

GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 25, 2004

Metro Regional Center, Room 501

Minutes

Committee members present: Chair Jim Zehren, Kim Gilmer, Steve Greagor, Faun Hosey, Esther Lev, Doug Neeley, Chris Noble, Mike Ragsdale, Tim Raphael, Zari Santner, Dick Schouten and Don Trotter. In attendance via speakerphone: John Griffiths and Mike Houck.

Committee member absent: Ernie Drapela

Metro elected official present: David Bragdon, Metro Council President

Metro Parks staff present: Jim Desmond, Heather Kent, Lia Waiwaiole and Cathy Rutkowski, Metro Finance

Convene

The meeting was called to order by Jim Zehren, Chair, at 5:30 pm.

Approval of the February 2004 minutes was tabled until next month allowing those who had not read them in advance to do so. Mr. Zehren suggested that in future the minutes be sent out with the agenda and meeting notice one week to ten days prior to the next meeting rather than as soon as completed. (Note: the February meeting notes were e-mailed to all on March 9 and the agenda on March 18.)

Review of Discussion Outline for Committee Work Plan

Mr. Zehren suggested using as a discussion guide the outline e-mailed to committee members on March 18. *(A copy of the Discussion Outline is included with the official meeting record.)*

For Section I (P1-P9) of the discussion outline, Mr. Zehren proposed giving consideration to the overriding policy questions that the committee will ultimately address. This should provide a frame of reference as to what the committee has been appointed to do. The format will be to pose questions without attempting to answer them at this point.

Section II (H1-H18) of the outline will search background material to address those questions and Section III (C1-C18) will examine the context in which the Parks and Greenspaces program is currently operating. Mr. Zehren noted how important it will be for each member to become familiar with this information and for the committee to begin working from the same starting point. Section IV (L1-L14) of the outline will examine committee logistics: how often to meet, the duration of the meetings, by-laws, etc. Committee members were invited to add, delete or offer revisions to any points of the draft committee work plan.

Mike Houck submitted his input on the work plan outline via e-mail prior to the meeting and copies were distributed. *(A copy of his comments is included with the official meeting record.)*

Mr. Zehren emphasized that the work plan will not be a product to be provided to the public of the region, but merely a discussion guide and a meeting planning guide to be used as the committee moves forward.

The items under each section were opened to discussion. The following were among the points made and questions asked:

Section I – Policy Questions

- (P1) Is Regional Parks & Greenspaces of a lesser level of importance than other Metro policy areas such as transportation planning and land use planning? If so, is that a problem? If so, what should Metro do about it?
- (P1) Should Metro have a regional vision for parks and greenspaces in this metropolitan area?
- (P2) The phrase "relate to and coordinate with" in the first line should be revised to include "complement".
- (P3) Change the phrase "local park providers" to "local park interests" which will cover both park providers and citizens.
- (P3) How does one assess those interests? Are they different for local interests and regional interests? Where do non-profit organizations fit in?
- (P6) This question presumes the possibility there would be lands and facilities included in the "regional system" which are not regionally owned. What would that mean for those providers that do own and operate them, if anything?
- (P9 on Mr. Houck's list of comments) Replace "how can Metro elevate. . ." with "should Metro elevate. . ." If the latter is answered in the affirmative, then ask "how can Metro elevate. . . ."
- (P10 on Mr. Houck's list) Repeat with the phrases "integrate" and "should" in the first sentence.
- (P10 on Mr. Houck's list) Add the phrase "state" so the first line would read "local, state and federal natural resource agencies".

Mike Ragsdale made the observation that the committee was wordsmithing when it did not yet have a mission. He suggested stepping back from this detail to look at the big picture. What is the committee's vision?

Mr. Zehren responded that this is a way of getting at a shared notion of what the committee's vision is.

Section II - History

- A preference was expressed for individuals who participated in the preparation of the document or event to be discussed (H1- H7), to take the lead in that discussion.
- When GPAC reaches a point where policy recommendations need to be made, having this historical information will be vital.

Section III – Current Context

- It would be helpful to know the current status of those documents or events (H1-H17) and if recommendations regarding them are still pending.
- (C10) The phrase "son of Measure 7" is to be deleted from the reference to Measure 36.
- Invite Local park providers to present to the committee information on their current situations, what they own/manage, what array of services they provide and to whom. This would also provide an opportunity to meet face-to-face.

Section IV – Logistics

- As to how often to meet, