

4-1-1976

City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 56, no. 48 (Special Edition) (1976-4-1)

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.), "City Club of Portland Bulletin vol. 56, no. 48 (Special Edition) (1976-4-1)" (1976). *City Club of Portland*. 301.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_cityclub/301

This Bulletin 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.

NEWSPAPER SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT PORTLAND, OREGON

City Club of Portland

BULLETIN

Portland, Oregon

Vol. 56, No. 48

Printed herein for presentation, discussion and action on Friday, April 9, 1976.

**REPORT
ON
THE PORTLAND ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS**

The Committee: R. Paul Aragon, Ann Hoffstetter, Donald C. Jones, Jack R. Sullivan,
Stephen B. Hill, *Chairman.*

This report published with
the financial assistance of
PORTLAND CITY CLUB FOUNDATION, INC.

Published April 1, 1976
Vol. 56, No. 48
(Special Edition)

City Club of Portland Bulletin
505 Woodlark Building
Portland, Oregon 97205

(Additional Copies \$1.00)

*"To inform its members and the community in public matters and to
arouse in them a realization of the obligation of citizenship."*

CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND BULLETIN

Published each Friday by the

CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND

505 Woodlark Bldg. Portland, Oregon 97205

Phone 228-7231

MARILYN L. DAY, *Editor
and Executive Secretary*

Second class Postage Paid at Portland, Ore.
Subscription rates \$6.00 per year included in
annual dues.

OFFICERS OF THE BOARD

- Clifford N. Carlsen, Jr. *President*
- William B. Webber *President-Elect*
- Peter A. Plumridge *1st Vice President*
- Stephen B. Herrell *2nd Vice President*
- Shirley M. Kennedy *Secretary*
- William A. Gittelsohn *Treasurer*

GOVERNORS OF THE BOARD

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Jean Babson | E. Shelton Hill |
| Paul E. Bragdon | William R. Lesh |
| William A. Comrie | Guenter Mattersdorff |

RESEARCH BOARD

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Peter A. Plumridge, Chairman | |
| Stephen B. Herrell, Vice Chairman | |
| Charles W. Bursch, II | Mary Anne Normandin |
| Ronald C. Cease | Alex B. Pierce |
| David M. Crow | Norman Sepenuk |
| Frank H. Eiseman | Jack R. Sullivan |
| James A. Nelson | Victor W. Van Koten |
| Stanton W. Allison, Research Editor | |

**REPORT
ON
THE PORTLAND ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS**

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Your Committee was authorized on November 19, 1973, to "investigate, analyze and report on the organizational structure, policies, administration, facilities, financing and goals of the Portland Zoo and make such recommendations as it deems appropriate in order that the community may attain maximum advantage from this metropolitan resource."

Additionally, your Committee was granted the discretion to pursue the following matters for comment:

1. Ascertain whether the concept of the Metropolitan Zoo is obsolete.
2. Ascertain whether the Zoo makes efficient use of volunteer help and whether it should make more use of same.
3. Evaluate the use and desirability of marketing and publicity programs.
4. Compare Portland's Zoo operation with those of other cities.
5. Evaluate the recommendations of the 1970 City Club report in light of the existing situation. Such evaluation should consider whether the Zoological Society contract should be renewed, and, if so, on what basis.

II. SCOPE OF RESEARCH AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Toward this end, the members of your Committee, singly or as a body, have interviewed Zoo officials, officials in city government and in the educational community directly and indirectly involved in Zoo related functions, private citizens involved in Zoo policy, and supervisory and administrative professionals. In addition, your Committee has reviewed numerous articles, publications, memoranda, treatises, financial and statistical data, and other printed matter pertinent to the inquiry at hand. A complete list of the persons interviewed and the printed matter gathered and reviewed may be found in the attached appendices.

III. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A concise and articulate summary of Portland Zoo's history since conception may be found in the City Club reports of March 23, 1951, and August 7, 1970. It is pertinent to note that the 1970 report concluded, among other things, that "since the City of Portland is faced with so many serious problems in human ecology, the only prospect for the future development of the Portland Zoo is the assumption of its management by the Portland Zoological Society, which is committed to the objectives and goals your Committee recommends. The choice for the taxpayer is quite clear: The *assurance* of \$2,000,000 in capital improvements added to their Zoo in the next several years under Society management, or *no further* improvements under continued city management."¹ (Emphasis supplied).

Subsequent to the 1970 City Club report, the City of Portland and the Portland Zoological Society entered into an agreement that, commencing July 1, 1971, the Society would assume responsibility for the custody, care, maintenance and development of its zoological animals, birds, reptiles, fish, the grounds and structures housing the collection,

and the exhibition of the animal collection. The Society also assumed responsibility for the maintenance and operation of those structures comprising the Zoo Railway and the concessions then existing.

The terms of the agreement provided that in consideration of the Society's management and operation of the Zoo, the City would pay to the Society the sum of \$354,471 each fiscal year, payable in equal monthly installments.² This subsidy, however, was provided with the intent that it would be *stabilized* or *reduced* rather than enlarged.³ However, the parties entered into an amendment of the agreement on February 21, 1974, which provided that the City would pay a supplemental consideration not to exceed \$132,858 for the 1974-75 fiscal year.⁴ Under a new agreement dated October 18, 1974 the subsidy was increased to \$581,078 for the 1974-75 fiscal year, and is presently budgeted at \$610,800 for the 1975-76 fiscal year.

