

A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736



METRO

TEL 503-797-1540 FAX 503-797-1793

MEETING: METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: December 14, 2005

DAY: Wednesday, 5:00-7:00 p.m.

PLACE: Metro Council Chamber/Annex

NO	AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	ACTION	TIME
	CALL TO ORDER	Hoffman		
1	SELF INTRODUCTIONS, ONE MINUTE LOCAL UPDATES & ANNOUNCEMENTS	All		5 min.
2	CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON- AGENDA ITEMS			5 min.
3	CONSENT AGENDA <ul style="list-style-type: none">• November 30, 2005• MTAC Appointment	Hoffman	Decision	5 min.
4	COUNCIL UPDATE	Hosticka	Update	5 min.
5	BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON OPEN SPACES	Fred Miller	Information	30 min.
6	NEW LOOK AT 2040 WORK PROGRAM	McArthur	Information	30 min.
7	MPAC SCHEDULE/WORK PLAN 2006-2007	Kidd/Hoffman	Discussion	30 min.
8	NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT	Hoffman	Update	10 min.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

MPAC: January 11, 2006

MPAC Coordinating Committee, Room 270: January 11, 2006

For agenda and schedule information, call Kim Bardes at 503-797-1537. e-mail: bardes@metro.dst.or.us

MPAC normally meets the second and fourth Wednesday of the month.

To receive assistance per the Americans with Disabilities Act,
call the number above, or Metro teletype 503-797-1804.

To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.

Minutes to be sent out via email on Monday, December 12, 2005 and made available in hard copy at the MPAC meeting on Wednesday, December 14, 2005.

DATE: December 6, 2005

TO: Chair Jack Hoffman
Metro Policy Advisory Committee

FROM: Andy Cotugno, Planning Dept. Director

RE: APPOINTMENT OF NEW MTAC ALTERNATE

Per the MPAC Bylaws:

Each jurisdiction or organization named [to MTAC] shall annually notify MPAC of their nomination. MPAC may approve or reject any nomination. Revision of the membership of MTAC may occur consistent with MPAC bylaw amendment procedures...

Please note that Tom Coffee has replaced Jim Hendryx as Interim Community Development Director for the City of Tigard. Please consider Tom Coffee's appointment to MTAC as First Alternate for the "Washington County/Other Cities" position. Jon Holan remains the primary member and Richard Meyer remains the Second Alternate for that seat.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at 503-797-1763.

Thank you.

I:\MTAC\Tom Coffee Appt.doc

**2006 Bond Measure
Blue Ribbon Committee**

**Summary Recommendations
December 3, 2005**

Size of 2006 Bond Measure: \$220 Million

Proposed Target Areas

Damascus Butte	Chehalem Ridge
Deep Creek and Tributaries	Wapato Lake
Clackamas River Bluffs	Rock Creek Watershed
Abernethy Creek	Columbia Slough
Stafford/Wilson Creek	Johnson Creek Watershed
Lower Tualatin Headwaters	

Proposed Regional Greenways

Tonquin Trail	Westside Powerline Trail
Willamette River Greenway	Cazadero Trail
Fanno Creek Greenway	Gresham-Fairview Trail

Remaining 1995 Target Areas

East Buttes and Boring Lava Domes	Tonquin Geologic Area
Clear Creek Canyon	Cooper Mountain
Clackamas River Greenway	Gales Creek
Newell Creek Canyon	Jackson Bottoms/Dairy-McKay Creeks
Tryon Creek Linkages	Forest Park
Willamette Narrows	Springwater Trail Corridor
Canemah Bluff	Rock Creek
Sandy River Gorge	

Local Share Per Capita: 20% (\$44 Million)

Local Opportunity Grant Fund: 5% (\$11 Million)

2006 Bond Measure Blue Ribbon Committee

Recommendations & Considerations December 3, 2005

Background

Over the past ten years, several planning efforts and other collective actions have been undertaken to develop a vision for our region that defines how it should grow and what qualities should be protected. Responsible development that builds strong local communities, the protection of ecologically significant lands and providing people with the experiences of nature that they value so highly are central tenets in all of them.

In 1995 citizens strongly approved Metro's \$135 million Open Spaces, Parks and Streams bond measure to protect the landscapes that help define our region. Since then more than 8,100 acres of river, stream and interconnected wildlife and trail corridors, buttes, wetlands and prairies have been protected.

In 2000 – 2001, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), a task force composed of elected officials from throughout the region, stated the need to protect and improve the ecological health of fish and wildlife habitat in the region and urged the Metro Council to extend its land acquisition efforts beyond the scope of the successful 1995 bond measure.

