

*Richardson read the
paragraphs marked in
red checks*

Mr. Chairman and fellow Commissioners:

In casting my vote today on selection of a site for the Exposition-Recreation commission's much discussed Sports-Recreation Center and Pacific International Livestock Exposition project I recognize it as being probably the most important decision I will have to make as a member of this Commission. What you and I do, by our votes today, will, I hope, reflect credit as it concerns our best judgment in the years the project will serve the people of Portland and be enjoyed by the many thousands within our State and from the Pacific Northwest.

To start with, let me say that the selection of a site for our projects should not be based on prejudices as so many have indicated in their letters to our two newspapers, but, instead should be predicated on our best thinking and business judgment as to what will be best for the majority of the people in the many years the structures will serve the community.

This Commission should consider in effect what they would do if they were chairman or president of a large corporation, or a wealthy individual or group of such men who had eight million or more dollars to spend on the basis of top returns for the money spent.

On the above basis I would not cast my vote for the Recreation-Sports Center at the extreme city limits, north, south, east or west. As an example let me cite the case of the proposed new hotel contemplated for Portland by the Corrigan hotel interests and individuals of Portland who are willing to invest in the project. All of them are civic minded and successful in their own businesses, who, together with Union Labor are helping finance the new hotel. They plan to build in the center of our downtown business area.

If that type of thinking prevails among people who are making their investment in the project solely for what it will do for Portland and return to them in dividends, why should not this Commission do likewise in selecting the site for the Exposition-Recreation Center. One cannot imagine placing a \$13,000,000.00 new hotel or office building at the extreme city limits unless they expected close to 100 per cent occupancy, without which, their project would fail.

Stanford Research Institute surveys show many supporting facts for placing the Recreation-Sports Center in a downtown area close to the hotels, business district and near the center of population, where public transit facilities will best serve the Center. Fringe area and coastwise bus service will be close to a downtown site. A downtown site would be in a low taxi fare zone for thousands of people in hotels and apartments, and, within walking distance if they desire.

Our City Planning Commission visions present highways as well as the fast expressways and contemplated highways, all of which will be close to and best serve our downtown site if this

Commission decides to vote for a downtown site; a site where our present and contemplated new bridges will open up much better traffic approaches to the Center; where our present public transit system will be able to provide the best in helping people of Portland reach the Center.

The Third Avenue bus line passes a downtown site and in doing so crosses every other bus line entering the WEST side downtown area EXCEPT Council Crest and Barbur Boulevard. A transfer from the Council Crest line can be made a 2-block walk. Barbur Boulevard passes within one block of a downtown site. In addition to excellent local bus service, two-thirds of all scheduled suburban busses pass within four blocks and forty per cent pass within 1 block of a downtown site.

A survey in 1946 demonstrated that 26 per cent of all trips made daily by all the people in Metropolitan Portland area was to and from the WEST side downtown area.

The site I propose to vote for was shown in a 1950 survey to have within a five mile circle, 348,000 persons or 58 per cent of the total 601,000 who lived in the Portland Urban community extending from and including Vancouver to Oregon City and Gresham to Beaverton. Within this five mile circle lived 317,000 or 85 per cent of the total population of Portland.

A downtown site is more convenient for more people to get to than any other location in the Metropolitan area of Portland. It is actually more accessible than buildings in the heart of the downtown area because it can be reached from Harbor Drive by-by-passing downtown congestion.

The new Portland-Salem expressway makes travel from the Willamette Valley communities faster and very convenient to a downtown site. The Banfield expressway will also be a valuable adjunct for those in the Eastern part of our State and city as well as those from Southeastern communities in Washington. Columbia and Jefferson streets, one-way affairs, can handle traffic from Lower Columbia river points, Beaverton, Hillsboro, Forest Grove, Tillamook, Astoria without going into the downtown congested area. Fourth avenue and Barbur Boulevard will carry the traffic from Newberg, McMinnville and Corvallis communities without it getting into the downtown congested area.

The proposed N. W. 21st Avenue bridge, better known as Fremont Bridge, and the St. Johns, Steel and Broadway Bridges, can take care of through traffic from all southwest Washington communities as well as North Portland residents. In other words, I am not concerned about people residing within a 200 mile radius reaching and leaving a downtown Center in the fastest and safest manner.

Since the study made in 1950 as to population of Portland which showed 348,000 persons or 58 per cent of the total 601,000 who lived in the Portland Urban community extending from Vancouver to Oregon City, and Gresham to Beaverton, and that within this five mile circle lived 317,000 or 85 per cent of the total population of Portland, it would be most interesting and informative as well as educational if Portland residents would, today, five years later, take time to re-visit these areas and note the fabulous increase in new homes and buildings both on the East and West sides of the Willamette river, particularly in the eastern, southeastern and southwestern areas and other suburban real estate and housing projects that are fast building up. In the near future it will be difficult to find unimproved property within our city limits.

In the past few years the number of apartment and apartment-hotel buildings that have been constructed, and additional projects that are contemplated in area close to the Portland business district makes a proposed down-town site within easy walking distance. Stanford Research Institute conducted a survey of arenas and auditoriums for this Commission with facilities similar to the one this Commission is contemplating and found that 29 out of 32 managers contacted indicated the desirability of a Center being as close to the hotel and downtown business district as is possible.

The same survey indicated need for a central location, in, that of 21 cities OUTSIDE the immediate business district 10 have either completed or are currently building similar facilities on downtown sites. Four other cities have plans for building on downtown sites to meet their needs. According to Stanford Research survey, to locate such a facility as the Recreation-Sports Center in a suburban location would mean that it would draw 10 to 40 per cent LESS attendance than if located centrally.

Parking for any site, particularly in a central location, is always a real problem. For 28 years I have lived with it in Portland during my affiliation with Multnomah Athletic Club and Multnomah Stadium. When you seat approximately 35,000 people in Multnomah Stadium without parking space provided by the stadium you will agree that I have lived with a parking problem. I believe parking requirements are greatly exaggerated. On an October afternoon in 1930, 35,266 persons jammed into Multnomah Stadium to see Oregon play Washington. The Center's parking requirements will be for a maximum attendance of 15,000.

Research shows that in the analysis of other cities there is about one car for each three persons required at suburban facilities and one car for each five persons at Central located facilities. This is so for the reason that at a central location many people arrive on foot, by mass transportation and taxicab, which does not occur in a fringe area site. This would indicate that if our Recreation-Sports Center were to be located on a down-town site that parking space for three thousand cars would be

required. Surveys show that ten large cities with arenas or auditoriums of varying seating capacity, with a minimum of 8,000 seats, have no parking facilities of their own and in some instances none close to their facility. Six cities, with larger population than Portland, have parking for less than 1,000 cars.

Speed instead of tolerance seems to be uppermost in peoples' minds when they get into their cars and proceed home or elsewhere at the conclusion of events. An orderly procedure in dispersing crowds in automobiles should be the aim of all people. I believe that on a downtown site, near The Auditorium, dispersal of cars can be handled adequately for the following reasons advanced by the City Planning Commission study:

When the Columbia-Jefferson and Market-Clay overpasses are constructed, there will be 19 traffic lanes available on arterials approaching or leaving the downtown site.

The carrying capacity of these 19 lanes can be reasonably rated at 11,000 cars per hour. If 30 per cent of this capacity were reserved for other traffic passing in the vicinity, the peak load of 3000 cars could be dispersed in 23 minutes. If drivers choose to use the several side streets in the vicinity namely, First and Second avenues, Mill, Harrison, Hall, College and Lincoln streets, dispersal could be cut to 18 minutes.

To support my statement of the possibilities of private parking in this area the Commission plus private operators of off street parking, whether it be street level, pigeon-hole or multi-deck type, should keep in mind this reference by the City Planning Commission: "Maps of the downtown site area showing land use, sub standard dwellings and owner occupancy indicate (S. W. Market Street to Arthur Street between Front and Fourth Avenues) the degree of blight in the encompassing South Auditorium site. There is an unusual mixture of land use. Although predominately residential, only two of 42 blocks in the study area are free of business, industrial or other non-residential use of property. The area contains some of Portland's oldest houses. As such the incidence of substandardness as indicated by delapidation or without private bath, is five times greater than the average for the whole city. HOME OWNERSHIP is practically NIL. More than 90 per cent are renters." unquote.

Concluding the parking situation, it is my belief that the Commission's revenue from whatever the Commission itself could provide for parking would be far greater from a downtown site than if the project were to be located at the extreme city limits. This is based on an all-year operation on a downtown site.

Information I have regarding off-street, pigeon-hole and multi-deck parking operations is, that when parking lot ground values pass the \$3 per square foot mark it is economically sound to erect pigeon-hole and multi-deck facilities. Off-street ground level parking does not require expensive maintenance.

From my observation of the area between S. W. Market and S. W. Arthur streets and Front avenue and Fourth avenue, owners of the property in many instances would receive a much larger return on an annual basis if their property were to be switched over to parking lots. This contention is based on the large number of downtown buildings not adjacent to the proposed Center site that are now being razed or contemplate being razed.

I would suggest shuttle service by the Commission to and from the Center parking site for those who desire it -- without charge, other than their parking fee.

While having no bearing on the parking situation it is interesting to note that in this area juvenile delinquency was almost three times greater in 1950 than the city as a whole; adult crime two and one-half times greater. The number of public welfare cases was almost four times the rate for the whole city.

On the basis of the above information it is my opinion that the area on which I propose our Recreation-Sports Center be built can ably qualify for Urban Renewal funds which, would help the Commission complete our projects and with not too much additional, if any, of our taxpayers' money.

If the vote of the Commission is to place the Recreation-Sports Center on a downtown location, I will vote to appropriate a portion of our funds to revamp the present Pacific International Livestock Exposition building and in addition build a fire proof pavilion for presentation of their entertainment program without which they claim they cannot successfully stage their annual stock show and the many other events they hold annually.

