



Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Jim Zehren, Chair

MEETING NOTICE

Thursday, March 25, 2004
5:30 to 7:00 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 501
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

AGENDA

Convene <i>Jim Zehren, Committee Chair</i>	5:30 p.m.
Announcements <i>All</i>	5:30 – 5:40 p.m. <i>10 min.</i>
Review of Discussion Outline for Committee Work Plan <i>All</i>	5:40 – 6:50 <i>70 min.</i>
Next Meeting – date and length <i>Jim Zehren</i>	6:50 – 7:00 <i>10 min.</i>
Adjourn	7:00 p.m.

The next GPAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 22, 5:30 p.m.
(unless the committee determines otherwise).

**METRO
GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***DISCUSSION OUTLINE FOR
COMMITTEE WORK PLAN***

***I.
POLICY QUESTIONS***

***The overriding policy questions that we ultimately should
consider and make recommendations to address***

- P1. What is the problem? Why does GPAC need to exist? In the most basic of terms, what is GPAC's mission? In five or ten or twenty years from now, how would anyone know if GPAC was successful? If GPAC is successful, will it then no longer need to exist, or is its mission of an on-going nature?
- P2. How does the greenspaces and parks effort in the region relate to and coordinate with the remaining elements of Metro's and local governments' planning and growth management regimen?
- P3. What is the regional interest in greenspaces and parks, as opposed to the local park providers' interests?
- P4. What is Metro's role in addressing the regional interest?
- P5. What is the scope and nature of the types of greenspaces and parks lands and facilities that are included in the regional interest and in Metro's role? Full spectrum of lands and facilities? Only regional scale? Only natural areas? Land only or recreational facilities too? Urban plazas and other public realm in town and regional centers? Etc.?
- P6. What is the "regional system" and what would it mean to be included in the regional system for (a) particular lands and facilities that are included and (b) local parks providers who own or operate lands and facilities that are included
- P7. What different ways could Metro act to achieve and help achieve the regional system— Direct ownership and operations? Funding assistance or incentives? Planning, technical and legal assistance? Coordinating and collaborating? Goals or standards or guidelines? Public education and political leadership?
- P8. Whatever the regional interest and Metro's role in regional greenspaces and parks, how should they be provided with the necessary resources?
- P.9 Other?

NOTES:

II. HISTORY

How we got to where we are re regional greenspaces and parks

- H1. Olmsted Report
- H2. East Bay trip
- H3. Greenspaces Master Plan
- H4. 1992 failed regional greenspaces bond vote
- H5. 1995 successful regional greenspaces bond vote
- H6. Metro greenspaces acquisition program
- H7. Regional Growth Concept
- H8. Regional Framework Plan
- H9. Title 3 of Regional Framework Plan
- H10. Metro Council Resolution 97-2562B
- H.11. Metro functional plans
- H.12. GTAC LOS report
- H.13. MPAC Parks Subcommittee report
- H.14. Metro staff "regional system" work
- H.15. Green Ribbon Committee report
- H.16. Minneapolis-St. Paul trip
- H.17. Metro's Title XII ordinance
- H.18 Other?

As to each one of the *History* items above, our approach should be as follows: (1) committee members read the document or read about the event (whenever practicable) prior to our discussion of the document or event, (2) our discussion of the document or event is lead by one or two savvy individuals who participated in the preparation of the document or in the event and (3) our discussion of the document or event is focused on the following questions:

- a. When did it happen?
- b. Who or what initiated it? Why? What was the underlying or basic agenda?
- c. What was new or different or significant about it, at the time it occurred?
- d. What did it say or teach re a multi-provider/regional approach?
- e. What did it say or teach re funding?
- f. What scope and types of greenspaces and parks lands and facilities did it address?
- g. What was its impact? What did it set the stage for or lead to that happened (or didn't happen) later?
- h. What did it leave undone or unresolved?
- i. What is its lasting legacy and continuing relevance today?
- j. Other?

NOTES:

III.