In December 2004, the Council adopted resolution No. 04-3506A, which resolved to take before the voters an acquisition and restoration program bond measure by November 2006. In accordance with this resolution, the Council established the Blue Ribbon Committee in September 2005 (Resolution No. 05-3612). The committee, a short-term task force, was to advise and make preliminary recommendations to the Council on the content of such a bond measure program.

Committee Process and Charge

The Committee, composed of 18 business, civic and citizen representatives recruited by Council President Bragdon, met for three sessions - October 25, November 2 and November 9, 2005 - and was asked by the Council to provide advice on the following questions:

1. What should the overall size of the bond be, within a range of \$140 to \$270 million?
2. Which regional-scale target areas should be prioritized for future acquisition by Metro?
3. What type, if any, of regional capital projects should be included – for example, open some previously acquired open spaces for public use,

- complete regional trails, build a few high profile capital improvements (e.g. trailhead facilities for Forest Park)
4. How much of the bond should be dedicated to the “local share per capita” component, as implemented under the 1995 measure?
 5. Should the “local share” fund be limited to acquisitions and capital projects related to natural areas as in the 1995 bond, or be open to any parks or public space projects at the discretion of the local jurisdictions, including soccer fields, tennis courts, urban plazas, etc.?
 6. Should the bond also contain a more flexible, opportunity-driven fund, such as the proposed competitive “Nature in Neighborhoods” capital grant program? If the committee favors this approach, what should be its primary focus and how large should it be?

In March 2006, Council will decide on a final bond sum and program after it considers and reviews the Blue Ribbon Committee’s recommendations, recommendations from Metro’s Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC) and seeks input from local jurisdictions and the community at large.

Recommendations & Considerations

1. Size of a 2006 Bond Measure. Protection of water quality and fish and wildlife habitat is essential in order to protect our quality of life, manage regional growth and leave a legacy for future generations. The Committee recommends a 2006 natural areas acquisition bond measure of a maximum of \$220 million in order to, as one member stated, “maintain a keen eye on what’s doable, sustainable and what protects our natural and cultural heritage.” It is critical to balance an investment in water quality and natural resource protection with strong voter support. The Committee believes that \$220 million is the “break point” between what will be gained from such an investment and where public support may fall off in the face of competing measures. A majority of the committee felt that going higher than \$220 would jeopardize support for the measure. \$220 million also translates into a \$32 per year contribution by the average homeowner, or \$2.67, approximately, per month for the protection of water quality, natural areas and fish and wildlife habitat – a sum consistent with preferences reflected in recent polling.

The Committee was asked by the Metro Council to consider a range of between \$140 million and \$270 million based on the size of the 1995 bond and indications of an acceptable ceiling provided from recent polling. In-depth discussions about the success of the last bond measure (\$135.6 million) weighed against lessening voter tax tolerance and the urgency of and opportunity for protecting remaining headwaters and areas critical to fish and wildlife habitat led the Committee to conclude that a balance must be achieved between these competing concerns in order for the measure to be enthusiastically embraced by voters. The Committee understands and strongly supports the need to continue investing in the region’s landscape in order to protect essential values but the investment must be made at a level palatable to citizens. \$220 million will provide a substantial local component and provide Metro with \$165 million to acquire ecologically significant lands and develop public access to previously acquired natural areas.

2. Protection of ecologically significant lands. The Blue Ribbon Committee recommends acquisition of lands in ecologically significant headwaters, rivers and stream corridors, forests and other critical habitat areas throughout all parts of the region in order to protect water quality and fish and wildlife habitat for the long term. The Committee also strongly supports the methodology of specific, justified target areas being clearly identified in advance on scientific grounds, and in pursuing only those acquisitions which are consistent with those standards.

The Committee recommends eleven new target areas (acquisition goal: 4,200 acres, approximately), six regional greenways, and continued acquisition (850 acres, approximately) of critical lands in specific target areas remaining from the 1995 bond measure. The recommendation is based on the assessment of over 40 public and private scientists from throughout the region who identified these areas as essential to the continued protection of water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. The protection of these proposed new target areas, when taken together with the lands acquired under Metro's 1995 bond measure, will help protect a vital ecological landscape for current and future generations, maintaining the values that make this region a desirable place to live, raise a family and do business.