Personally, I would like to see the Pacific International Livestock Exposition tied in with the Multnomah County Fair Grounds at a new location, even tho, in my opinion, their presentations are not easily designated as being comparable. In the interest of economy and non-waste of taxpayers' money by both Commissions it is my belief that together we should explore every avenue of thought in the hopes the many problems to be solved can be made workable. Whatever site is selected must have adequate railroad facilities close at hand and a large parking area. I'm now speaking of the P.I. If the Commission builds for the P.I. it has been agreed that the 42.7 acres of property now owned by them will be deeded to the City of Portland.

There is one point to be strongly considered by this Commission and that is whether or not either West or East Vanport, the latter known now as Delta Park, are suitable locations for the P.I. I quote in part from a letter dated November 19, 1954, received by Hon. Fred L. Peterson from Col. J. U. Moorhead, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer: "Last May the voters of Portland approved a major bond issue to finance construction of an Exposition-Recreation Center. Prominently mentioned among possible sites for the new structure has been the diked area in Peninsula Drainage

District No. 1 between Oregon and Columbia Sloughs and Denver Avenue and North Portland Boulevard, which formerly contained the City of Vanport. In the event the consideration is still being given to that location, I feel that those charged with making the final selection should be informed of the potential flood hazard which still exists in the area. ✓

"The present protective system contains levees along Columbia Slough and Oregon Slough, plus the railroad embankment to the West and the Denver fill to the East. A break in the railroad fill during the 1948 flood resulted in inundation of the area and destruction of Vanport City. Although the break was repaired by the railroad company following the flood, the nature of the remainder of the fill is not definitely known and it must be assumed that the protective system is still vulnerable as it was prior to the 1948 flood. The 1950 Flood Control Act contained authorization for the improvement for Peninsula Drainage District No. 1 which would eliminate both railroad and highway fills from the protective system. Funds have not yet been appropriated for detail planning and construction of those improvements, however, and I cannot predict when it will be possible to initiate work on the project."unquote. ✓

Also, a letter to the Commission from C. F. Thomas, Chief Engineer, Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway, dated July 20, 1955, concerning the same matter, follows and I quote: "The railways operate over a fill---not a dike---that holds high water out of this area--- (meaning Vanport.) This fill is supported by 50 feet of mud. The temporary trestle built at the time of the 1948 flood required 110 foot piles. Records show that original timber bridge was supported on piling driven to elevation minus. Whenever the river exceeds the 24 foot stage, we become a little uneasy. There is considerable seepage that so far we have been unable to stop, so we sandbag to equalize pressure. S. P. and S. records are available if you wish to see them." unquote ✓

As problematical as the flood conditions are foundation-conditions at Vanport. The area is a former river bed and is now covered in part by swamps and sloughs. It is underlain by mud, silt, sand and gravel which tend toward differential movement under pressure, especially when saturated with water. Foundation engineers engaged by Port of Portland in 1946 found no bed rock after exploring to a depth of 121 feet. These engineers state not only are unusual and expensive foundations required but that special structural features must be included in buildings to allow for expected differential settlement. It is not possible to estimate extra costs necessary to meet these foundation problems until at least a hypothetical building is analyzed. The situation is especially critical for a sports coliseum because of long, clear roof spans which concentrate exceptional loads where structural supports bear upon the sub soil. ✓

The Steel Bridge site would, in my opinion, prove to be a bottle-neck in traffic due to its proximity to the Broadway Bridge. This site, I believe, could qualify for Urban Renewal funds as a ✓

blighted area, but, among other objections is the fact that it is not considered a downtown site.

The Ross Island Bridge site is not, in my opinion, a downtown site. To build the Center on the Ross Island site would require large sums of money for purchase of excellent income revenue property which will continue to be such for 50 or more years; filling in the area to above high water levels, access roads and new bridges.

I am in favor of the South Auditorium site for the following reasons:

1. Close to center of population.
2. Close to hotels.
3. Close to main downtown business district.
4. Close to Apartment-Hotel buildings which now show in Portland's downtown skyline.
5. Best public transit facilities.
6. Close to downtown bus depots and bus stops.
7. Close to fringe and long haul bus depots and routes.
8. Has benefit of present and proposed highways and freeways.
9. Best served by Portland's bridges, present and proposed.
10. Within walking distance for many thousands of people.
11. Low taxicab fares.
12. 29 out of 32 managers of midwest and eastern arenas and auditoriums indicate site should be close to downtown business district.
13. Survey of 21 cities with arenas or auditoriums OUTSIDE the immediate business district, 10 have either completed or are currently building similar facilities on downtown sites to meet the need of those cities.
14. An Exposition-Recreation Center in any suburban location would draw from 10 to 40 per cent fewer customers.
15. Stanford Research Institute survey shows that a downtown site should be selected.
16. The City Planning Commission recommends a downtown site and particularly the South Auditorium site as their number one choice. I should like to adopt as a part of my own reasons for selecting the South Auditorium site the advantages of that site as stated by the City Planning Commission, some of which I have stated above, and, to reemphasize them again, because all of us are prone to forget, that the City Planning Commission is an expert, impartial body organized to bring a coordinated program of improvement to the City of Portland. Its fact-findings have at all times had the highest regard for fairness. Its staff consists of a long-experienced and well-qualified Planning Director, an Assistant Director, a Zoning Supervisor, four City Planners, five Engineers, an Engineering aide, in addition to other help. Its staff report which I have read ~~since my return from the beach~~ was fairly lengthy and had only one purpose, to locate the Center in the best available site. Its recommendations in favor of the South Auditorium site shows the

following advantages which I believe other groups have also approved:

- A. The Exposition-Recreation center would be in the center of the city.
- B. The site offers accessibility from all directions and areas of the city and neighboring communities.
- C. The ease of traffic dispersal is unsurpassed, east, west, north and south.
- D. Its proximity to all city bus lines and to inter-urban and national bus lines is excellent.
- E. It is served by major utilities.
- F. The availability of immediate and adequate fire and police protection is important.
- G. Its parking areas would be used continuously.
- H. Its topography is adapted to two or more levels.
- I. Improvement of the area would benefit the area and the entire city.
- J. It is expansible.

17. From a standpoint of greatest financial returns from an arena located on a downtown site, close to hotels and main business district, public transit facilities, bus routes and walking distance for many, it would offer a much greater opportunity of achieving the fullest occupancy on a yearly basis of operation which would result in maximum revenue for the Center.

As mentioned before there are many fine reasons that have been advanced by proponents of other sites but in the final analysis the South Auditorium site, in my opinion, outweighs all other arguments. Based on what I consider facts and not prejudice I desire to cast my vote for the South Auditorium site for our proposed Center.

I want to thank both the Morning Oregonian and Oregon Journal for their most helpful editorials and news stories which I am sure presented their viewpoints honestly and sincerely although I did not always agree with some of their thinking.

For those who have criticized the Commission for the delay in selecting a site I wish to read in part an editorial from the Oregon Voter of August 27, 1955. I quote:

"In view of time taken by new industries coming to the Pacific Northwest in selecting a site, the impatience in some quarters for a hurried decision of the Exposition-Recreation Commission could be bad medicine for the City if it causes the Commission to act without full consideration of all that is involved.

"Those that are so impatient to get at spending the \$8,000,000. should remember that many of the new industries that have come to Portland, took not months, but years to study sites for the

purpose intended. Studies of traffic, trend of housing, future of transportation, taxes, and a score of other factors have delayed the selection of some of these sites, and the experts to pick the site usually had to satisfy only a vice-president or a president, who in turn was charged with satisfying only a small board of directors or perhaps one or two owners. The E-R Commission has the whole population including some special pleaders to satisfy and the task is not easy. Figuratively speaking the E-R Commission has some 400,000 rocking chair quarterbacks telling them what to do, though they haven't studied the facts at all.

"Those who are so impatient should recall that the \$10,000,000. National Biscuit Company plant came to Portland only after seven years of intensive study, first, in all cities of the Northwest, and then of possible sites in Portland, after this city was selected." The Willard Storage Battery Company took several years to be satisfied as to a site after spending several years selecting Portland. The most recent example is that of the Owens-Illinois Glass Company now building in Park Rose, where experts studied for years the several inviting locations for their \$1,700,000.00."

In this same article the Oregon Voter said, "Oregon Voter, in view of its warning a year ago of the site selection difficulties, and always being wary of run-away costs on any tax-spending public undertaking, hopes the Commission will take time to study the advisability of using some of the money in completely rebuilding and modernizing the existing P.I. site and structures to meet part of the need, and then centering on a downtown site with the City Planning Commission findings in mind, very seriously, for those other needs that are so much, now, a part of the problem."

I would say that the Oregon Voter's position is well taken.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES J. RICHARDSON, Vice-Chairman
Exposition-Recreation Commission

official date
Oct 5, 1955
10¹⁵ AM

John T. Carson

REPORT
OF
JOHN T. CARSON
AND VOTE

SOUTH AUDITORIUM SITE

It is freely admitted by the proponents of this site that \$8,000,000 would not be sufficient to build an ample facility to completion. To embark knowingly on such a proposition before a further vote of approval be obtained would, in my opinion, be a betrayal of public trust.

The congestion in downtown Portland today is very bad, indeed. This in no way reflects discredit on our Traffic Authorities, for they are facing a well nigh impossible task. The beautiful Willamette River which flows thru our city is responsible for it. The bridges are jammed for five hours each day. The new bridge and approaches will bring some relief but not nearly enough in comparison with our problem.