The Portland Zoological Society had its beginnings in 1953 when the mayor of Portland appointed a Zoo Commission. Since the City could not legally raise funds, the Zoo Commission formed the nucleus of the Zoological Society in order to raise funds, acquire animal specimens and do some of the public and community relations work. Currently, the Society is comprised of approximately 1031 members, who come within one of the following categories and respective membership dues:

Student	\$ 5.00
Individual	8.00
Family	15.00
Sustaining	25.00
Patron	100.00
Sponsor	250.00
Life/Bene.	500.00
Corporation	1000.00

At the time of the original agreement, it was the Society's position that the City was unable, either through regular tax funds, or through special levy elections, to provide in any appreciable way for the capital improvement and development of the Zoo. It was the prevailing feeling, supported by the 1970 City Club report, that the Society was then the only potential source available to generate the major financial support needed to properly expand and develop the Zoo facility. The Society agreed that it was more capable of raising the needed capital by way of donations from the private sector, and optimistically predicted the acquisition of two million dollars for the completion of the last one-third of the original capital improvement plan.

In January 1973 the Society initiated a fund drive to obtain the needed capital. During the year, \$82,035 was received in cash and pledges, and after deduction of \$60,000 for professional solicitation fees, an \$8,000 allowance for pledges not expected to be collected, and \$850 in other expenses, the net addition to the capital development fund was \$13,185. Some additional contributions were made in 1974 and the professional solicitation fees were later reduced by \$13,340. As of June 30, 1975, the capital development fund had a balance of \$33,065.⁵ It is the Society's contention that private donors have been scared away by the controversy concerning the continuance of the Society's management of the Zoo.

In 1971 when the Portland Zoological Society assumed the managerial reins of the Zoo, the Zoo was in the process of attracting 650,000 visitors (both paid and unpaid) through its gates. Since that takeover, attendance has steadily decreased, with 605,000 visitors in 1972, 525,634 visitors in 1973, 474,114 visitors in 1974, and 448,198 visitors in 1975.⁶

As agreed between the parties, the Society succeeded to management of the Zoo without any changeover in personnel. Jack Marks continued as Zoo Director, and the Society retained the existing employees, who had been hired by the City, although two eventually returned to the City payroll. The Society, in order to hire a Director of its own choosing, was required to create the position of Director Emeritus for Marks. Marks

continued to draw his yearly salary of \$16,920, while being relieved of all managerial duties and responsibilities. This paved the way for the Society to hire Dr. Philip Ogilvie as Executive Director, at a yearly salary of \$24,000.⁷

Operating under the philosophy that the animals on display should be governed by the quality of the exhibit rather than the sheer number of animals, the Society immediately began to reduce the number of animals in the collection. Dr. Ogilvie, then the Zoo's Director, shipped out a significant number of animals, previously retained in holding areas, which were deemed not acceptable to public view. A substantial effort was also made to replace old animals with animals of breeding age, and to replace animals constituting a single unit with family units. Such actions were met with some criticism, since popular animals were sold, and the actual number of animal exhibits was significantly reduced.

The Society, through the efforts of Joey Cross, Volunteer Coordinator, maintains an active volunteer program. Volunteers are used to staff the Children's Zoo, the Nursery, the Zoomobile, the Gift Shop, Concessions, and certain research projects, and are ably supervised by the paid staff of the Zoo. Volunteers are also used as tour guides for the blind, deaf and other special groups visiting the Zoo.

The Zoomobile has been in increasing demand with elementary schools in the metropolitan area and has been expanded to include elementary schools in Vancouver, Washington. The program consists of volunteers presenting films and animals (which are easily transported and handled) to school children. This program is geared toward the first grade level, but can be easily adapted to other special groups, and is intended to teach young children respect and proper treatment of animals.

The Society inherited an incomplete Zoo facility and intended, through the generation of additional capital, to complete the final phase of the construction. Since that time, the Society has apparently abandoned plans for the last one-third of the capital improvements and has, instead, marked time by attempting to maintain and repair the existing facilities. Initial inquiries have been undertaken, however, by J. d. Lorenz & Associates, an opinion research firm, to ascertain the opinions of the public concerning additional exhibits, such as the construction of a Northwest Exhibit, an exhibit to display animals and plants indigenous to the Northwest.⁸ Such an exhibit was recommended by the 1970 City Club Committee. In addition, at this writing, the new Executive Director, Warren J. Iliff, has made public plans to bring back the penguin exhibit, housed in a new structure, and has supported the idea of a more attractive seal-sea lion exhibit.⁹

In the last session, the State Legislature enacted a bill authorizing metropolitan service districts to provide zoo facilities, and to levy an *ad valorem* tax not to exceed one-half of one percent, when authorized by election, for such a purpose.¹⁰ An annual tax levy of \$2,000,000 per year for five years will be presented by the Metropolitan Service District to the voters of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties for approval at an election on May 25, 1976.

