examined and a detailed budget can be made. However, for budgeting purposes it is estimated that $40,000 would be spent in this effort if necessary. The chart below estimates the amount of time that would be devoted to each task by each of the team members of the design group. It should be pointed out that should the time allocated for any task significantly exceed the anticipated budget, the consultants will submit a revised schedule of time and consultation for the review by the client. When 75% of the project budget has been expended, we will notify
the client and request permission to complete the project as defined. Should the client request additional work, the project scope will be redefined and a revised project cost will be submitted.

The budget includes a final written report summarizing pertinent findings and a total of 15 days in Portland and no more than eight trips by Royston, Hanamoto, Beck and Abey and Larry Smith and Associates.

**MAN DAY ESTIMATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHASE I</th>
<th>PHASE II</th>
<th>PHASE III</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WZGFR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$240/day*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$144/day*</td>
<td>40 5</td>
<td>80 60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.Conslt.</td>
<td>$240/day*</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHBA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$240/day*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$144/day*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$240/day*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LS &amp; ASSOC.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$250/day*</td>
<td>25 8</td>
<td>21 17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$150/day*</td>
<td>47 25</td>
<td>24 11</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$280/day*</td>
<td>23 15</td>
<td>17 14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Payroll is an estimated average daily rate. Prior to beginning the project all team members will submit actual payroll rates for all levels of personnel for the clients approval.
We sincerely appreciate the opportunity of presenting this proposal on such a very important commission. We look forward to working with you in the near future.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Robert J. Frasca
Partner

Enclosures: Wolff Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Ritter Office Brochure
Royston, Hanamoto, Beck and Abey Office Brochure
Larry Smith and Associates Office Brochure

My observation is that there is an overlap in work being accomplished by the Downtown Plan team and that to be accomplished by WZFR.