The eleven Proposed Target Areas include (see attached map and target area descriptions on back):

Damascus Butte	Chehalem Ridge
Deep Creek and Tributaries	Wapato Lake
Clackamas River Bluffs	Rock Creek Watershed
Abernethy Creek	Columbia Slough
Stafford/Wilson Creek	Johnson Creek Watershed
Lower Tualatin Headwaters	

The six proposed regional greenways include:

Tonquin Trail	Westside Powerline Trail
Willamette River Greenway	Cazadero Trail
Fanno Creek Greenway	Gresham-Fairview Trail

Remaining 1995 Target Areas include:

East Buttes and Boring Lava Domes	Tonquin Geologic Area
Clear Creek Canyon	Cooper Mountain
Clackamas River Greenway	Gales Creek
Newell Creek Canyon	Jackson Bottoms/Dairy-McKay Creeks
Tryon Creek Linkages	Forest Park
Willamette Narrows	Springwater Trail Corridor
Canemah Bluff	Rock Creek
Sandy River Gorge	

The Committee recommends the removal of Hayden Island as a proposed target area because of its land use designation (industrial) and the owner's documented unwillingness to sell, but encourages continued exploration of potential opportunities in the existing East Buttes Target Area, given its location in the region relative to population growth. Metro staff will continue analyzing opportunities in each target area in order to produce "an ecologically meaningful portfolio."

3. 'Peopling Nature' Projects. The Committee recommends that no more than a few (approximately six) highly visible capital improvement projects on public land, regardless of jurisdiction, be included to improve peoples' access to previously acquired public sites and to help protect and improve water quality and fish and wildlife habitat.

Some capital projects, only if they clearly reflect the ecological intent of the measure and provide opportunities for citizens to use and appreciate previously acquired natural areas, will increase park provider and citizen support without eroding support overall. Completion of important land and water trail corridors, new trailheads and other projects that help citizens be in and enjoy natural areas should receive consideration. Metro staff will continue to develop a compatible package in close coordination with local park providers that own key elements of the current regional system (e.g., Forest Park). Current potential projects include \$16.5 million, approximately, of total bond funds. We believe this level of involvement is advisable, but to go further would undermine the purpose by inappropriately diluting the land acquisition and water quality protection focus of the bond.

4. Local Legacy Program. Local government and community involvement in the implementation of the bond measure provides an opportunity for communities to contribute to the protection of water quality, fish and wildlife habitat and the presence of nature in neighborhoods throughout the region. Such efforts will reinforce the regional vision by integrating natural areas, wildlife and trail corridors, and nature-related parks and parklands into local areas.

The Committee recommends that twenty-five percent (25%) of the total bond be provided for local projects. Twenty percent (20%) should be allocated as a per capita share to be used by local jurisdictions and park providers. Five percent (5%) should be allocated to a capital fund made available to a variety of community groups, on a competitive basis, for projects that produce the same results – improve water quality, protect or enhance fish and wildlife habitat and return nature to deficient neighborhoods throughout the urban and exurban parts of the region.

5. Local Legacy Criteria. Local projects should directly complement the larger regional vision by focusing on the protection of water quality and fish and wildlife habitat, and the restoration of areas important to our quality of life. The Committee embraces and recommends use of the attached local share project selection criteria but encourages some flexibility to accommodate communities with multiple park needs. However, the Committee reiterates that projects should connect directly to or complement the ecological intent of the bond measure, and cautions against deviating from that intent. Hence, land acquisition for future neighborhood parks may be eligible, but construction of active recreation facilities should not be considered eligible (see attached criteria).

6. Community Water and Restoration (Opportunity) Grant Program. A new capital fund would provide an additional opportunity for more people to engage in local efforts that reinforce the regional vision. The restoration of natural areas, wetlands and stream corridors, construction of rain gardens, and the replanting of streets are a few examples of the types of projects that can re-nature neighborhoods and build strong constituencies that will help protect natural processes at all scales. The Committee embraces and recommends the attached project selection criteria. The Committee discussed and reached unanimous agreement that these funds should not be used to develop facilities such as farmers markets, interpretive centers, or other heavily developed public spaces. (see attached criteria).

Meeting Summaries

The following brief summaries present the interim issues and direction set by the Committee in each of its three meetings.

October 25, 2005

Council President Bragdon reiterated the Committee's charge and the need for the Committee's scrutiny in recommending elements of the 2006 bond measure. Regional Parks Department staff presented background on the composition and success of the 1995 Open Spaces, Parks and Streams bond measure and articulated the current need for continued acquisition of critical lands to protect water quality and fish and wildlife habitat for the future. Staff described the 2006 bond measure as contemplated to date and provided a computer flyover of proposed regional target areas selected through a survey of scientists and biologists, a local share per capita component and a new opportunity grant program designed to include and engage a wide range of local partners. Patricia McCaig presented poll results from a recent survey of 600 residents that indicates strong interest across all populations in a regional measure focused on the protection of water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. Mike Ragsdale, chair of Metro's Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC), presented that committee's recommendations concerning the bond measure.