Under Iliff's leadership, it is the intention of Zoo officials to campaign actively for the ballot measure, which would place the Zoo within the aegis of the Metropolitan Service District and thus be funded at \$2,000,000 a year, which Iliff believes would provide sufficient monies for a comprehensive capital improvements program over the next five years in order to enhance the quality and number of exhibits.¹¹

IV. DISCUSSION

The citizens of the City of Portland now find themselves with a Zoo:

- 1) which represents the completion of only two-thirds of the original construction plan approved by the City of Portland voters in May, 1954;¹²
- 2) which is in many respects obsolete and in need of modernization;
- 3) in which no significant capital improvements have been made in the past five years;

- 4) at which almost all preventive maintenance has been postponed;
- 5) at which the exterior appearance has, until the last twelve months, been allowed to substantially deteriorate;
- 6) at which the number of animal exhibits has declined in the past five years;
- 7) at which attendance has steadily declined in each of the past five years;¹³
- 8) at which residents of the City of Portland appear to comprise less than twenty percent of the annual attendance;¹⁴
- 9) which is now required to be annually subsidized by the City of Portland taxpayers to the extent of \$610,800.¹⁵

Functions of a Metropolitan Zoo

The initial inquiry for your Committee was whether a metropolitan zoo is still a viable concept. From the interviews and information gathered by your Committee four basic functions have been set forth as justifications for a metropolitan zoo facility. These are conservation, education, animal research and recreation.

In the view of your Committee animal research cannot be considered as a basic function of a zoo facility but rather as a means of assisting in the fulfillment of the conservation, education and recreation functions. Your Committee also questions whether the conservation function of a zoo can justify the existence of a metropolitan zoo. While a metropolitan zoo may well assist in the conservation of wildlife, such function cannot be the justification for the zoo's existence. The retention of animals in a caged, unnatural environmental state can in no respect satisfactorily compete with wildlife refuges and animal breeding stations as a means of conserving the animal species of the earth. The latter can accomplish the conservation function far more efficiently and at less cost than that of a zoo facility. Moreover, with the many competing priorities of a metropolitan area it is seriously questioned whether the conservation of wildlife is an appropriate justification for the allocation to the zoo of metropolitan funds.

The question has been raised whether a metropolitan zoo can even be justified on the basis of its educational and recreational functions. The argument is that the viewing of animals neurotically pacing in their caged, unnatural environment or begging for food with their carnival antics can in no respect compete educationally or recreationally with the multitude of television programs and movies depicting animals in their wild, natural environment with accompanying informative narrative. In support of this position there is cited the ever-declining attendance at metropolitan zoos throughout the country.

Although recognizing certain merit in these arguments, your Committee is convinced that a metropolitan zoo can justify itself on the basis of its educational and recreational functions. The zoo offers a perspective of the animals which is not available in movie and television programs. Unlike the movie and television programs, the zoo can provide the viewer with the opportunity to see the animals alive and to hear, smell, and occasionally, feel these animals. A child can only truly appreciate the size of an elephant if the child has the opportunity to stand and gaze up at it. Moreover, the zoo is one of the last forms of recreation and education which can be equally enjoyed by all members of the family.

Likewise, attendance at certain metropolitan zoos has increased rather than decreased.¹⁶ A metropolitan zoo can attract attendance if the zoo management is cognizant of the zoo's primary role of being a recreational and educational facility which is in competition for the attendance dollars with other recreational and educational facilities within the community.

Performance of the Portland Zoo

However, in studying the Portland Zoo, your Committee found a zoo which in its present state cannot be justified on the grounds of serving its educational and recreational functions. Your Committee found a zoo with an educational philosophy which,

as expressed by Dr. Ogilvie, limited the educational activities to primarily those conducted within the Zoo itself. While educational activities within the Zoo are important, the modern zoo must be outward reaching in its scope if it is to be an essential institution within the metropolitan community.¹⁷

Within the Zoo, the Portland Zoological Society has made progress with improved graphics, guided Saturday morning tours, tours for the handicapped and limited offerings of courses at the Zoo school. The Society also has improved the educational level of certain exhibits, including the diana monkey, gibbon and seal exhibits, by encouraging the animals to display their natural movements during the feeding process.

However, your Committee found limited coordination by the Zoo with the institutions of higher learning and no formal coordination with the metropolitan school districts. Your Committee found that the Zoo was working with the science classes of only one high school in the Portland school district and this on an informal basis resulting from the acquaintance of the teacher with Zoo personnel. At the lower grade levels there was a similar lack of formal coordination between the school districts and the Zoo. Your Committee was informed that the Zoomobile Program was scheduled by Zoomobile volunteers through contacting individual school building principals or classroom teachers. As a result, your Committee found that many schools within the metropolitan area have not been visited by the Zoomobile.

Your Committee is convinced that, with its declining attendance, the Zoo must go to the children rather than waiting for the children to come to the Zoo, if the Zoo is to justify itself on an educational basis. The Zoomobile Program is a good program and in a survey conducted by your Committee¹⁸ the Program received high marks from teachers whose classrooms have been visited by the Zoomobile.¹⁹ The availability of the Zoomobile Program should be expanded to enable all schools in the metropolitan area to avail themselves of this Program. Similarly, the Zoomobile Program should be extended during the summer months to the parks and recreational centers, especially in those areas of the metropolitan area where it is less likely that the children will have an opportunity to attend the Zoo.