My opinion is the building of a facility downtown operated both day and night, would aggravate further these problems and would make shopping in our department and other stores even more difficult. Also it would remove valuable property from the tax rolls. If it is true that downtown area's need a resurgence of activity the solution certainly does not lie in the direction of more congestion and fewer parking places, but rather a community effort of downtown business to evoke a permanent plan which would result in making the downtown a more attractive place to shop, not less. Present parking spaces do not now take care of the demand.

One argument used to further the selection of a downtown site is the proximity to hotels. This reasoning is not valid because sleeping space for conventions cannot now be taken care of by present hotel space. If there were five (5) new hotels built in downtown Portland instead of just the one proposed we still would have ample room to take care of them all in the present Auditorium which also has some exhibit space.

In our meeting with the hotel men these facts were brought out and we asked where people would sleep in case we got a convention which could fill the present Auditorium. The reply was that they would tell their regular patrons to stay home in such an event. My opinion is that more business should be obtained not the "instead of" kind. It was not discussed but it is true that most conventions never go beyond the confines of the hotels. I certainly am very sympathetic to all of these problems but the solution lies in their hands, not in those of the E-R Commission. The subject of motels was not discussed, for obvious reasons.

There is somehow an idea prevalent that locating the sports center downtown would be a panacea for all the ills therein. Here is one example of what I mean:

Mr. Henry Cabell of the State Board of Higher Education brought out the point that parking around a downtown facility could be used for a small fee, by the students of Portland State College.

The parking for the facility, if such a facility is to be successful, must be reserved for the patrons of that facility which would be used night and day for most of the year. This is particularly true in Fall, Winter and Spring. Here again I'm very sympathetic to their problem but as said before, that is their problem, and should be faced up to honestly and objectively. There is no other way.

On the subject of aid from Urban Renewal funds, we can only say that maximum possible grant indicated by Portland Housing Authority is \$1,300,000. Nothing definite could be promised so the proposition is an "iffy" one at best. That, of course, is tax money and would be final whereas the P.I. would give assets

approximately that figure. The income from these assets would amount to \$30,000 to \$50,000 per year -- every year. This is in effect lessening the tax load instead of adding thereto.

Large department and various other stores in urban centers throughout the United States and Canada have built branches in suburban areas. They have done so for only one reason -- to serve their customers better and to make more profit. Macy's and Gimbel's in New York, May Co. and Broadway stores in Los Angeles have done an outstanding job in this manner to name a few. In the case of Los Angeles the fastest growing city in the U.S. Just where is downtown? Everyone knows where the financial center is...but just where is downtown? The answer of course, is everywhere or anywhere.

Did Walt Disney locate in an urban area? Of course not. He built where lots of freedom could be exercised and is he doing business? Knotts Berry Farm is another example. So is Golden Gate Park in San Francisco.

It is my considered judgment that patronage in the downtown area would be augmented considerably by the location of the facility in a suburban area, not hurt. People in this trading area want and need to park where they shop. Last, but not least, is the timetable of building downtown. Three years would be an absolute minimum with five years more nearly correct. More money would, of necessity, have to be voted in any event...There is no assurance of that.

Participation in an Oregon Centennial in this site is impossible. This is admitted by all concerned.

I, therefore, reject the South Auditorium site for being too costly, lacking parking, traffic congestion, loss of tax revenues, and because it would be forever contained with no hope for expansion of future facilities. It is ~~inimicable~~ to the best interests of Portland.

CAL

BROADWAY-STEEL BRIDGE SITE

The traffic and parking disadvantages around this site are similar although somewhat less than the South Auditorium site. Having a limited parking area bounded by the arterials of N. Broadway, Wheeler, Weidler, Williams and Holladay together with the immediate proximity of the bridges make traffic dispersal an impossible situation. That is true both of pedestrian and mobile traffic.

Erection of a facility in this location would further blight the area and does not lend itself to maximum return of parking and concession income. We need that income for a successful operation.

A big factor in favor of this site over the South Auditorium site is that it would cost less and is on the East side of the River, where 80-85% of the people in Portland live.

The time table on this site would be lengthy too. Time to negotiate or condemn property, demolition, grading etc. all extend the period before construction. The people already own the Delta Park area and plans could proceed forthwith.

I would not vote for this site because of cost, lack of parking, traffic congestion, immediate proximity to bridges and river, loss of tax revenues and finally because expansion would be too costly.

This is preferable to the South Auditorium site, however.

DELTA PARK SITE

Delta Park is the only place proposed where the complete facility can be built for \$8,000,000. It is also the only place that can provide enough parking and in return produce the much needed revenue from such parking and the maximum revenue from concessions, (estimated \$250,000). It is a well-known fact that a sports facility of any kind, private or public, could not long exist without these maximum revenues except through a tax-drain on the people.

In addition the P.I. is badly needed not only for the income they would provide every year for 8 to 10 days, but the revenue resulting from the rental of the property which they would give the city. The estimated income from the P.I. would be \$4,000 to \$5,000 each year in facility rental and between \$30,000 and \$50,000 per year in property rental. The Pacific International Livestock Exposition is second only to the Rose Festival in attracting visitors in Portland. That is not inconsiderable in itself.

It is axiomatic in this automobile age that "if you can't park -- you don't go". All of the experts we've talked to, all of the facilities we have seen, are proof of it. For example, Mr. Wm. Nicholas, Manager of the Los Angeles Coliseum, (most successful in U.S.) stresses parking as all important. Mr. Gabe Paul, President of the Cincinnati Reds said if they had the parking area such as Milwaukee has, their attendance would have been 300,000 more than it was in 1954. If there are any coliseums in the United States that are successful without ample parking, then conditions exist there which do not accrue or apply to Portland. That can be proven given any specific example.

Mr. T.J. Millisack of Denver specifically pointed out that freedom of movement within the area was of greatest importance to both pedestrian and automobile traffic. The latter because of the necessity of having enough room to organize traffic before it gets into the traffic stream. That is very basic in dispersal of crowds as attest railroad switching yards, etc. The tentative plans for Delta Park call for 8-10 more exits and entrances and a sectional parking plan.

The exhibition buildings which would be necessary to house livestock exhibits would be needed for the other fifty weeks for trade shows and exhibits of all kinds. It is not true that animal smells would be omnipresent. I have seen many examples of such multiple use and no smell. Such buildings could be used too for play areas when our weather is inclement. That is done with great success in Dallas, Texas and other places. In Dallas, we witnessed three tennis courts and five basketball games going in one building, at the same time, in cooperation with the City Park Bureau. Ice facilities can also be operated for relatively small cost for the skaters and on the same basis from a central coliseum plant.

Danger of flood is so remote in this area that it can be ignored. The millions of dollars being spent on the Portland International Air Base is testimony for this. In any event, however, Delta Park can be safeguarded by its own dikes at relatively little cost. The 1948 flood was the result of pure negligence and need not have happened.

The need for plenty of area for expansion is not only indicated but imperative if we are to discharge our duties as responsible public servants. One needs only to look in retrospect to the Portland of 40 years ago. Why 40 years? Because the occasion of building a facility of this kind is 42 years on a national average.

How many times have our city fathers bemoaned the lack of room and the lack of previous planning. That same thing applies to every single facet of our economic existence. Why then-- be short sighted now.

Some people say "What about the distance to Delta Park from downtown"? That does not obtain in my reasoning simply because people go to spectator events from their respective homes. That must be so if we are to be successful. In the cases of most of the people it is closer by "time" to a place where one may park readily than it is to drive a shorter distance and look longingly for a place to park. This is substantiated by the success of drive-in markets, movies, restaurants and shopping centers wherever located.

Another favorable aspect to Delta Park is that it would result in no further blighting of homes or businesses which naturally result when a facility is placed in proximity to home and/or business areas.

In the event that the Oregon Centennial plans are carried out on any basis, the location of the Coliseum and exhibit buildings at Delta Park is a must. The cooperation of and participation with the rest of the State of Oregon is not only desired but badly needed. The result would be of great benefit to our City as well as the entire state. Ignorance would be a calamity.

Also the property known as Portland Meadows should be acquired as quickly as possible. This would add 246 acres to the 99 now owned by the City. It could be acquired as previously pointed out on a self-liquidating basis and would become a permanent asset to the city as well as preventing future competition to our own facility.

As far as a division of facilities is concerned, there is no valid area for discussion in my opinion. In the effort to please everyone -- no single good facility would obtain and we would find ourselves pleasing no one and a resultant disservice to the City of Portland and its people. It would further result, in my opinion, in partially completed structures through the lack of sufficient monies.

The citizenry of Portland have had much progress in times past, but mostly of the "blueprint" variety. It would be shameful indeed to give them less than the most for their money this time.

I am very grateful for the many letters and "curbstone" opinions I have received. I am sure that they were sincere in every case although most were biased in favor of one site or the other, while others were negative in their theme. That of course is "par for the course". It has been, however, a strong incentive to be well and factually informed.

Because of this and aforementioned reasons, I believe that I can successfully sustain my position by voting for the DELTA PARK SITE.

Very truly yours,

John T. Carson



STATEMENT OF CARVEL LINDEN

Although the resolution you have just heard passed is complete in itself, some amplification is in order. This Commission is fully aware of the delay encountered in the selection of a site for this city's multi-million dollar, multi-purpose recreation-exposition center. The Commission believes that it is in the public interest to avoid further delay in the site selection as the first step toward bringing this facility into being, and since members of the Commission have indicated their readiness and desire to reach a decision, as they are empowered and obligated to do under the law establishing the Commission, this action taken today, is solely in the interest of expediting the great amount of work, which lies before the Commission. In no way is it an affront to any group or organization represented here today.