Issues Identified for Discussion:

- Competition from other bond measures (i.e., schools, jails)
- Inclusion of active recreation projects as part of the measure
- Operation and maintenance revenue needs for current and future land management

Direction: Chair Miller asked that Parks staff provide millage rates, population by county, and generate three acquisition and cost estimate scenarios - \$140 million, \$195 million and \$270 million - including acreages for new target areas, acreages for land still to be acquired in the 1995 bond target areas, regional greenway acquisitions and regional capital improvement projects. All three scenarios would assume a local component of 25% of the total sum for discussion purposes.

November 2, 2005

Committee members discussed the three acquisition scenarios and the proposed target areas, and concluded the meeting with a brief discussion of the local share and opportunity fund. The acquisition of the total acreages outlined in all target areas is estimated to cost \$800 million. Parks staff stated that given the program's willing seller approach, \$270 million is the sum required to sustain all these areas to protect water quality and the current biological functions identified by the science community. Staff described the target areas using biologic and landscape ecology principles and their compatibility with Metro's regional growth management goals. A \$140 million scenario would provide little ability to acquire acreages that would contribute significantly to sustaining future water quality or fish and wildlife habitat unless several proposed target areas were dropped, particularly those located within the current Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Chair Miller emphasized the need to reach agreement on the total program in the third meeting on November 9.

Issues Identified for Discussion:

- Inconsistency of 'signature' projects with intent of the measure based on recent polling and Council's Nature in Neighborhood directive.
- Need for flexibility in local share to maintain support for the measure.
- Focus of opportunity grant fund - need for clear criteria and types of projects.
- Relationship of target areas to vision for region (Metro's 2040 Framework Plan). Need for target areas to be defined in the context of the Regional Framework Plan and current growth management efforts.
- Need for target areas and local share to include growing cities and new areas in order to maintain residents' enthusiasm for the measure.

Direction: Committee members decided to recommend funding the local component of the measure at 20% per capita and 5% opportunity grant fund. The majority rejected the concern of some members about 'signature' projects and decided to retain them to improve public access to nature and to strengthen local support for the measure. They also requested cost estimates for each project. Committee members rejected the \$140 million bond total as too low for success in maintaining regional water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. Chair Miller directed staff to generate a \$200 million package and to prioritize proposed target areas using four overarching criteria: water quality, ecological significance, public usability and compatibility with regional growth goals. Committee members requested that Hayden Island be identified for deletion due to its inclusion as industrial land in Metro's 2040 Regional Framework Plan. Members also requested that the opportunity grant fund and local share criteria be made more explicit. Finally, members requested a list of potential ballot measures slated for November 2006.

November 9, 2005

Chair Miller asked the group to reach as much agreement as possible on the bond total, proposed target areas and criteria of the local funding programs, and to make clear additional considerations for Council on issues not fully resolved. GPAC Chair Mike Ragsdale reiterated GPAC's recommendation of a \$270 million bond measure. Members agreed to decide the largest prudent number for the measure in the context of tax weariness, competition with other measures and the need to balance the right target

areas with the right locations. Members negotiated a total number after weighing the risk of a higher measure losing with the overall broad regional ecological landscape vision being diluted further in a lower measure by public process or a Council decision. The Committee reiterated the need for the measure to remain consistent with water quality and fish and wildlife habitat protection goals.

Issues Identified for Discussion:

- Addition of Scouter Mountain (East Buttes Target Area) as a proposed target area
- Opportunity grant fund needs tighter focus – needs to reflect poll results and keep ‘re-naturing’ and water quality focus
- Retention of regional capital improvement projects vs. trimming; addition of other capital improvement projects (e.g. Willamette River railroad bridge from Milwaukie to Lake Oswego)

Direction. The Committee agreed on a \$220 million bond that includes \$16 million, approximately, for regional capital improvement projects. The local component was set at 25%. Committee members urged Metro to make every effort to acquire land in the 1995 East Buttes Target Area, if financially feasible. Members approved the local share and opportunity grant fund criteria and recommended that community gardens be included under project eligibility criteria.

Blue Ribbon Committee Members

Fred Miller, Chair

Fred Bruning, President, CenterCal Properties

Richard Cantlin, Partner, Perkins Coie LLP

Debbie Craig, Trustee, Meyer Memorial Trust

Carol Dillin, Vice President for Government Affairs and Public Policy, PGE

Ashleigh Flynn, Director, Cascadia Behavioral Health Care

John Griffiths, Business Development Manager, Intel

Mike Houck, Director, Urban Greenspaces Institute

Charles Jordan, Board member, The Conservation Fund

Lynn Lehrbach, Representative for Joint Council #37, Teamsters Union

Lori Luchake, President, Miles Fiberglass

Patricia McCaig, McCaig Communications and Opinion Research, Inc.