The failure of the Zoo to serve its recreational function is clearly evident by the steady decline in attendance over the past five years. The blame for this failure must, in no small part, be accepted by the Society and Dr. Ogilvie. While recognizing that many of the problems which distracted from the recreational appeal of the Zoo have arisen from causes beyond the control of the Society and Dr. Ogilvie, your Committee believes greater effort and emphasis on solving or at least reducing the effects of these problems should have been made. In the view of your Committee there was a direct correlation between the decline of the attendance and the lack of emphasis by the Society and its past director on the recreational function of the Zoo.

The area of the Zoo on a per exhibit basis is small in comparison with most metropolitan zoos which results in the visitors being confronted with a mass of concrete and asphalt. The spacious park-like setting of the more successful zoos of this country is missing in the Portland Zoo. This situation was further aggravated by the decision of the Society to turn the grassy knoll near the entrance into a pile of wood chips.²⁰

In a national survey conducted by Mr. Neil Cheek,²¹ he found 62 percent of those attending zoos engaged in looking at the scenery and over one-half of this number particularly enjoyed looking at the scenery. While recognizing that the climate of Portland is not amenable to the year-round garden-like settings of zoos in the more southerly portion of the United States, it is felt by your Committee that more needs to be done to enhance the park-like setting of our Zoo.

The Zoo facility, itself, has been described as "drab" in a recent national publication²² and certainly cannot be viewed as attractive. As a result of the substantial lack of exterior and interior maintenance by the Society up to twelve months ago, the facilities could more aptly be described as "shabby." Substantial additional work is still needed.

Moreover, many have criticized the littered look of the Zoo grounds, especially on weekends.

It is apparent from the manner in which the facility was allowed to deteriorate and the Zoo grounds allowed to remain littered, that the Society viewed the recreational function of the Zoo as not being a high priority. In the view of your Committee, the cosmetic maintenance of the buildings and clean-up of the grounds is essential to the Zoo serving its recreational function. Only if families find a clean, well-kept facility are parents willing to return frequently with their children, and only by visitors being willing to return can the Zoo hope to reverse the decline in attendance.

The Society has, however, increased the recreational appeal of the Zoo by its research projects involving the diana monkeys, gibbons, seals, and mandrill baboons. In each of these projects the animal must earn his food by undertaking certain actions which, if performed correctly, will result in the animal obtaining food. In so doing, with the exception of the mandrill baboons, the visitors are able to see the animals displaying their natural movements. More importantly, in most of these exhibits the visitors are able to interact with these animals by starting the feeding process through the deposit of a coin in the machine. The most sophisticated of these projects involves the visitor in a game of matching lighted panels with a mandrill baboon. Whichever identifies the lighted panel first wins the point, and whichever is first to win two points wins the match. The Society has provided a scoreboard to indicate whether the animal or the visitor has won. The visitors are also provided the opportunity of attempting to talk in sign language with the chimpanzees.

Although most of these projects have little value from a scientific standpoint, they do have value by providing both an educational and recreational experience for the Zoo visitors. The Society should be commended for the innovative way in which it has provided interaction between the visitors and the animals. Your Committee found that in comparison with other zoos, the Society provides far more opportunities for interaction through these projects.

Counterbalancing the increased recreational appeal of the research projects was the lack of the pony rides and elephant shows. The pony rides, which according to Zoo personnel were barred by federal law,²³ were not replaced by another animal ride until 1974 when the elephant ride (which is still offered) was introduced.²⁴ The elephant shows, according to Dr. Ogilvie, were required to be discontinued by reason of the retirement of the animal keeper who had worked with the elephants. However, Ogilvie did not feel that the show was appropriate, since in his opinion it lent a carnival atmosphere to the Zoo, and no attempt has been made to institute another show to take its place.

Not only did the Society terminate the elephant shows and pony rides without providing a substitute, but also reduced the number of animal exhibits since assuming the Zoo management. In addition, the Society has disposed of certain popular exhibits, including the trading of "Yogi," a kodiak bear—an action which generated a great deal of public protest.

It is the view of your Committee that in satisfying its educational and recreational functions the Zoo must provide interesting exhibits and attractions for the public. The Society has done this in part, but much more is needed. It is hoped by your Committee that, with the appointment of a new executive director, more will be accomplished.

Financial Feasibility of the Portland Zoo

In addition to the question whether the Portland Zoo can be justified on its educational and recreational value, there is a separate question of whether the Zoo can be justified financially. Between calendar years 1972 and 1974, the revenues generated by attendance²⁵ have declined, while the cost of operation has increased. As a result, the City of Portland was required during the last budgetary year (1974-75) to provide the

Society with \$581,078 to operate the Zoo and has budgeted to provide an additional \$610,800 for the current fiscal year (1975-1976).

Under the 1971 agreement between the City and the Society, the City agreed to subsidize the Zoo to the extent of only \$354,471. It was also intended under the agreement that the Society would work for a stabilization or reduction of the City's support based on a joint recognition of budgetary pressures on the City. However, in the calendar years of 1972, 1973 and 1974, the revenues generated by Zoo attendance declined while the operating costs increased. Between 1972 and 1974, these revenues decreased by two percent²⁶ while operating expenses increased by 11 percent over the two year period. (See Appendix D.) As a result, the excess of operating expenses over revenues exceeded \$483,601 in 1974. The deficits created in 1972, 1973 and 1974 have exhausted the annual contributions received by the Society as well as significantly reducing the financial resources of the Society.