As we all know, the problem of locating a multi-purpose facility to effectively handle all types of activity is not an easy one, particularly with respect to the requirements of a livestock show. Basically, my personal opinion is that a livestock exposition is hardly compatible with a fine structure capable of handling effectively and to the greatest advantage most other types of multiple use, such as sporting events, exhibit hall, areas for multiple meeting rooms, facilities for large banquet and other large gatherings, including conventions, such as are found downtown in most all large cities. We have good examples of such facilities being located downtown in Denver, Omaha, San Francisco, Dallas, where at the same time they have additional outlying facilities for use of their livestock show. The needs of Portland cannot be so different from those of other cities.

Let me say this Commission on several occasions has made a conscientious effort to meet with the principals of the Pacific International Exposition in an effort to arrive at a program of something less than an \$8,000,000 facility designed and located primarily for use of this organization. However, the Pacific International has not seen fit to indicate needs other than their originally stated requirements including 50 acres of parking area. This is born out further by the letter received this morning, dated January 3. It is the feeling of the Commission that no one group or organization should occupy a dominant position in the selection of a site. They feel a downtown site is better for the people of the city as a whole.

To the people of the East Side, let me thank you for coming here in support of your belief that this project should be located on your side of the River. Your principal premise, as I understand it, relates to the fact that about 80% of the population within the City limits reside across the river and therefore by sheer weight of numbers it seems logical to you that an East Side location should be selected. Let me remind you, there are numerous other considerations equally important, such as the location on the West Side of Portland of the principal business district, its center for hotels and amusement facilities. The taxpayers on the West Side pay nearly as much taxes as those on the East Side. I am convinced that if you would study all information available your point of view would change.

Let me say in support of each of the commissioners their vote represents what they conscientiously feel is best for the city population and its business interests at large, without placing undue emphasis upon any particular group, section of population or individual organization. The vote was not unanimous

Linden
2-2-2-2

which is a healthy thing. However, their decisions were reached after exhaustive research supplied by independent thought and investigation, which conclusions are also supported by the actions of numerous cities throughout the country which have under construction or in the planning stage, the same type of facility needed for Portland.

Now if the people will permit us to do so, we shall proceed with the least possible delay to fulfill our responsibilities.

C.C. Linden

EXPOSITION-RECREATION SITE ANALYSIS

BY

JAMES H. POLHEMUS

1. MAYOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Mayor's Advisory Committee, prior to the May, 1954 ballot, outlined in their report what the Exposition-Recreation Center should be, and for which the City of Portland voted an \$8,000,000 bond issue. Quote, "Primarily an all-purpose Coliseum with 10,000 permanent and 5,000 temporary seats -- a wing or section of the building as a War Memorial, an arena for athletic events, basketball, skating, fights, tennis, wrestling, ice hockey, large concerts, mass meetings, fairs, large dances, large banquets, Shrine Circus, Ice Follies, bicycle and midget auto races, large assemblies, Boy Scout Jamborees, church congresses, conventions and other events; a ten acre one-story "Exposition Wing" connected directly to the Coliseum for auto, housing equipment, furniture, flower and Pacific International Expositions, shows and exhibitions and similar space using activities".

As to parking they said, "It is planned to provide 50 acres of parking. This will furnish sufficient area to provide proper parking facilities for 7500 cars with ample ingress and egress to avoid traffic delays at the termination of large crowd assemblies and permit rapid dispersal of crowds."

The Mayor's Advisory Committee also stated that the Exposition-Recreation Center was not primarily for conventions. Quote "Large conventions with up to 10,000 delegates could be accommodated in the Coliseum. But for ordinary conventions, a close-in site near the business district would be preferable. Such a site is prohibitive in cost and would eliminate the all-purpose type of building which is so needed in Portland. Special taxi rates and mass transportation facilities will no doubt be provided for large conventions if the site of the project is removed from the business district."

2. CITY ATTORNEY'S OPINION

The City Attorney gave the Commission an opinion, Quote "Since the Act imposes a duty on the Commission as well as granting power and authority, it is my opinion that the Commission is required to provide the facilities first listed, namely a multi-purpose coliseum stadium, a playfield, an exposition and exhibition center and a war memorial; and to plan, construct and equip these in such a manner as to make them suitable for the use of conventions, expositions, sports events, concerts, shows of all kinds, including livestock shows, automobile shows, housing shows and ice shows, patriotic, educational and fraternal meetings and church conventions. If these things were included it would then be optional with the Commission to erect other buildings or facilities along similar lines or to further equip or expand the facilities to accommodate other shows, meetings or other events or recreational pursuits which the Commission may find desirable and appropriate and within the limits of the funds provided."

3. BASIS FOR ESTIMATING COST OF PROJECT

The \$8,000,000 estimated cost of this Center was predicated upon a campus-type development at Delta Park, a 99-acre tract of land owned by the City of Portland and being able to take over the 42 acres of the P.I. as well as their buildings and further being able to acquire the 650 acre West Vanport property now owned by the Federal Government.

4. LOCATION NOT LIMITED TO DELTA PARK OR WEST VANPORT

In voting on the bond issue the people were also given to understand if these facilities could be built for \$8,000,000 in a more favorable location that such a site would be given full consideration.

5. VARIOUS SITE STUDIES MADE BY COMMISSION

The Exposition-Recreation Commission made studies of many locations and came up with the three sites that seemed to be the most acceptable. Delta Park, a campus-type suburban site; South Auditorium location, a centrally located site on the West side and the Broadway-Steel Bridge location, a centrally located site on the East side.

6. CENTRALLY LOCATED SITES NOT SUITABLE FOR THE P.I.

Our Commission was advised by the P.I. that the two centrally located sites which we had under consideration as well as the planned facilities would not be suitable for their purpose. This was also the advice we received from Mr. T.J. Millisack, Commissioner of Supplies, City and County of Denver, who is in charge of similar facilities in Denver and who made a survey of the three sites in Portland which our Commission is considering.

7. COST OF AND SIZE OF THE THREE MOST FAVORABLE LOCATIONS

The Exposition-Recreation Commission made studies of many locations and came up with the three most acceptable sites. They are compared in Exhibit A as to their general characteristics, cost to build, cost to operate and probable income as interpreted from a report on these matters made by the Stanford Research Institute for our Commission, and from data furnished us by other cities operating like facilities. These figures may not be entirely accurate or realistic for many reasons but they are comparative and at least show trends.

It will be noted from Exhibit A that Delta Park is the only site that can be developed within the \$8,000,000 bond issue and at the same time care for the P.I.

8. ADVANTAGES OF THE DELTA PARK SITE

(a) The cost of the property is known and there will be no delay in getting title to the 99 acres in Delta Park owned by the City of Portland and the 42 acres of land and buildings owned by the P.I. which adjoins Delta Park, and which they will donate to the City of Portland.

(b) The City of Portland should be able to obtain the 650 acres in the old West Vanport area from the U.S. Government for \$100,000. This property can be used for future recreational purposes and industrial sites as well as future expansion of the Center if desired at some future date.

(c) The Pacific International buildings donated to the Commission with luck and good management should be a source of net income to help defray the cost of operations.

(d) The ingress and egress facilities planned for this site are excellent and the dispersion of traffic will be good.

(e) This is a good site for the P.I. being adjacent to the Portland Stock Yards and removed from areas apt to complain about nuisance aspects.

(f) This area is served by the Peninsula Terminal Railroad which connects with the U.P.; G.N.; N.P. and S.P. & S. Railroads, and there are no switching charges.

(g) The large campus type exposition area astride the main Pacific Coast Highway U.S. 99 adjacent to one of the two transcontinental railroad approaches to Portland and bounded by the only north-south railroad route on the Pacific Coast; as well as being within view of most passenger planes landing at the Airport, is bound to advertise Portland most effectively.

(h) It would also be possible for Multnomah County to use these facilities for their County Fair should they find it practical and desirable to so do.

(i) There will be room for certain recreational facilities that the Park Bureau might care to operate in the future such as sand-lot baseball diamonds; softball diamonds, tennis courts, badminton courts, archery, golf driving ranges, drag race strips, flying model airplanes, etc. as well as rose, azalia and other flower gardens such as we now find in our beautiful well-maintained City Parks.

(j) There is also the possibility of the Park Bureau using part of the buildings for indoor sports such as basketball and tennis in connection with the Public School Administration, such as they do in Dallas, Texas.

(k) Such a large acreage would provide room for a football stadium and baseball park should the Multnomah Stadium be used for other purposes some time in the future and it was found desirable to center all such sport activities in one place and take advantage of as many joint facilities as possible.

(l) Water sports are possible here with the 1000 ft. water frontage on Oregon Slough and the possibility of creating an artificial lake in West Vanport area.

(m) Though it is not the Commission's immediate problem, a large tract of land such as East and West Vanport with the Center's proposed developments, might work in most advantageously with the proposed Centennial celebration which is another civic undertaking sponsored by the general public.

(n) The 50-acre parking area will provide ample parking and this can be expanded at a later date if found necessary or desirable. A large parking area is most essential to any large sports or recreational center in this modern day of automobiles. This applies not only to the convenience to the patrons acting as another drawing card to any large event, but it also provides a large source of revenue. Parking on a large scale to be profitable must be on cheap land and so arranged that it is practically self-serving.

(o) Public utilities such as water, power, telephone and telegraph, drainage and sewage are available at moderate expense.

(p) Presents more freedom of action in design and construction, operation and maintenance, growth and expansion.

9. DISADVANTAGES OF THE DELTA PARK SITE

(a) Not Centrally Located

The site is not centrally located but it is the closest in large tract of property suitable for this purpose that is available to the City of Portland at a reasonable price. Its location is $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles from downtown Portland and about the same distance from the center of population. However, as the City grows in size and large affairs will draw from nearby cities within an hour and a half's drive, it is not believed this location will be handicapped to any great extent as the extra driving time will not be great, and will be made up for in a way by not having to fight downtown traffic, bridge traffic and having the convenience and ease of ample cheap parking.