CURRENT CONTEXT

*The current setting and state of affairs re regional greenspaces and parks
(other than as laid out in the History items above)*

- C1. Metro's pending regional parks development funding proposal
- C2. Metro's Greenspaces and Parks Department: what is its mission, how many and who are its staff, what is its budget, what are its current programs and operations
- C3. The greenspaces and parks lands and facilities that Metro currently owns (and will own once the bond monies are all spent)
- C4. The current local greenspaces and parks providers in the region—their geographic scope, how are they structured and funded, how active and successful are they
- C5. The roles and contributions, if any, to regional greenspaces and parks by our state and federal governments
- C6. The existing and potential significant players in greenspaces and parks in the region *other than* parks providers
- C7. The Vancouver USA/Clark County WA greenspaces and parks situation
- C8. What we know about the existing greenspaces and parks in the region across the entire spectrum of types of lands and facilities
- C9. Metro's Goal 5 program and agenda: what it is about and how it relates to regional greenspaces and parks
- C10. Measure 36 ("Son of Measure 7"): what it is and how it relates to regional greenspaces and parks
- C11. The macro and micro economic benefits of greenspaces and parks
- C12. The existing and potential approaches to greenspaces and parks funding (a) in the region and (b) used elsewhere
- C13. The existing and potential approaches to cooperation, collaboration and partnering in the delivery of greenspaces and parks in the region--between and among units and levels of governmental, nonprofits, and private sector
- C14. What the political and legal horizons portend re (a) regulatory approaches to achieving greenspaces and parks in the region, (b) Metro and local greenspaces and parks bond and levy ballot measures in the region and (c) use of system development charges for funding greenspaces and parks in the region
- C15. Specific other regional models to consider: (a) East Bay, (b) Minneapolis-St. Paul, (c) other USA regions and (d) regions outside the USA (*GPAC trip to London, Paris, Amsterdam, Berlin and Barcelona, anyone?*)
- C16. What local parks providers in the region think Metro should do and not do
- C17. Public opinion: (a) Oregon Values and Beliefs Survey results (b) SCORP results and (c) McCaig poll results
- C18. Other?

NOTES:

IV.
LOGISTICS
How we operate as a committee

- L1. How often we meet
- L2. How long our meetings last
- L3. Where we meet: (a) meeting room at Metro Regional Center (b) meetings elsewhere in the region
- L4. Committee By-Laws
- L5. Meeting comments by guests
- L6. Meeting comments for the good of the order: heads-ups on relevant activities, pending actions and items of interest outside of Metro
- L7. Meeting updates on relevant activities and pending actions at MPAC, JPACT and Metro Council
- L8. Periodic regional greenspaces and parks conferences
- L9. GPAC tour(s) of existing greenspaces and parks of (a) Metro and (b) other parks providers in region (*i.e.*, an East Bay trip/Minneapolis-St. Paul trip, but in our own region)
- L10. Need for a GTAC—if so, now or later
- L11. Need for Vancouver USA/Clark County WA representation on GPAC (and a GTAC)—if so, now or later
- L12. Joint meetings from time to time with MPAC and JPACT
- L13. Hearing from and engaging local park providers' board, staff and volunteer leadership
- L14. Other?

NOTES:

DATE: March 18, 2004

TO: Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

FROM: James A. Zehren
Chair

RE: Agenda for next GPAC meeting March 25, 2004

Thank you for a very good first GPAC meeting on February 26th. It was enlightening to hear about everyone's different backgrounds and the various individual connections to the issues of parks and greenspaces. We have a broad array of interests and experiences on the committee that I know will serve us well as we proceed with our important work as a policy advisory committee to the region's elected Metro Council.

Enclosed please find the results of my attempt to create a framework for our discussion of GPAC's work plan, which we agreed on February 26th that we need in order to proceed with the scheduling and planning of our committee meetings. With the help of Jim Desmond and Heather Nelson Kent, I have outlined the discussion items in four major categories: (1) Policy Questions, (2) History, (3) Current Context and (4) Logistics. I have arranged these sections in the order in which I believe the committee should address them.

As such, the agenda for our next meeting on March 25th will be a committee work session discussing the enclosed discussion outline--on a section-by-section basis in the order that the sections appear in the outline.

The objective of the work session will be two-fold. First, to agree on or revise the items set out in the first THREE sections of the discussion outline (Policy Questions, History and Current Context). To be clear: In discussing the first three sections during our meeting on the 25th, the purpose will NOT be to try to answer any of the questions posed or to receive, review or discuss any of the information or documents listed. The purpose on the 25th rather will be to discuss and resolve whether the questions and information and documents listed are the ones—as best we can tell at this time—that we should address in our future meetings. We also will want to consider our priorities in addressing the various topics.