It was against this background that the City Council voted three to two in October, 1974 to provide the Society with a subsidy of \$581,078 for the City's 1974-1975 fiscal year. At the same time, the City and the Society entered into a new agreement which again provided for stabilization or reduction of the City's support. However, in the view of your Committee, it is entirely unlikely that the operation of the Zoo will be such to allow stabilization of the subsidy, let alone reduction of the City's present support, as evidenced by the fact that the subsidization was increased to \$610,800 for the current fiscal year.

The obvious financial problem with the Zoo is that less people each year are paying to attend the Zoo while the costs, fueled by inflation, continue to escalate. Paid attendance at the Zoo dropped from 447,021 in 1972 to 372,929 in 1974, a decrease of 16.6 percent over the two year period. This decrease continued in 1975 when the paid attendance dropped an additional 6.6 percent to 348,349.²⁷ However, due to the increase in admission prices, the preliminary estimates for the 1975 calendar year indicate that the Zoo did increase its revenues from attendance by \$169,878 over 1974. This increase, however, was expected and contemplated in providing for the present subsidy level of the City.

Only by a substantial reversal of this trend in attendance can the Zoo be considered a financially viable entity. In the view of your Committee this reversal can occur only if substantial funds are now expended to refurbish the present facilities, new exhibits are added and the Zoo receives the broad support of the metropolitan community. Such reversal, your Committee believes, cannot be accomplished under Society management.

In seeking the management of the Zoo, the Society committed itself to a major fund-raising effort to add \$2,000,000 in new exhibits and improvements to the Zoo, and it was on the basis of this commitment that your 1970 City Club Committee recommended the transfer of management from the City to the Society:

"The choice for the taxpayers is quite clear: the *assurance* of \$2,000,000 in capital improvements added to their Zoo in the next several years under Society management, or no further improvements under continued City management." (emphasis supplied)

As of this date, the net funds raised by the Society from its capital fund drive are only \$33,065. In addition, the Society received a \$62,313 bequest from the Macleay estate in 1973 which has been used to reduce the large operating deficits of the Zoo. The Society has little in the way of financial resources, and future fund raising prospects are not promising. The fund raising efforts of the Society were seriously damaged by its decision to cease participating with OMSI in the "Zoomsi" auctions.²⁸

Not only has the Society failed to raise the necessary funds for the Zoo, but it appears also to have failed to generate broad public support for the Zoo. The reason for this may lie in the fact that the membership of the Society does not represent an adequate cross section of the metropolitan community. As a result, the composition of the

board and the direction in which community relations have been aimed have likewise failed to represent a cross section of the metropolitan community. The abortive South African wine-tasting fund raiser exemplifies the cause of the Society's inability to garner broad public support for the Zoo.²⁹ Your Committee feels it is difficult, if not impossible, for the Society to gain popular support from all segments of the metropolitan community as long as only a narrow segment of the economic and social community are represented within the Society.

With the Society unable to generate the funds necessary to reverse the operating loss at the Zoo, it is left to the City to furnish these funds. However, the City is under increasing budgetary pressures of its own.

Your Committee can find no justification for the City increasing its subsidy of the Zoo. In fact, your Committee can find no justification for the City continuing its subsidization of the Zoo, as it currently exists, at any level.

In surveys conducted by the Zoo, it was found that less than 20 percent of those visiting the Zoo were City residents.³⁰ As such, the City is presently paying a subsidy to the Zoo of over \$8.70 per each City resident visiting the Zoo in 1975. Other than being a facility for the use of its residents, there is no justification for the City's support of the Zoo. One City Commissioner attempted to justify the Zoo as just one of the many "pieces of furniture" that every great city must have. In view of the financial priorities and needs of the City, your Committee does not believe that the Zoo is an "ego trip" which the City can afford. Moreover, it should be noted that no other "cultural institution" within the City is annually subsidized in excess of \$50,000.³¹

Justified or not, as a practical matter, your Committee believes that because of other budgetary pressures, the City cannot increase its subsidization to the Zoo, and certainly not to the extent necessary to allow the Zoo to fulfill its recreational and educational functions within the metropolitan community. Continued reliance on funding by the City of Portland can only prolong a losing proposition in which the Zoo facilities would continue to deteriorate and become more obsolete, the Zoo attendance would continue to decrease, and the Zoo would be even less able to satisfy its educational and recreational functions.

Another entity must be found to operate and to help fund the Zoo. In all likelihood, this entity would have to be a tax-supported body, since it is highly improbable that revenues and contributions would ever be able to meet the operating and capital needs of the Zoo. The entity must also be one which provides tax support from all residents in the metropolitan area.

Your 1970 City Club Committee concluded that the functions of the Metropolitan Service District should be enlarged to allow for the operation of a zoo, and this the 1975 Oregon legislature did. The board of the Metropolitan Service District has now voted to undertake the operation of the Zoo, provided that the taxpayers of the Metropolitan Service District provide the District with a \$2,000,000 tax levy for each of the next five years. Your Committee will leave discussion of the merits of the Metropolitan Service District's operation of the Zoo to a future study by this Committee.

In the view of your Committee, unless another entity does step forward to fund and operate the Zoo, the City has no alternative but to take steps to close the Zoo, or in the alternative, substantially reduce the size of the Zoo. In essence, the Zoo would remain principally an enlarged children's zoo with a few other animal exhibits, plus the train ride.