(b) POOR FOUNDATIONS

The foundation conditions in this area are not good but they can be solved by good sound engineering and it is believed the additional foundation costs can be made up for in other design features made possible by a suburban location. No property would be purchased or buildings started until test piling were driven and it was determined beyond a question of a doubt that the foundation conditions were satisfactory.

(c) FLOODS

The U.S. Engineers have a project for improving the levees and the cost of participation on the part of the land owners in the Vanport area is not great. Nevertheless, immunity from flooding cannot be guaranteed, regardless of upstream dams and improved levees. However, fills can be made and buildings designed so that any damage due to flooding will not be too serious. Events can be scheduled so that there would be no undue risk to life and property.

(d) LAND FILLING AND DRAINAGE

These are engineering problems that are not difficult to work out and though they cost money they do improve the property.

(e) LACK OF ESTABLISHED PUBLIC TRANSIT

Public transit plays a smaller part in handling the public than most people think and amounts to less than 10%. There will be special busses and taxi service provided to a suburban site where there is a demand for it.

(f) POORER PATRONAGE

The suggestions that a downtown location would increase attendance at events is not supported either by logic or fact. Maximum use is determined by the quality of the attraction, not the location.

The fact that restaurants, shops, hotels and other entertainment facilities are downtown is not going to materially add to attendance at a downtown location.

The vast amount of potential patronage would be from permanent residents of the metropolitan area who would proceed directly from their homes to the event which attracted them. It is also normal practice for hotel guests to take taxis from their downtown hotel to places of amusement within even a few blocks area.

By referring to Exhibit A it is noted the largest income producer is the P.I. and it is important that this institution be kept healthy and have the full backing of the community.

We know from past experience that the Auto Show, Ice Show, Do-It-Yourself Show, Home Show and the Circus drew well in this location as well as outstanding basketball games and boxing matches.

The drawing power of nearby Jantzen Beach as well as the drawing power of the Garden Show and County Fair at the Gresham Fair Grounds, a location further removed from the City Center where the parking as well as the ingress and egress facilities are less than adequate demonstrates the important items affecting attendance are the quality of the show. Adequate parking facilities with good ingress and egress, as well as comfortable seats, good lighting, good accoustics and adequate ventilation are important factors.

(g) INCONVENIENT FOR CONVENTIONS

According to the Stanford Research report, Portland in 1954 had 399 conventions and the average number of delegates per convention was 270. This was better than an average year and our hotels had no trouble in accommodating these conventions.

Except for very large conventions it is taken for granted the hotels and our civic auditorium, accommodating 2500 to 3500 would take care of the convention business except for an exceptionally large one which could take advantage of the Coliseum at Delta Park.

It is the experience of many cities like Denver, for instance, that the convention business does not pay its own way as far as rental for convention rooms and space are concerned. There is, of course, the indirect benefit to the city due to the money spent by the convention delegates.

During the 1952 season only 20 conventions held in San Francisco exceeded 3000. It was also reported that the large conventions are not as remunerative to the community as a steady flow of day-after-day moderate sized conventions. Also there is a warning that Class A-1 hotel sleeping accommodations should be available to cater for the anticipated attendances.

The 1953 conventions between 1000 and 3000 attendance held on the Pacific Coast were as follows:

Canada	Total Conventions	6	Those of local origin	4
California	" "	26	" " " "	20
Oregon	" "	2	" " " "	1
Washington	" "	3	" " " "	1

It must be kept in mind that while there are a few conventions requiring a seating capacity in excess of 3500, they seldom return to the same city twice within a period of ten years and it is reasonable to assume that Portland could not expect to be host to more than one or possibly two of such conventions in a five-year period.

Therefore, with due deference to the judgment of others who have expressed themselves differently, it does not seem that the convention feature is too important in selecting the site and dictating the type of facilities for our Exposition-Recreation Center, since we now have a centrally-located Civic Auditorium that can take care of conventions requiring a seating capacity up to 3500.

(h) COMPETITION FROM A CENTRALLY LOCATED ARENA

Competition from a centrally located arena will always be present for small gatherings and in that case the large arena would not be used, as large arenas are too costly to operate for small gatherings or events. It is hoped that Delta Park development would carry its operating expenses and that the operating defecite of the Civic Auditorium would not be any more than it is at present which is about \$8000 per year.

However, the financial success of the proposed Exposition-Recreation Center will depend upon the support it gets from the Portland people where ever it is located as well as the quality of events held in it and their appeal to the general public.

It is not known for sure what the future of the P.I. will be. There is the possibility that it might just fade out for one reason or another while on the other hand it could be expanded like the P.N.E. in Vancouver, B. C. which show attracted over 870,000 people last year, and the Labor Day attendance alone was over 145,000. Its success depends upon Portland's leadership, civic cooperation, public enthusiasm, desire to do big things, etc., and that affects directly the success of the new Exposition-Recreation Center.

(1) OPERATING DEFECITS

It must be kept in mind that parking will have to be charged for where in the past at many events such as the P.I. it has not been. This revenue from on-site parking is absolutely necessary if the Coliseum is expected to earn its operating expenses.

It is also true that the radio and television is having its effect on the attendance of many sporting events and the dropping off in attendance of many of the Coliseums throughout the country has been noted in the past years.

It is quite doubtful for one reason or another that this Exposition-Recreation Center will be self-supporting whether built in a suburban or centrally located site.

We have used the Stanford Research Institute figures to estimate the income by event for the first full year of operation based on principal income events only and as shown in Exhibit A; these figures are as accurate as we can determine them at this time and we have made certain changes to cut down operating expenses to conform with what we think the actual operating personnel might be, based on information we have gathered from others operating like properties. At least these

figures show a trend of what might be expected rather than what the precise figures might be.

Apparently, such a development to break even in Portland must have the revenues as contemplated from a successful P.I. and a satisfactory rental of the P.I. buildings. Furthermore, there must be ample parking and it must be used and charged for.

Loss of revenue due to removing valuable property from our tax rolls must be considered as a loss of revenue to the city and will be higher for a central location than a suburban location.

10. SPLIT OPERATION

The Stanford Research Institute made quite a lengthy economic study of the Portland Exposition-Recreation Center for the Commission. This report, though quite general is well worth reading and studying for anyone interested in this problem. They outline in detail the various facilities which Portland now has and what has been their useage. They set forth what useage they think the new Coliseum might have and it is interesting to note how many nights the facility might be used and for what purpose. There is always the possibility of expanding its use by intensive promotion and the hazzard of a dropping off in use due to the changing habits of people, economic conditions and competition from other sources of entertainment or competing facilities.

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>NUMBER OF DAYS</u>
P.I. Exposition	10 days
Auto Show	10 days
Home Show	10 days
Garden Show	4 days
Do-It-Yourself Show	10 days
Food Show	4 days
Circus	4 days

<u>EVENT (Cont.)</u>	<u>NUMBER OF DAYS</u>
Ice Show	12 Days
One Night Stands	6 Days
Band Concert	4 Days
Amateur Basketball	12 Days
Promoted Basketball	4 Days
Boxing	4 Days
Wrestling	2 Days
Hockey	<u>2 Days</u>
TOTAL DAYS FACILITIES ARE IN USE	98 Days

Considerable thought has been given to a split operation but this approach does not seem to fully meet our problem, as it was the original thinking of the promoters of this Center that they would concentrate all or as many as possible of the activities requiring like facilities in one place to cut down the first cost of the development and make it a self-sustaining one. We do not have the funds on hand to provide adequate facilities for a split operation and not only would the revenues be split but the operating expenses would be more. Therefore, the City would surely be faced with an operating deficit and especially so if the facilities were competitive and there was much duplication.

Exhibit B shows the probable breakdown of events and revenues of a split operation which was given some study. The operating expenses of two such facilities might be on the order of \$246,500 per year. However, it must be kept in mind that there are other variations of such a split operation, which will vary with where you put your emphasis. The logical grouping of activities, of course, would be the P.I., County Fair, dog racing horse racing and etc. on a campus-type site at Delta Park. Such a development requires extensive cheap parking facilities.

The sports center, convention facilities, theater, etc. to be at the South Auditorium site where extensive parking is not so necessary.

The scheme of augmenting the Delta Park development with a re-vamped City Auditorium is an approach to this problem and probably would be called a split operation. Such a plan no doubt would work out very well and be subject to expansion at a later date if found desirable to do so, and especially so if the city went through with its Urban Renewal program for that area.

When one starts to consider a new conception it might be interesting to note the thoughts of George W. Stoddard in his letter to the Commission of September 12, 1955 which is reproduced as Exhibit C.

While serious thought is being given to a split operation which may well be an answer I think it would be wise for the Commission to seek the advice of Mr. Ben Moore of Spokane, Washington who is successfully operating the new Coliseum in that city and who not only has had operating experience, but also has had experience planning coliseums and supervising their construction. He understands the promotion, and how to handle the public as well as the operating details and cost of running such an operation. I visited his operation in Spokane last week and was very favorably impressed with the job he was doing there and ascertained that he is available for consulting work on such projects as ours. We may not agree with his conclusions but we will benefit from his intimate knowledge of operating procedure, operating costs, probable revenues, etc., as well as the type and first cost of adequate facilities for our city. I should say Mr. Moore leans toward an all-purpose coliseum centrally located with plenty of on-site parking space; but he is also conversant with the problems of handling a large stock show such as the P.I. and knows something about split operations such as they have in Denver where he once operated.

Exhibit D gives Mr. Millisack's reason why a centrally located facility with limited ground area would not successfully handle the P.I. Stock Show.

11. SOUTH AUDITORIUM SITE VS. BROADWAY-STEEL BRIDGE SITE

The South Auditorium site is more centrally located than the Broadway-Steel Bridge site and probably would be the best selection if a smaller downtown, centrally located site was felt to be more desirable than a large campus-type suburban development at Delta Park.