Randy Miller, President, The Moore Co., and chairman, Portland Ambassadors

Don Morissette, President, Don Morissette Homes

Larry Sitz, CEO, Emerick Construction

Hans Van de Meer, President and CEO, The Parati Company

Sara Vickerman, Senior Director of Biodiversity, Defenders of Wildlife

Dilafruz Williams, Professor of education policy, PSU; Portland School Board

Blue Ribbon Committee Open Spaces Agenda Item #5:

The preliminary target areas map is provided on the Metro MPAC webpage at:

<http://www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?articleid=8878>

The map has been posted separately due to the size of the document and to in order to allow the public to download the MPAC packet material as needed without problems.

If you have any questions please contact Kim Bardes at bardes@metro.dst.or.us.

Thank you.

Metro Blue Ribbon Committee 2006 Criteria for Regional Target Areas

1. Water Quality: Contributes to watershed protection/water quality

Protecting the riparian area of streams, rivers, wetlands, and lakes is most critical for maintaining clean water and protecting aquatic habitat. However, without adequate watershed protection, the aquatic system can be severely degraded even with the best riparian protection. Examples are found of highly urbanized streams where most of the watershed drainage area is impervious (i.e. paved for infrastructure or developed with commercial, industrial and residential structures), resulting in flash flows of high volume during fall, winter and spring, and low flows during the drier season. Protecting the headwaters of streams and floodplain wetlands is also a high priority for water quality protection.

2. Habitat value: Supports a diversity of plant and animal life.

The habitat value of a site is what life it currently supports as well as its highest potential for supporting a diverse population of flora and fauna (particularly native species), which is generally desirable for ecosystem stability. If the habitat is available, the wildlife can be expected to prosper either through natural or human-facilitated introduction. Habitat diversity is a function of structural diversity; that is, a mixture of living (vegetation) and non-living (water, soil, minerals) elements. For example, in a forested ecosystem, diverse structure would include a range of plant species at different canopy levels and a mixture of large and small trees, snags, and downed and dead wood. Principal factors that determine habitat value are size, soils, slope, aspect (general direction it faces), local climate, susceptibility to edge effects, degree of fragmentation, and connectivity. Maintaining rich and diverse flora within the region enriches the lives of all and provides diverse visual and recreational experiences for all segments of the population.

3. Rarity: Reflects the relative rarity of ecosystem or possesses unique natural features.

While the protection of rare and endangered species is a high priority, very few opportunities exist to protect habitat for these species in our region. However, more opportunities exist to protect natural features that are relatively rare in our region. For example, protecting a stream that continues to support a healthy steelhead population within our urban region is very important although the species itself is not endangered. Likewise, protecting an oak/madrone forested habitat may be prioritized over a fir/hemlock/cedar forest because the former is rare in our region while the latter is not.

4. Size: Ability to sustain fundamental biological features.

Protection of large blocks of natural areas of a sufficient size to sustain key biological features is a high priority at the regional level. A regionally significant natural area must be able to support a viable and diverse community of flora and fauna. In some circumstances, protecting smaller parcels may have regional significance, such as

closing gaps along a linear corridor. In most instances however, protection of large natural areas will allow greater opportunities for colonization, persistence, and breeding of a greater number of species. The actual size needed to support viable populations of plants and wildlife is specific to the species but some generalizations can be made. For example, literature suggests that the minimum forested area needed to support land vertebrate communities ranges from 50 to 75 acres. Many of our migratory birds require a minimum of 75 to 250 acres of forested area for nesting, breeding, and foraging.

An area's size can also reduce the deleterious effect on habitat caused by "edge effect." The transitional edge between a natural area and development (houses, roads) provides different character and properties than a natural area's interior. Edge habitats are more exposed to climatic stress, invasion of exotic species, predation (domestic as well as natural) and to human impact. Generally, the smaller and narrower the natural area, the higher the ratio of edge to interior species. While these habitat edges are not lacking in our region, large intact habitat interiors are becoming increasingly scarce.

5. Restoration. Current conditions provide for feasible restoration action.

Ecological restoration is the process of intentionally altering a site to establish a defined indigenous, historical ecosystem. The goal of this process is to emulate the structure, function, diversity and dynamics of a specified system. Restoration cannot be evaluated solely on current conditions but must also include what can ultimately be achieved on a site.