It is regrettable that your Committee must be considering closure of the Zoo. However, after two years of study of the Zoo, your Committee cannot ignore the realities of the situation. The City and the Society are not in a position to make the Zoo what it needs to be in the community. Unless this is done, the use of the Zoo will continue to decrease and it will become an ever greater source of dissatisfaction within the community.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. The Zoo can justify its continued existence in the community only if it fulfills its educational and recreational functions. At present, the Zoo is not fulfilling these educational and recreational functions.

2. Although certain improvements have been made in the educational program within the Zoo, the Zoo has been too limited in its educational efforts and has not extended itself into the community.

3. The Zoo administration has failed to coordinate, except on the most informal of bases, with the Portland and other metropolitan school districts. The Zoomobile Program, an excellent program which received high marks from the elementary teachers participating in the program, has not been coordinated to assure participation of all metropolitan school districts and all schools within each district. The program appears to operate on a "word-of-mouth" basis and is largely dependent on contacts between those operating the program and the individual classroom teachers or school building principals.

4. The Portland Zoological Society, acting through its prior executive director, Philip Ogilvie, appeared to place greater emphasis on areas other than the recreational function of the Zoo. This lack of emphasis in fulfilling the recreational function is evidenced in the "shabby" appearance to which the Zoo facilities have been allowed to deteriorate, the lack of effective grounds maintenance during peak attendance periods, reduction of overall exhibits, removal of certain popular animal exhibits, failure to provide an elephant or substitute animal show, and the slowness in which the elephant ride was substituted for the removed pony rides. In the view of your Committee, this failure to place a high priority on the recreational function of the Zoo substantially contributed to the steady decrease in attendance in each of the past four years, resulting in an overall decrease in excess of 31 percent between 1971 and 1975.

5. The City of Portland is at present subsidizing the operations of the Zoo to the extent of \$610,800 per annum. If the Zoo is to satisfactorily fulfill its educational and recreational functions within the community, substantially greater sums of money must be provided the Zoo in the next few years to cover its increasing operational costs and to improve its facilities. It is evident that these sums cannot be provided by either the City of Portland or the Portland Zoological Society.

6. The composition of the Portland Zoological Society does not represent an accurate cross-section of the metropolitan community, resulting in a narrowness of vision respecting the functions of the Zoo and a loss of support for the Zoo by the metropolitan community.

7. Portland residents constitute less than 20 percent of the attendance at the Zoo and your Committee could find no other significant benefits accruing to the City of Portland or its citizens from the Zoo. Under these circumstances, continued subsidization of the Zoo by the City of Portland cannot be justified.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing, your Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. For the Zoo to fulfill its educational function within the community, the Zoo should:

- a) view its educational responsibilities as extending beyond the Zoo facilities;
- b) expand the fine Zoomobile Program of the Zoo to include visits to community centers and neighborhood parks, especially during the summer months;
- c) establish coordination of its Zoomobile Program with the administration of each school district within the metropolitan area to assure accessibility to each school in each school district;
- d) establish a reference library for use by educators in the community;

e) encourage the utilization of Zoo facilities by high school science classes and provide assistance to the instructors of such classes;

f) exhibit the animals in a more natural setting and encourage the animals to display their natural movements and actions;

g) provide a greater number of exhibits wherein the visitors can interact with the animals, especially in the children's zoo area.

2. For the Zoo to fulfill its recreational function within the community the Zoo must place a much higher emphasis on recreation by:

a) undertaking without delay to paint and otherwise make more attractive the Zoo facilities and to assure that the facilities and grounds are thereafter maintained in a manner conducive to return visits by families;

b) endeavoring to make more park-like the grounds of the Zoo;

c) continuing to extend the number of animal exhibits in which the Zoo visitors can interact with the animals;

d) continuing to create innovative programs which encourage movement of the animals;

e) reinstating the elephant shows or in the alternative a substitute animal show;

f) upgrading and improving the boat ride facilities;

g) encouraging repeated visits, by obtaining new animal exhibits through exchanging exhibits on a loan basis with other zoos or acquiring new exhibits.

3. By reason of the budgetary problems of the City of Portland and the insignificant number of City residents utilizing the Zoo facilities, the City of Portland should cease its subsidization of the Zoo. Unless another entity steps forward to finance the operating deficit of the Zoo, the City of Portland should take steps either to close the Zoo or substantially reduce the number of exhibits, or undertake other steps to bring the cost of operation in line with the revenues generated by the Zoo.

4. If a different *public* entity shall undertake responsibility for the Zoo, such entity should establish a board of citizens to develop the policies and goals of the Zoo for administration by the Zoo director and staff. This board should reflect a cross-section of the community and be answerable to the community.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Paul Aragon

Ann Hoffstetter

Donald C. Jones

Jack R. Sullivan

Stephen B. Hill, *Chairman*

Approved by the Research Board February 26, 1976 for transmittal to the Board of Governors. Received by the Board of Governors March 8, 1976 and ordered published and distributed to the membership for consideration and action on April 9, 1976.