12. DISADVANTAGES OF SOUTH AUDITORIUM SITE

The disadvantages of the South Auditorium site may be summed up as follows:

- (a) The development would be costly and the matter probably would have to be submitted to the voters again for them to approve, as it cannot be developed within the limitations of the \$8,000,000 bond issue even with financial assistance of an Urban Renewal program. (City Planning Commission in their final report sets forth four stages of development for the site that comes to more than 16 million dollars).
- (b) The plot of ground would be limited in size and the parking areas would soon become inadequate if the facility drew well. Also parking facilities in this location would be expensive.
- (c) It would be very expensive if not impossible to expand at some future date if this became necessary or desirable.
- (d) It would be an entirely different type of facility such as the one at Syracuse, New York or at Spokane, Washington.
- (e) It is doubtful if such a facility with its limited scope of activities would be self-sustaining for some time to come as far as operating expenses are concerned. It would not be able to take advantage of the drawing power of the P.I. and some way would have to be found to prevent competition between the present civic Auditorium and the new one.
- (f) It would lack earning power derived from the rental of industrial property.
- (g) It would only accommodate spectator sporting events and its objectives as a sports and recreation center would be rather limited.
- (h) It would have no rail connections but that might not be necessary in this day of automobiles and trucks.
- (i) It probably would further complicate the downtown and bridge traffic conditions as over 80% of the people live on the East side of the River.
- (j) A rehabilitation program if feasible for one reason or another will take a long time to work out and hence unduly delay the project.

(k) The integration of the ingress and egress from this site with the proposed highway plans for the area might be more difficult and costly than they now appear.

(l) The downtown centrally located buildings would probably cost more per permanent seat than the buildings erected on a suburban site.

13. ADVANTAGES OF THE SOUTH AUDITORIUM SITE

(a) Site is centrally located for hotel traffic.

(b) It has good public transportation for those who would use bus transportation.

(c) Such a site would have a high degree of flexibility.

(d) There are no major foundation problems or exposure to floods.

(e) There is a possibility of some parking revenue from outside sources.

(f) It would please the large downtown property owners and merchants as they feel it would help their property and businesses. If this were true it certainly should have the most serious consideration; they are very heavy taxpayers and carry the major city tax burden.

(g) It is felt many of the City officials would prefer a centrally located site if the problem could be satisfactorily solved by such a selection.

14. PROVISION FOR BETTER THEATER FACILITIES

It is not mandatory for the Commission at this time to provide new theater facilities by either rebuilding the present Civic Auditorium or building a new theater, and it is not known that the City would want our Commission to do so. However, we should be willing to cooperate in any such venture which is for the general good of the city and which we can see our way clear to finance. Mr. Millisack (see Exhibit D) has made a good suggestion along that line that I think could be expanded on.

15. PURCHASE OF PORTLAND MEADOWS RACE TRACK

The purchase of the Portland Meadows Race Track is not necessary for the development of the Delta Park site. The 107 acres between Delta Park and the Portland Meadows would be nice to have; the land, however, is low and would require extensive fill and drainage and might or might not be worth the costs involved. At any rate, this feature needs considerable study and engineering work done on it before the Commission should take any final action.

Whether this Commission should consider the purchase of the Portland Meadows Race Track at some future time is a matter that should have full and careful consideration of the Commission at some future date. It probably would have to be submitted to the voters for their approval and the voting of additional funds to finance such a purchase and the development of the additional property. If there is a definite guaranteed yearly profit in such a venture it surely should be looked into very carefully and it no doubt would receive public support.

According to the Stanford Research report the annual maintenance of the Portland Meadows race track was set forth as \$35,000 and it is understood the yearly taxes amount to some \$29,000.

There is always the possibility that a satisfactory operating agreement might be worked out between the owners of the Portland Meadows, the Dog Races, the County Fair and the P.I. and the Exposition-Recreation Commission that would make such a working agreement practical and desirable to the community as a whole.

16. PARKING SPACE

Adequate parking has a material effect upon the attendance of various shows, and by charging a nominal parking fee, a substantial source of income is available. I have been advised by people who understand this problem that we should provide parking space based on three persons per car to start off with but be prepared to take care of a ratio of 2.2 persons per car. Public or mass transportation due to obvious reasons plays a less and less important part.

It is believed that the paved parking areas at Delta Park should be provided for only about 1/3 of the area to start with, depending upon crushed rock surface for the balance of the parking area to take care of the larger overflow crowds. The permanent paved parking area can be extended as found necessary.

17. PRACTICAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

A practical approach to the most complicated problem might be as follows:

- (a) Proceed with the development of Delta Park at once to provide the following facilities and at the same time stay within the \$8,000,000 limitation.

1. Erect an arena-type coliseum with about 8,000 permanent seats and provision for temporary seating crowds up to about 11,000 for basketball games, boxing, etc. similar except for details of design to those in Denver, Colorado; Montgomery, Alabama; Charlotte, N.C. and Dallas, Texas.
2. To provide about 100,000 sq.ft. of all-purpose exhibit space suitable for trade shows, conventions and consumer exhibit shows.
3. Provide about 300,000 sq.ft. of inexpensive stock barns with removable stalls, so that this building can be cleaned out and used for other purposes when not used by the stock show.
4. Provide other small auxillary buildings and facilities as the operations of such a plant will require. For example, parking areas, shops, storage accommodations for 4-H boys and girls, cafeteria, meeting rooms, etc.

My original concept of what the Exposition-Recreation Center should be, after reading all the printed matter and reports on the subject, as well as discussing the matter with those interested in promoting the Exposition-Recreation Center is shown in Exhibit E. It was merely a program of suggestions to base our thinking on and not necessarily the final development. It was necessary for us to have something definite down on paper not only to discuss among ourselves, but with others.

(b) Plan to revamp the present city Auditorium as a part of the Delta Park development along the lines suggested by Mr. Millisack, the conventions that are too large for the hotel accommodations and too small to make use of the Delta Park facilities would be taken care of in the revamped Auditorium. All large conventions and those requiring facilities not available at the Auditorium in the central location would use the Delta Park facilities.

(c) Work with the City Planning Commission and the City Council to obtain a federal grant-in-aid for an Urban Renewal project on the so-called South Auditorium site so as to provide parking area with enough room for adequate parking for the revamped Auditorium and any future additions that might be contemplated and found desired.

It may be possible that enough money could be held out of the \$8,000,000 and Delta Park not fully completed at once to permit the revamping of the present City Auditorium. An improved Auditorium with some on-site parking and more extensive convention facilities might be able to break even on operation expenses. The Auditorium now plays quite an important part in our city life and it is understood that its present operating deficit is only \$8,000 per year. This is not due to poor management, as I feel our City Auditorium is well run and the whole operation is a credit to the city. It must be remembered this Auditorium was built nearly 40 years ago and not only has the city grown but the times have changed.

18. INFLUENCE OF THE P.I., CONVENTIONS AND SPORTS ON SELECTION OF SITE

If the Commission desires to take care of the P.I. in an adequate manner then their first choice of location would probably be at Delta Park if satisfactory contracts and agreements could be made with all interested parties and it was understood the West Vanport property would be acquired from the government and made a part of this development. If this West Vanport property was to be used as an ammunition dump then you have another problem to consider.

On the other hand if the Commission feels that the controlling factor is conventions it would be more desirable to have a centrally located site where the general run of conventions would be held and it would appear then that the South Auditorium site would be the best location.

A compromise solution might be the development of the Delta Park facilities first, then the remodeling of the present City Auditorium along the lines suggested by Mr. Millisack to provide a first class theater as well as more exhibit space and conference rooms. The \$8,000,000 now available might be sufficient to do this and the earnings from the Delta Park operation if there were any, could be earmarked for the further development of the old Auditorium. The extension of the South Auditorium site to be carried on in connection with the city's urban renewal program and the expectation that more funds could be raised for land, parking area and more buildings as they were found necessary. To be successful such a plan would have to have the full cooperation of the

city with the management of the revamped Auditorium turned over to the Exposition-Recreation Commission.

19. INFORMED PUBLIC

It is most desirable when the Commission selects a site and adopts a program that a clear cut statement be made to the public stating clearly the reasons for the decision and what the annual operating expenses and income might be expected as well as the probable first cost of the facilities. Before the final adoption of such a program it might be well to have it carefully reviewed by a board of competent experienced Coliseum managers who are now successfully operating like facilities and who can guide us away from any pitfalls, and pretty well spell out what we are going to accomplish and what it will cost us.

20. SEATING CAPACITY

There has been a lot of discussion on the size and seating capacity of this new arena. It must be remembered that a first class modern arena will cost about \$500 per permanent seat. We have gone along with the recommendations of the Stanford Research Institute in regard to size, but here again the advice of the experienced advisory board of Coliseum operators and managers would be a desirable check.

21. COOPERATION WITH COUNTY COMMISSION

It goes without saying that this Commission will cooperate 100% with the County Commission and the County Fair officials. I am sure any facilities we build or property we acquire will be available to them for holding their Fair and any other county activities on a basis that will be fair and satisfactory to both parties. First of all we and the County officials are good friends and respect each other's ability and we all want to help one another. Secondly, we are both handling public funds and there should be no unnecessary duplication of facilities and expenses. No one wants to do that.

We feel confident we will have the full cooperation of the County Commission and its officials when we know what we have to offer them. On the other hand they have a development that is not entirely compatible with ours and we surely do not want to be put in a position of pressuring them into something they do not feel should be done.

Personally, I am open at any time to any suggestions the county may make and I know they will be of a constructive nature as they see the problem. We also appreciate the good work the City Planning Commission has done to help us solve our problem.

22. ADEQUATE PARKING

No such development will be fully successful without adequate and relatively cheap on-site parking facilities. You should not count on more than 150 cars per acre for self-parking and at a price in the neighborhood of 50¢ per car if possible. The latest trend is to provide at least one parking space for each 2.2 persons using the facilities. Also parking space must be provided for the working personnel, service trucks and equipment.