The feasibility of ecological restoration is dependent on the size of the area and its level of degradation. The degree of difficulty for restoration is dependent on the condition of the soils, water resources, degree of pest invasion, and human-induced disturbances (i.e. dams, fragmentation by streets). For example, a small, relatively undisturbed area may have less restoration potential than a large, highly disturbed area assuming that the larger area can ultimately support greater habitat diversity with greater control over pest species. With restoration, the site should also be able to sustain itself as an ecosystem given its adjacent land uses, and contribute significantly to other beneficial ecosystem functions, such as water quality and floodplain protection.

6. Connectivity: Potential linkages to stream and wildlife corridors, existing parks, natural areas and trail systems.

Large, self-supporting natural areas are more valuable as a resource when connected to other natural areas by wildlife and stream corridors. Sites that serve as existing or potential linkages for wildlife and a system of trails have even higher regional significance.

7. Scenic Resources: Potential to protect views to an from visual resource representative of the region's natural and cultural landscapes.

The scenic value of a site describes its visibility from key viewpoints, views from the site out to resources of high scenic and regional value, and its own value as a contributing feature of the scenic quality of the region.

8. Public Access

Access to a regional natural area should be made available by foot, bicycle, public transportation, and/or personal motorized vehicle, ideally in that order. Rating the appropriateness of public access includes evaluating existing linkages. For example, a regional target area's connection to an existing or potential local or regional trail will give it a higher rating than a site with primarily car access.

Based on landscape form, size and type of habitat, a natural area may accommodate limited public use without significant degradation of its natural values. A balance must, however, be achieved to promote public appreciation of a site while protecting the natural qualities the public has invested in and is drawn to. The ability of a site to promote citizen support through volunteer restoration activities and environmental education is also important and depends on its accessibility from large population groups, its proximity to schools and its connection to the regional trail system.

9. Criteria for Regional Trails, Greenways and Wildlife Corridors

The regional trails system consists of primarily off-road, non-motorized linear corridors for wildlife movement, ecological connectivity, human recreation and transportation. These linear linkages (land or water) are located in natural settings where possible, and are designed primarily for pedestrian use and cycling and equestrian use, where appropriate. The system possesses the following characteristics:

Land or water-based trails

- Provide links between parks, local trails and local communities.
- Provide non-motorized access to a river or parkland of regional scale from a major population center or mass-transit terminal.
- Provide a day-use loop or link through other regionally significant lands or waters.

Regional greenways

- Provide continuous riparian habitat along a river or stream that can also accommodate pedestrian, equestrian and/or bicycling where possible.
- Provide continuous connections for wildlife between various habitats.
- Provide access to a river or land trail with some provision for parking and passive recreation.

Regional wildlife corridors

- Provide significant habitat for species that reside in and pass through the region along regular migratory routes.
- Improve or enhance an existing reserve.
- Provide a link between habitats that is beneficial to wildlife and assists in maintaining biological diversity. Opportunities for human access will be limited.

A trail or greenway must meet the following criteria to be considered 'regional':

- Interconnects regionally significant natural areas, parks, or other destinations (e.g. scenic or historic sites).
- Interconnects regionally significant trails and/or loop systems.
- Interconnects regional centers, town centers, industrial areas and/or light rail station areas.
- Connects to or through significant habitat areas, wildlife corridors or other publicly-owned LCDC Goal 5 resources where appropriate.
- Involves multiple jurisdictions, including Washington State.
- Receives use from citizens of the region.

D R A F T

2006 Bond Measure Local Share Guidelines

In order to be eligible for Local Share Funds, projects or associated costs must meet the following criteria:

1. Eligible agency is a city or park provider as of November 6, 2006.
2. Funds must be expended on natural area-related activities only, including:

Acquisition

- Fee Simple (or easement) purchase of natural areas, wildlife and/or trail corridors identified in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan, Regional Greenspaces System Concept Map (adopted 2002), the Regional Trails Plan Map (adopted 2002), the Nature in Neighborhoods Map (Fish & Wildlife Habitat Protection Program, Resource Classification Map), and/or locally determined significant natural areas, neighborhood and pocket parks, wildlife and/or trail corridors.
- Out-of-pocket costs associated with property acquisition.

Capital Improvement Projects

- Restoration or enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat.
- Improvements to existing natural area amenities to provide universal access to the public (meets Americans with Disabilities (ADA) requirements).
- Public use facilities such as roads, parking areas, trailheads, rest rooms, picnic tables, shelters, children's play equipment compatible with environmental education or interpretive activities, viewing blinds, water systems, camp sites, fishing piers, and associated appurtenances such as information signs, fences, security lighting, and barbecues.
- Environmental education facilities such as nature centers and interpretive displays.
- Trail design, engineering and construction.