NOTES

1. City Club of Portland, *Portland Municipal Zoo*, August 7, 1970, p. 49.
2. Agreement between the City of Portland and the Portland Zoological Society, dated June 3, 1971, Sec. 4(i).
3. "The City and the Society also jointly recognize the existence of budgeting pressures on the City and Society, and agree to work toward eventual stabilization or reduction of general fund tax support to the Zoological Gardens, as may be mutually agreed." Ibid, Sec. 3(c).
4. Ordinance No. 137862 of the City of Portland.
5. Certified statements of operations and fund balances for the six months ended June 30, 1975 and for the years ended December 31, 1973 and 1974.
6. See Appendix C.
7. Records of Portland Zoological Society as of June 30, 1973.
8. J. d. Lorenz & Associates, "The Portland Zoo, Public Attitudes and Behavior," July 1, 1974.
9. Interview with Warren J. Iliff, January 14, 1976.
10. Senate Bill 937 (1975 Session).
11. Interview with Warren J. Iliff, January 14, 1976.
12. City Club of Portland, *Portland Municipal Zoo*, August 7, 1970, p. 49.
13. See Appendix C.
14. A survey taken by the Portland Zoological Society during the months of October, 1974 through February, 1975, showed less than five percent of the visitors were residents of the City of Portland. A random survey conducted at the Zoo by J. d. Lorenz & Associates in July, August and September 1975 showed 16.1 percent of the visitors were residents of Portland.
15. 1975-1976 City of Portland Budget.
16. Joann Lublin, "More People Go to See the Animals but Pinch on Finance Worsens," *Wall Street Journal*, November 26, 1973.
17. Caras, "Zoos of the Future," *International Wildlife*, (Jan.-Feb. 1975) pp. 15, 16.
18. The survey was conducted by Dr. Laurence E. Winter while a member of your Committee. On his retirement as an Assistant Superintendent, Portland Public School District No. 1, he also retired from the City Club and your Committee. Although he did not take part in the drafting of this report, he did provide a valuable contribution to your Committee prior to his retirement.
19. This survey consisted of a short form and a long form questionnaire sent to different schools which had participated in the Zoomobile Program. Responses were received from 38 percent of those schools to whom the long form was mailed and 62 percent of those schools to whom the short form was mailed.
20. "Many zoo visitors have criticized (this decision)." John Painter, "Conflicting Management Goals Cloud Future of Portland Zoo," *Sunday Oregonian*, December 23, 1973.
21. Neil H. Cheek, Jr., "Selected Aspects of the Social Organization of the Zoological Park in the United States," pp 13-14 (1971).
22. Daniel Chasan, "In this Zoo, Visitors Learn, Through No More Than Animals," *Smithsonian*, July 1974, p. 24.
23. Hooved domestic animals are prevented from entering a zoo on a temporary basis. The intent of the law is to prevent the contraction of hoof-and-mouth disease from exotic hooved animals imported from countries where the disease is prevalent.
24. It is interesting to note that the elephant ride was not introduced until subsequent to sessions with your Committee at which Dr. Ogilvie was asked why an elephant ride could not be instituted to replace that of the pony ride.
25. The term "revenues generated by zoo attendance" is defined as revenues from admissions, concessions, gift shop, railroad and boat rides.
26. Revenues generated by zoo attendance were \$505,823 in 1972, \$496,161 in 1973 and \$495,799 in 1974.
27. See Appendix C. Between 1972 and 1975 the attendance at OMSI increased 14 percent from approximately 414,000 in 1972 to approximately 473,000 in 1975.
28. Prior to 1972, the Society and OMSI had jointly sponsored an auction at which a significant amount of money had been raised through the sale of donated items. OMSI continued the auction subsequent to the withdrawal of the Society's sponsorship with no apparent loss in support from the community.
29. Due to the substantial public criticism which arose, the Society cancelled this wine-tasting party, which was to be a major fund raising event in 1974.
30. Survey taken by the Portland Zoological Society during the months of October, 1974 through February, 1975.
31. Interview with Paul Linnman, Assistant to City Commissioner Mildred Schwab.