Again, I wish to point out the importance of providing ample parking which is necessary if the people using this facility are to be adequately accommodated and also to provide revenue that may help put the center on a financially self-sustaining basis.

It has been the experience in other cities that private development occurs immediately surrounding such a facility as we are to build. Therefore, importance is placed upon acquiring sufficient property for adequate parking at the same time the building site is selected if we are to avoid the possibility of having to condemn or pay for extremely high priced property in the future.

EXHIBIT "A"

EXPOSITION-RECREATION COMMISSION

COMPARISON ON DATA ON SITES

I. <u>PHYSICAL FEATURES</u>	Delta Park Site	Broadway-Steel Bridge Site	Auditorium Site
1. Site Size			Based on Plan I of CPC Rep.
(a) Basic Site	141 Acres	27 Acres	24.2 Acres
(b) Possible Addition	750 Acres	10 Acres	22.5 Acres (Power Plant Site)
2. Improved Parking Area			
(a) Area	50 Acres	12 Acres	15.5 Acres
(b) Number of cars @ 150/ac.	7500	1950	2320
3. Coliseum			
(a) Number of permanent seats	8528	8528	8000
(b) Add'l Temp. Seats, Basketball	3000	3000	3000
(c) Diameter	340 Ft.	340 Ft.	340 Ft.
(d) Height	100 Ft.	100 Ft.	100 Ft.
(e) Apprx. Acres Covered By Bldg.	2.08	2.08	2.08
(f) Size of Arena Floor	130'x260'	130'x260'	130'x260'
(g) Sq. Ft. of Arena Floor	33,800	33,800	33,800
4. Class "A" Exhibit Hall			
(a) Width and Length	130'x780'	130'x240'	75'to 180'x400'
(b) Ceiling Height	20'	16'to 18'	10'to 16'
(c) Number of Floors	1	2	2
(d) Total Square Feet	100,000	104,000	74,000
5. Livestock Barns or Class B Exhibition Bldg.			
(a) Width and Length	375'x800'	250'x600'	Abt 450'x450'
(b) Wall Height	20'	20'	Abt 200'x425'
(c) Number of Floors	1	2	10'
(d) Total Square Feet	300,000	300,000	2
6. Rail Connection	Yes	Near Spur	No
7. Ingress			
(a) Number of Available Lanes of Traffic	13	15	19
8. Egress			
(a) Number of Traffic Lanes from facility	13	15	19
(b) Estimated time to evacuate			
(1) 1500 cars	7 min	10 min	11.5 min
(2) 3000 cars	14 min	20 min	23 min
(3) 5000 cars	23 min	33 min	38.3 min

	<u>Delta Park Site</u>	<u>Broadway-Steel Bridge Site</u>	<u>Auditorium Site</u>
(b) Estimated time to evacuate (Cont.)			
(4) 7500 cars	35 min.	50 min.	57.5 min.
II. <u>COST OF PROPERTY</u>			
1. Basic Site	City owns 99a. PI Donate 45a.	\$2,395,500	\$3,216,666
2. Possible Addition	\$160,000	678,000	225,000
III <u>COST OF THREE MAIN BLDGS.</u>			
1. Coliseum	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
2. Class "A" Exhibit Hall	750,000	900,000)	2,945,531
3. Class "B" Exhibition Bldg and/or Livestock Barns	900,000	1,500,000)	
4. Truck and Trailer Parking *Bldg D	-----	540,000	
5. Equipment	500,000	500,000	500,000
TOTAL	\$5,650,000	\$6,940,000	\$6,945,531
IV. COST OF DEVELOPING PROPERTY OTHER THAN BUILDINGS	1,553,524	959,424	1,151,279
V TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	\$7,203,524	\$10,294,924	\$11,313,476

COMPARISON ON DATA ON SITES (CONT.)

VI ESTIMATED INCOME - BASED ON
ARENA RENTAL OF \$500/DA MIN
OR 15% OF GATE OPTION

	Delta Park Site	Broadway-Steel Bridge Site	Auditorium Site
1. P.I. EXPOSITION	\$78,100	****	****
2. AUTO SHOW	25,200	22,800	22,800
3. HOME SHOW	12,400	10,600	10,600
4. GARDEN SHOW	9,200	7,700	7,700
5. DO IT YOURSELF SHOW	11,900	10,800	10,800
6. FOOD SHOW	4,800	4,100	4,100
7. CIRCUS	13,300	13,300	13,300
8. ICE SHOW	52,000	52,400	52,400
9. ONE NIGHT STANDS	9,700	9,700	9,700
10. BAND CONCERTS	7,900	7,900	7,900
11. AMATEUR BASKETBALL	9,400	8,700	8,700
12. PROMOTED BASKETBALL	3,300	3,000	3,000
13. BOXING	5,000	5,000	5,000
14. WRESTLING	3,100	3,000	3,000
15. HOCKEY	3,400	3,400	3,400
16. CONVENTIONS	****	7,500	7,500
TOTAL	\$248,700 (\$78,800)	\$169,900	\$169,900
PARKING	67,700 (27.2%)	35,200 (20.7%)	35,000 (20.7%)

VII ESTIMATED OPERATING EXPENSE

\$180,350	\$165,550	\$165,550
-----------	-----------	-----------

EXHIBIT "B"

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR FIRST FULL YEAR OF OPERATION
BASED ON PRINCIPAL EVENTS ONLY
P.I. SITE IN CONJUNCTION WITH AUDITORIUM SITE

EXPENSES
(Based on S.R.I. Figures)

ITEM	ANNUAL SALARY	NUMBER	TOTAL COST
<u>PERSONNEL</u>			
PERMANENT:			
General Manager	8,000	1	8,000
Assistant Manager	6,000	1	6,000
Building Superintendent	6,000	2	12,000
Stenographer	3,300	1	3,300
Clerk	2,800	1	2,800
Bookkeeper	3,600	1	3,600
Operating Engineer (Chief)	4,500	1	4,500
Operating Engineer	3,900	3	11,700
Electrician Foreman	4,600	1	4,600
Electrician	4,300	2	8,600
Maintenance Man	3,600	2	7,200
Utility Workers	3,600	1	3,600
Custodians	2,900	10	29,000
Watchman	3,300	2	6,600
		<u>29</u>	<u>\$111,500</u>
Non-Reimbursable			
Nurse	(\$6.00 per show)	1	600
Parking Attendants	(\$6.00 per show)	<u>12</u>	<u>8,000</u>
		<u>13</u>	<u>\$ 8,600</u>
<u>OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE COSTS:</u>			
Heat, Light and Power			37,000
Water			1,500
Telephone and Telegraph			2,000
Postage			300
Insurance			8,000
Supplies			
Office			1,200
Janitor			8,500
Parking Lot			3,300
Other			5,000
Dues, Memberships, etc.			600
Fuel, Oil, Tires, Etc.			1,100
Advertising			600
Repair and Maintenance			24,000
Misc. Services			1,500
Travel and Managerial Expenses			1,800
Operating Equipment Depreciation			<u>30,000</u>
			\$126,400
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE			\$246,500

ESTIMATED INCOME FOR FIRST FULL YEAR OF OPERATION
BASED ON PRINCIPAL INCOME EVENTS ONLY AS PER S.R.I. REPORT

P.I. SITE IN CONJUNCTION WITH AUDITORIUM SITE

		<u>Income from Auditorium Site (Coliseum)</u>	
<u>SOURCE OF INCOME</u>	<u>Number of Days</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>INCOME</u>
		<u>\$500/da. Min With 10% of Gate Option</u>	<u>\$500/da. Min with 15% of Gate Option</u>
<u>ARENA INCOME</u>			
Circus	5	6,700	10,000
Ice Show	13	26,300	39,500
One Night Stands	6	4,900	7,300
Band Concerts	4	3,700	5,600
Amateur Basketball	12	6,000	6,000
Promoted Basketball	4	2,000	2,000
Boxing	4	2,600	3,900
Wrestling	2	1,300	1,900
Hockey	2	1,500	2,300
Conventions	5	2,500	2,500
		57,500	81,000
<u>EXHIBIT INCOME</u>			
Conventions	5	1,000	1,000
Food Show	4	500	500
		1,500	1,500
<u>CONCESSION INCOME</u>	<u>1/</u>	12,000	12,000
<u>PARKING INCOME</u>	<u>2/</u>	13,800	13,800
<u>INCOME FROM</u>			
AUDITORIUM SITE \$ 84,800			\$108,300

- 1/ Concession Income - 20% of Gross at 20¢ per person for Arena events
20% of Gross at 35¢ per person for Exhibit Events
- 2/ Parking Income - 35¢ per car at a 1.3 ratio of cars to people

Income from P.I. Site (Steel Arena & Remodeled Bldgs.)

<u>SOURCE OF INCOME</u>	<u>Number Of Days</u>	<u>TOTAL INCOME</u>	
		<u>\$500/da Min with 10% of Gate option</u>	<u>\$500/da. Min. with 15% of Gate option</u>
<u>ARENA INCOME</u>			
P.I. Exposition	10	\$15,800	\$23,700
<u>EXHIBIT INCOME</u>			
		<u>1/2¢/sq.ft./da</u>	
P.I. Exposition	10	7,500	7,500
Auto Show	10	10,000	10,000
Home Show	10	5,000	5,000
Garden Show	4	500	500
Do-It-Yourself Show	10	5,000	5,000
	44	28,000	28,000
<u>CONCESSIONS</u> <u>1/</u>		21,300	21,300
<u>PARKING</u> <u>2/</u>		38,800	38,800
INCOME FROM P.I. SITE		\$103,900	\$111,800

1/ Concession Income - 20% of Gross at 20¢ per person for Arena Events
 20% of Gross at 35¢ per person for Exhibit Events

2/ Parking Income - 35¢ per car at a 1.3 ratio of cars to people

RECAP OF INCOME:

Auditorium Site	84,800	108,300
P.I. Site	103,900	111,800
TOTAL INCOME	\$188,700	\$220,100

EXHIBIT C

GEORGE W. STODDARD-HUGGARD AND ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS
1120 Harvard Avenue
Seattle, 22

September 2, 1955

Mr. James H. Polhemus, Chairman
Exposition-Recreation Commission
623 Park Building
Portland 5, Oregon

Dear Mr. Polhemus:

Please be assured that I was delighted to have had the opportunity of meeting with you and the other Commissioners on August 18, 1955.