D R A F T

2006 Bond Measure Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Fund Guidelines

In order to be eligible for Nature in Neighborhoods Capital Funds, projects or associated costs must meet the following criteria:

1. Eligible agency is a non-profit, 501(c) 3, education district or higher education organization, city, county, special district or park provider at the time of application to Metro.
2. Leverages the public's investment. All project applications must demonstrate a 1:1 match. Match may be cash and/or in-kind donations, services, staff time and volunteer labor hours, and must come from sources other than Metro.
3. Funds must be expended on natural area related activities, including:

Acquisition

- Fee Simple (or easement) purchase of natural areas, wildlife and/or trail corridors identified in the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan, Regional Greenspaces System Concept Map (adopted 2002), the regional target area map (1995), the Regional Trails Plan Map (adopted 2002), the Nature in Neighborhoods Map (Fish & Wildlife Habitat Protection Program, Resource Classification Map), and/or locally determined significant natural areas, neighborhood and pocket parks, wildlife and/or trail corridors (e.g., Portland urban forest canopy map, PSU).
- Out-of-pocket costs associated with property acquisition.

Capital Improvement Projects (publicly owned locations only – fee or easement)

1. Enrichment of the region's fish and wildlife inventory through effective techniques for riparian restoration, diverse vegetation structure, fish passage and wildlife crossings.
2. Conservation and/or restoration of habitats of concern, lands identified in Metro's habitat conservation area inventory, headwaters and confluences of the region's streams and rivers.
3. "Renaturing" neighborhoods by increasing the presence of parks, trails and natural systems (e.g., creek or stream day lighting, retention

- ponds, rain gardens, rooftop wetlands, restoration of woodlands, improvement of storm water storage and/or soil infiltration capacity).
4. Innovative solutions that benefit the natural environment and serve as demonstration projects for neighborhoods or local communities (e.g. urban community gardens, pocket parks).
 5. Trail design, engineering and construction.
 6. Improvements to natural amenities that provide universal access to the public (meets Americans with Disabilities (ADA) requirements).
 7. Opportunities for environmental education through facilities such as nature centers, interpretive displays, restoration sites, community gardens.
 8. Collaboration between multiple partners to leverage community resources and bond dollars.

Blue Ribbon Committee
2006 Bond Measure
Members and Bios

Fred Miller, Chair

Fred Miller is former director of Oregon's executive, transportation and energy departments (1976 – 1992) and former executive vice president of public policy and consumer services at Portland General Electric. He served as Chair of the 1995 open space bond Blue Ribbon Committee and will serve again as Chair of the 2006 Blue Ribbon Committee.

Fred Bruning

Fred Bruning is a lawyer, realtor and president of Center Oak Properties, a retail development company notable for its development of Gresham Station and Bridgeport Village. Fred is a member of the Urban Land Institute, the International Council of Shopping Centers and the California Bar Association.

Richard Cantlin

Richard Cantlin is a partner with Perkins Coie and chair of the firm's real estate group. He has practiced transactional law for over thirty years with an emphasis on real estate development and finance. His peers and clients have recognized him as outstanding in his field and he has been listed in Chambers USA as a leading American business lawyer for 2005.

Debbie Craig

Debbie Craig is an attorney and a Trustee of the Meyer Memorial Trust. Her non-profit interests include education and land conservation. She has directed four bond campaigns in Lake Oswego for schools and parks.

Carol Dillin

Carol Dillin is Vice President of Portland General Electric and oversees the company's Government Affairs, Corporate Communications, Community Affairs and Environmental Policy, and Special Attention Customers departments. She also addresses energy policy issues on behalf of PGE customers and actively engages city, state and federal leaders on important public policy issues. Her community work includes membership on the boards of the Portland Business Alliance and the Oregon Business Association, and membership on the Leadership Council of the Northwest Business for Culture and the Arts. Carol is also a William Marsh Lifetime Achievement Award recipient.

Ashleigh Flynn

Ashleigh Flynn works for Cascadia Behavioural Health Care and is a former Americorps worker in the Oregon RARE program (Resource Assistance to Rural Environments) which focused on sustainable development in the McKenzie River watershed. Ashleigh has training in regional planning and landscape architecture from the University of Oregon. She is also an accomplished singer/songwriter and recording artist.

John Griffiths

John Griffiths is the business development manager for the operating divisions within Intel's Platform Components Group. He is also a board member of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District and a member of Metro's Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC). John has been actively involved in park advocacy within the Portland metropolitan area for over fifteen years.