APPENDIX A — SOURCES

1. Agreement between City of Portland and Portland Zoological Society dated July 1, 1971, and October 18, 1974.
2. Arthur Young & Company. Financial Review of the Portland Zoological Society, dated December 18, 1972.
3. Capps, Douglas. Memorandum to Neil Goldschmidt regarding zoo management, dated December 31, 1973.
4. Caras, Roger. "Zoos of the Future," *International Wildlife*, January-February, 1975.
5. Chasan, Daniel. "In this Zoo, Visitors Learn, Through no more than Animals," *Smithsonian*, July, 1974.
6. Cheek, Neil H., Jr. "Selected Aspects of the Social Organization of the Zoological Park in the U. S." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in August, 1971.
7. Cheyenne Mountain Zoological Park Annual Report, December 31, 1972.
8. City Club of Portland, *Bulletin*:
Portland Municipal Zoo, March 23, 1951.
Special Five-Year Modern Zoo Levy, April 30, 1954.
Planning for Capital Improvements, May 16, 1958.
Special Tax for Zoo Expansion, Operation, October 21, 1960.
Portland City Government, May 19, 1961.
Special Tax Levy for Enlargement and Addition to Pachyderm House at the Portland Zoo, April 24, 1964.
Portland Municipal Zoo, August 7, 1970.
9. City of Portland:
Ordinance No. 137862 (February 24, 1974)
Ordinance No. 138986 (October 17, 1974)
Ordinance No. 139028 (October 30, 1974)
10. Christiansen, Dale. Memorandum to Commissioner Ivancie regarding Zoo Management Plan, dated November 16, 1973.
11. Cross, Joey. "An Overview of the Portland Zoological Gardens Volunteer Services Program." Portland Zoological Society, September 26, 1973.
12. Ivancie, Francis. Recommendations regarding zoo management, dated January 4, 1974.
13. J. d. Lorenz & Associates. "The Portland Zoo: Public Attitudes and Behavior," survey conducted for Portland Zoological Society, July 1974.
14. Lorenz, John. Memorandum to Director, Portland Zoo, regarding In-Zoo Survey, Phase I, dated September 23, 1975.
15. Lublin, Joann. "More People Go to See the Animals but Pinch on Finances Worsens," *Wall Street Journal*, November 26, 1973.
16. National Zoo and Aquarium Assistance Bill, (S.2042) introduced by Senator Mark Hatfield, June 18, 1973.
17. Ogilvie, Philip W. "Zoos as Potential Research Resources" (undated).
18. Painter, John. "Conflicting Management Goals Cloud Future of Portland Zoo," *Sunday Oregonian*, Forum Section, December 23, 1973.
 —. (December 23, 1973). "Pony Ride, Summer Elephant Show Dropped, But There is Still a Lot of Animal Clowning." *Sunday Oregonian*, Forum Section.
19. Portland Zoological Society:
 Animal inventories, various dates.
Bylaws
 Job descriptions for staff.
Proposal for extension of July 1, 1971 agreement with City of Portland.
Proposal submitted to Oregon legislature for grant in aid from Oregon Department of Education.
Response to survey by American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums.
 Solicitation document prepared in February, 1973.
1975-1976 Budgetary Request for City of Portland Funding (Feb. 4, 1975).
Policies on Human Handling and Care of Animals.
20. Ripley, S. Dillon. "The View from the Castle," *Smithsonian*, May 1974.

APPENDIX B — PERSONS INTERVIEWED

William V. Aragon, Curator, Cheyenne Mountain Zoo, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
 Dale Christiansen, Superintendent of Parks, City of Portland.
 Dharma Dhinsia, Ph.D., Scientist at University of Oregon School of Medicine.
 Neil Goldschmidt, Mayor, City of Portland.
 Warren J. Iliff, Executive Director, Portland Zoo.
 Francis J. Ivancie, Commissioner, City of Portland.
 Donald Lengacher, then President, Portland Zoological Society.
 Paul Linnman, Administrative Assistant to Commissioner Schwab, City of Portland.
 Hal Markowitz, Ph.D., Associate Director of Research, Health and Education, Portland Zoo.
 Jack Marks, Past Director, Portland Zoo.
 Loren McKinley, Executive Director, Oregon Museum of Science & Industry.
 James Metcalf, M.D., Professor, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, Department of Medicine; Past Director, Oregon Zoology Research.
 William Montagne, Ph.D., Director, Oregon Regional Primate Center; Board of Trustees, Portland Zoological Society.
 Philip W. Ogilvie, Ph.D., then Executive Director, Portland Zoo.
 Mildred Schwab, Commissioner, City of Portland.
 John Wilson, Business Manager, Portland Zoo.

APPENDIX C

PORTLAND ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS

Attendance in Thousands 1965-1975

<i>Year</i>	<i>Paid</i>	<i>Free</i>	<i>Total</i>
1965	494.9	245.0	739.9
1966	465.3	255.7	721.0
1967	457.1	265.0	722.1
1968	410.2	257.5	667.7
1969	432.9	225.8	658.7
1970	462.3	252.0	714.3
1971	416.2	234.3	650.5
1972	447.0	158.0	605.0
1973	415.5	110.1	525.6
1974	372.9	101.2	474.1
1975	348.3	99.8	448.2

APPENDIX D

PORTLAND ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY — STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

Revenues:	<i>1972</i>	<i>1973</i>	<i>1974</i>	<i>1975¹</i>
Zoo Admissions	\$272,488	\$249,932	\$ 239,094	\$ 423,879
Concessions and gift shop	115,993	130,635	128,680	123,727
Railroad and Boat Rides.....	117,342	115,594	128,025	118,071
Macleay Bequest	—	62,313	—	—
Donated Equipment, Materials and Labor	—	—	13,435	711
Total Revenues	572,897	644,025	581,313	774,721
Expenses:				
Animal Care, Welfare, Food ...	\$ 59,854	\$ 73,801	\$ 105,233	\$ * ²
Salaries, Wages and Other				
Payroll Expenses	695,573	669,502	720,059	*
Maintenance	47,049	40,210	60,577	*
Utilities and Insurance	109,531	94,627	89,108	*
Graphics, Public Information, Security	28,614	26,725	28,970	*
Other Expenses	18,741	40,777	60,967	*
Total Expenses	959,362	945,642	1,064,914	1,218,241
Excess of Expenses over Revenues:	\$386,465	\$301,617	\$ 483,601	\$ 443,520

¹In 1975 the Society changed from a calendar year to a fiscal year ending June 30. The amounts for the first six months of 1975 are audited while the amounts for the last six months of 1975 are unaudited.

²Due to a change in classification, 1975 expenses cannot be compared with expenses in earlier calendar years.