Because of our development of structures used for public entertainment, intimate association with the operation of the Seattle Civic Auditorium and University of Washington Athletic Pavilion, we feel somewhat better qualified to speak on your problem than most practicing Architects.

The basic premise of this office in analyzing such a Center is to seek those functions which will be income producing beyond the mere cost of maintenance and operation; then those that will pay their own way and finally the ones that are free, or practically so, for public attendance. Such a Center, in our humble opinion, should not only be self-supporting, but should, in part at least, amortize the original investment and thus provide funds for desired improvements and additions in order to broaden the scope for public entertainment.

So, we ask ourselves: What events will produce the greatest net income? What events will provide the greatest amount of enjoyment to the citizens providing the funds therefore? What are the items of greatest overall need for the community? A few of the answers appear to us about as follows:

1. That a Stadium of 35,000 seats could be used for college football in this area and that such a capacity should be a minimum for attracting professional football.
2. That it would be highly desirable to have a new baseball park with a minimum seating of 15,000 people.
3. That basketball could be played before audiences up to 12,000.
4. That professional hockey should draw up to 6000 persons.
5. That 140,000 square feet of area should be anticipated for Stock Shows, Horse Shows and Rodeos.

6. That other facilities are required for exhibitions, expositions and conventions.
7. That an Auditorium of around 3,500 seats is necessary for Public assemblies, musical attractions, symphonies, Opera and the like.

In this northwest climate of ours, we have found it almost imperative to cover the spectators with a roof in order to insure maximum ticket sales. The University of Washington has found it has greatly enhanced their advance ticket sale by having the purchasers assured of comfort regardless of the weather. The covering of the maximum number of spectators was one of the prime demands in the design of the new addition to this structure.

I know that your budget will not permit the erection of an exhibition hall, an exposition hall, a stadium, a baseball park, a basketball pavilion, an ice rink etc., not to mention the problem of the music hall, but I do know that if we could house all of the needed facilities, except the music hall, in one grand Exposition Building and Sports Center, it could be within the scope of your bond issue.

I am proposing that you erect one huge building completely covered, but without columns, that would be high enough to take the highest batted fly or the highest booted punt; that would be big enough to house 35,000 people at a football game. I have made enough investigation to feel that it can be done for around \$5,500,000.00 and that in the doing, we could handle the stock shows, rodeos, expositions, exhibitions and large productions staged for such organizations as Rotary and Shrine etc. at their conventions, all within the one structure.

Many will say that the football and baseball games are not to be played on the same field - yet they have been doing it successfully in New York and Cleveland for years. I believe we hit upon a plan for such a double use of the playing field that would be even better than those above-mentioned.

Many will say you are taking outdoor games indoors. I must reply that I might not suggest such a procedure except in our own particular part of the world where we have already demanded roofs, and where attendance has been severely curtailed even with roofs when the spectacle is an evening show and it turns cold and windy. The American public demands comfort.

Portland has no College Stadium, no proper facility for High School or Junior College games, no baseball park with proper parking. Neither is a home for stock shows, exhibitions, musical events and the like to be found. What could be a finer development than a terrific Sports and Exhibition Center, the like of which the world has never seen? I can assure you it would be exciting to look at; a showman's dream where all he would have to worry about is timing for non-interference. Old man weather would be no problem. What a place for a flower show! Or a boy scout circus! There would be lots of room under the stands where meeting rooms, cafeterias, handball courts and other interesting develop-

ments could be tucked in. I would then suggest a budget of \$500,000.00 to be set aside for improving and modernizing your present Auditorium to make suitable as a music center, convention hall etc. This would leave \$2,000,000.00 for site purchase and development together with such auxiliary buildings as cattle barns, stables and the like.

A suggested plan to get this idea in motion is to employ our Firm to produce schematic drawings to indicate both the general thoughts expressed above and also determine the area required for the facility. After such a presentation, the site would be selected. Our Firm should then be awarded a contract to serve as supervising Architect for the entire project and to produce preliminary designs and illustrations. A suggested fee would be \$10,000.00 for the schematic phase which would be credited to a fee of 1.5% of the estimated overall cost for the supervising Architect services or the Preliminary phase.

The supervising Architect should then be empowered to select for the Board's approval, Portland Architects and Engineers for the development of the Working Drawing, Specifications and Supervision of construction.

I would strongly urge that we be given authority to have a model built illustrating the entire development, somewhat during the Schematic or Preliminary Phases, such a model to be delivered to you at cost of production from some qualified model maker.

As to the length of time logical for the development of all documents ready for construction to start, I would venture to guess as follows:

1. Drawing and approving the Schematic Phase - two months.
2. Drawing and approving the Preliminary Phase - three months.
3. Drawing and approving Working Drawings, Specifications and Contract Documents - six months.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. STODDARD-HUGGARD AND ASSOC.

(Signed)

George W. Stoddard

GWS/msh

c.c. James J. Richardson, Vice-Chairman
Carvel C. Linden, Secretary-Treasurer
John T. Carson, Commissioner
Clyde C. Crosby, Commissioner
Alden F. Krieg, Executive Secretary

EXHIBIT E

Memorandum prepared by James H. Polhemus for Exposition-Recreation Commission members and other interested parties as to what his conception of what the development might be and to be used as a guide only.

1. To build an all purpose agricultural, educational and sports coliseum with plenty of parking space, similar to the one in Montgomery, Alabama.

Sizes:

- (a) 8,500 \pm permanent seats
- (b) 4,500 \pm temporary seats
- (c) 11,000 seats for basketball and 13,000 seats for boxing
- (d) Arena 130' x 260' - clear open space 286 feet.
- (e) Over-all diameter 340 feet - 2 acres smooth ceiling
- (f) Minimum parking space 30 acres - 4,000 cars
- (g) Minimum land area 150 acres
- (h) 2 main entrances and 2 levels
- (i) 35 rows of seats - top seat 75 feet from arena

2. Other facilities to be built simultaneously with the Coliseum

- (a) Combination Livestock and Exhibition building
- (b) Sand lot baseball diamonds
- (c) Softball diamonds
- (d) Tennis courts
- (e) Badminton courts
- (f) Archery
- (g) Golf driving range
- (h) Golf putting green
- (i) Parking facilities with some covered walkways
- (j) Parking space for trailers

3. Coliseum facilities to accommodate the following main features:

- (a) Pacific International Horse Show
- (b) Rodeos
- (c) County Fairs
- (d) Farm shows
- (e) Implement shows
- (f) Band shows
- (g) Orchestral and choral shows and concerts
- (h) Moving pictures and slides
- (i) Circuses of all kinds
- (j) Ice skating and skating extravaganzas
- (k) Ice hockey
- (l) Basketball
- (m) Boxing and wrestling matches
- (n) Indoor professional tennis

3. Coliseum facilities to accommodate the following main features:
(Continued)

- (o) Indoor track
- (p) Large conventions
- (q) Display space and booths for Exposition purposes
National and international trade shows, auto motor
shows, Home shows and extravaganzas of all kind.
- (r) Dancing and large balls to accommodate up to 3,000 couples

4. Coliseum utility facilities

- (a) Dressing rooms for participants in the shows and
athletic activities
- (b) Two dormitories to accommodate 4-H boys and girls
- (c) Meeting rooms for smaller gatherings
- (d) Restaurant and Coffee Shop facilities
- (e) Facilities for concessionaires
- (f) Sanitary and toilet facilities
- (g) Ventilation, heating and air conditioning equipment
Change air every three minutes, 7 fans - 6 - 500,000 B.T.U.
heating plants.
- (h) Ice rink skating facilities
- (i) Press, radio and television booths and facilities
- (j) Power and lighting facilities, 120-220 and 440 volts-
750-kva transformer vault 222,000 watts controlled
lighting
- (k) Storage facilities
- (l) Transportation facilities for mass transportation,
taxi cabs and private cars, so they can unload under cover.
- (m) Covered entrances, ramps, stairways and walkways
- (n) Special quarters for officials
- (o) Facilities to evacuate building in four to five minutes
and parking lots in 10 to 20 minutes

5. Landscaping

Grass plots, roses, azalea and rhododendron gardens, that go to give Portland the name of the Rose City, laid out and arranged to give a pleasing and artistic effect on the thousands of people who will visit, pass by in autos or trains or pass over the center in the air. This to be a co-operative affair with the City Park Bureau and carried out under their direction at the expense of the Sports Center.

6. Ground space for future expansion

- (a) Baseball and football stadium
- (b) Race track
- (c) Swimming
- (d) Drag strips for small auto racing
- (e) Water sports
- (f) Outside and covered storage areas
- (g) Outside amusement midway
- (h) Swimming

This is just a general outline of what a campus-type development might be and is to be used as a starting point for discussion and planning of facilities. It is difficult to select a site until you have determined what it is to contain in the way of facilities and what are the items of greatest overall need for the community, to say nothing of those events which will provide the greatest amount of enjoyment to the people who are providing the funds to build these facilities. Every effort should be made to make the facilities pay their own way, by attracting events which will produce the greatest net income.