Mike Houck

Mike Houck is an urban naturalist, Executive Director of the Urban Greenspaces Institute at PSU and a member of Metro's Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee (GPAC). He has been a leader in the regional and national park, trails and greenspaces community since 1980 when he founded the Urban Naturalist Program at Portland Audubon Society. He has also been involved in previous regional open space bond measures (1992, 1995), the development of Metro Greenspaces and Metro's 2040 Plan. Mike is a Loeb Fellow (2004), a member of the Ecological Cities Project steering committee, and co-author with M.J. Cody of Wild in the City.

Charles Jordan

Charles Jordan is a former Portland city commissioner and director of Portland and Austin, Texas, Parks. He is currently a board member of the Conservation Fund. Charles is recognized throughout the country for his conservation and park advocacy work.

Lynn Lehrbach

Lynn Lehrbach is representative for Joint Council #37 of the Teamsters Union. He is also the Oregon legislative representative for the Teamsters, and an international representative in the construction industry for the International Brotherhood of the Teamsters (IBT).

Lori Luchak

Lori Luchak is President of Miles Fiberglass headquartered in north Clackamas County. She is former president of the North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce and a former board member of the American Composite Manufacturing Association. She is also active in Clackamas community programs such as the Oregon State Austin Family Business Program and the Owen Sabin Skill Center.

Patricia McCaig

Patricia McCaig is a small business owner whose firm, McCaig Communications and Opinion Research, Inc., uses quantitative and qualitative research to develop support for complex public policy initiatives. She specializes in developing communication strategies and building public support for measures that fund public services. McCaig has more than 25 years of political, legislative and public policy experience in the Pacific Northwest. She is a former Metro councilor and in 1995 co-chaired Metro's first successful Open Spaces, Parks & Streams campaign.

Randy Miller

Randy Miller is president of Portland Ambassadors and a board member of the Portland Business Alliance.

Don Morissette

Don Morissette has been engaged in the homebuilding industry for over thirty years as founder and president of Don Morissette Homes. He is a former Metro Councilor and crafter of the successful willing seller component of the 1995 bond acquisition program.

Larry Sitz

Larry Sitz is CEO of Emerick Construction, past AGC president and current chair of Metro's legislative committee. Emerick Construction specializes in school buildings and unique projects throughout Oregon such as Crater Lake Lodge, Salem's Capital Dome, and the Shakespearean complex in Ashland, OR.

Hans Van De Meer

Hans is CEO and President of The Parati Company, an architecture, planning, transportation and engineering firm. Hans has over thirty years experience in civil engineering, international construction and management, and project finance. He has extensive, global experience in the design and construction of marine ports, airports, roads and bridges. He and his firm are also active in development efforts throughout Washington County.

Sara Vickerman

Sara Vickerman is Senior Director of Biodiversity Programs for Defenders of Wildlife and oversees its Oregon Biodiversity Project. Sara has served on the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission, the Governor's Willamette River Basin Task Force, the Willamette River Greenway Plan steering committee, and the President's Council on Sustainable Development. She is currently a board member of Sustainable Northwest and a member of the Oregon Sustainability Board.

Dilafruz Williams

Dilafruz is Professor of education policy and public administration at PSU and an active member of the Portland School Board. She has extensive experience in sustainability education and grants administration, and is involved in promoting conservation education and local, organic food in public schools through Learning Gardens and JEANS' Farm.

Agenda Item No. 6: New Look at 2040 Work Program

Materials will be distributed at the meeting.

Tentative List of 2006 MPAC Work Program Issues

- State Big Look (SB 82) (Work Program Input)
- LCDRC Rule Making
 - Urban Reserves
 - Subregional Land Need
 - Goal 9 (Economic Development) & 12 (Transportation) Amendments
- New Look at Regional Choices (2040)
 - Regional Framework Plan Policies
 - Regional Business Plan (Regional Meeting)
 - 2030 Forecast Allocations
 - Agriculture/Urban Symposiums – Next Steps
 - UGB Process
- Functional Plan Implementation and Compliance
 - 2005 Compliance Report
 - Title 11 Concept Planning
 - Damascus Concept Plan
 - Expansion Area Planning Fund Committee
- Title 7 Revisions/Compliance – Housing Choice Task Force Proposals
- Nature in Neighborhood
 - Basin Goal 5 Program Implementation & Metro Title 13 Compliance Acknowledgement
 - Metro 2006 Greenspaces/Goal 5 Bond Measure Allocation
- Periodic Review
 - Industrial Lands Remand/Acknowledgement
- Economic Development – Brownfields/EPA Grant Proposal
- Get Centered! Program Changes-Incentives
- Ballot Measure 37 – Role of Cities and Counties
 - Claims Coordination
 - Service Extensions
 - Revision/clarification of measure
- JPACT Make-up & JPACT/MPAC working relationship