

Testimony: Portland City Council  
Resident Input: Portland Art Museum Rothko Proposal  
April 20, 2017

Let me start by saying that we love the Portland Art Museum as we love museums anywhere in the world. My wife and I have been members of PAM for what seems like a lifetime -- 30-35 years. But we feel that the proposed Rothko Pavilion is ill-considered, and that PAM is trying to impose it on Downtown without considering its negative impacts.

This is a downtown neighborhood issue of keeping Portland connected, which should be considered the "greater good" since we live here and don't just visit once or twice in a lifetime.

A well-documented survey/traffic count by Eliot residents during key hours showed heavy use of the Madison passageway by people with strollers or using walking aids, shoppers returning from Safeway and the Wednesday Farmers Market, people visiting or having their lunch break. It is **the** enjoyable approach connecting our neighborhood -- walking through the park to reach the theater, Schnitzer concert hall, etc.). As a side note: it is extremely important for residents have easy access to the South Park Blocks (partially cared-for by residents) to keep "eyes on the street" -- Jane Jacob's prescription for preserving neighborhoods.

Limiting use of the passage will make residents less safe, especially at night, by making them detour through poorly lighted and less-used streets (other than by transients, who tend not to use the Madison passageway). PAM's proposal provides convenience only for the greater good of PAM but not for the residents.

Downtown residents have felt helpless when confronted with PAM's proposed Pavilion project -- Don Quixote fighting the mighty windmill that is PAM and its wealthy, influential, and powerful sponsors and lawyers. PAM has e-mailed their thousands of members urging them to support the development, and has just hung marketing materials on the outside of the Bellus chi building that show the Pavilion as an already approved concept.

PAM's immediate neighbors were presented by PAM's marketing and development arm with a "matter of fact" professional presentation. The neighbors were told "we are not interested nor do we need residents' input since our committee and architectural contractors have already considered all the options and **will not** consider any changes to the proposed plans."

The project is billed as being for the common good and as a supposed enhancement of a higher profile PAM -- but in fact it would disadvantage Downtown residents and Portland taxpayers.

Is PAM going to purchase the right to restrict the public from ITS existing right to use this publically-owned corridor? What is it worth for the passageway to be vacated in increased revenue for PAM? Portland taxpayers should know the monetary value of the land they would

be basically donating to PAM – since the public would, essentially, have no further right to use it. This is prime real estate, one might add.

I feel that it is vital to keep the Madison Passage open as currently permitted and keep all citizens' rights to use the passage. There should not be a walk-up through the museum's lobby – it would be like walking through someone's living room to get to your destination through an uncomfortable environment. There should be no restriction to the walking-challenged, people with pets, or bikes.

In short, I strongly urge you to make no changes in the current Street Vacation Ordinance, and request PAM to come back with a design taking the City's own livability goals into account. If PAM wants to use the actual land for their building, the city will have to establish a proper value for the same.

Thank you for taking my concerns and suggestions in-to consideration.

Wilfried Mueller-Crispin  
1221 SW 10<sup>th</sup> Ave, Unit 1013, Portland, OR 97205

wilfried@involved.com