The second objective of the work session will be to go through the FOURTH section of the discussion outline (Logistics) and to make a decision--as much as we can, or as much as we decide to decide --on each of the items listed before we adjourn the meeting.

I very much look forward to our discussion, and hope that you do, too. As always will be the case, feel free to call me (503-294-9616) regarding this subject or any other aspect of GPAC or its work.

**Meeting Topic Interest Survey – Portland Area Parks and Greenspaces
Providers & Advocates**

I. Please place an “x” in the cell that indicates your level of interest in the following potential forum topics.

Topic			
	High	Moderate	Low
A. Funding advocacy – How can this group work together to create a bigger “funding pie” to address the park and greenspace needs of the region? Identify and discuss some key funding sources (local, regional, state, federal), and develop strategies for collaborating to obtain more funding from these sources.		XX	
B. Non-profits – What is their role; how can they best be involved in funding and policy discussions and decisions? What are some examples of productive partnerships? What are some of the pitfalls?	XX		
C. Message – Additional information and discussion about connecting the region’s park and greenspace resources to broader public concerns about air and water quality, physical fitness/public health and livability – and how to promote that message.			XX
D. Operations and maintenance – What are the best ideas for increasing funding for operations and maintenance? What about cost-saving measures? What works and doesn’t work?			XX
E. Joint project – Are there projects that this group could work on together that address widely-held priorities and could draw funding from outside the region? (e.g. jointly sponsored/produced regional trails map and outreach/fitness program)	XX		
F. Natural area acquisition and restoration - What are the needs, how are we going to meet the needs?		XX	
G. Goal 5 – What is Goal 5, and how does it relate to the region’s parks and greenspaces? (Primarily educational.)			XX
H. Willamette Greenway – How can the Willamette Greenway concept be revived and strengthened? What is the role of various agencies? Where will funding come from? What is the message?			XX

II. What other topics would be of interest to you, and benefit from exploration and discussion by the region’s parks and greenspaces professionals?

III. Logistical Information

Depending on the results of the survey, we're thinking about planning for three additional half-day meetings in 2004 focused on the topics identified through the survey. To help us plan, please respond to the following questions about meeting preferences.

- A. What day or days of the week work best for you for meetings of this type? (Place an X next to all that apply.)

Monday () Tuesday () Wednesday () Thursday (x) Friday (x)

- B. Do you prefer a morning or afternoon meeting? (Place an X next to your preference, or both if either works for you.)

Morning (x) Afternoon ()

- C. Do you have any suggestions for centrally-located, easily accessible, inexpensive meeting spaces (large enough to comfortably accommodate 20-40 people)?

Metro is available if you'd like.

Contact: Kathie Smith 503.797.1848, smithk@metro.dst.or.us

IV. Other Comments and Suggestions

Use the space below to offer other comments and suggestions about these forums.

THANK YOU. Please return completed surveys by 4/22 to Pam Wiley at pwiley@teleport.com, or, if more convenient, to the following address:

Pam Wiley
3408 SE 8th Ave.
Portland OR 97202

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Member sign-in sheet

March 25, 2004

Please sign your initials next to your name.

JZ	Jim Zehren, Chair	Citizen Representative
Absent	Ernie Drapela	City of Gresham
KG	Kim Gilmer	Lake Oswego Parks and Recreation
SG	Steve Greagor	Hillsboro Parks and Recreation
by rhm	John Griffiths	THPRD
(FZ)	Faun Hosey	Citizen Representative
by rhm	Mike Houck	Portland Audubon Society
EL	Esther Lev	Citizen Representative
DN	Doug Neeley	Oregon City
CN	Chris Noble	Citizen Representative
MR	Mike Ragsdale	Citizen Representative
TR	Tim Raphael	Trust for Public Land
ZS	Zari Santner	Portland Parks and Recreation
DS	Dick Schouten	Washington County Commission
DT	Don Trotter	NCPRD Advisory Board

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Visitor sign-in sheet

March 25, 2004

[illegible]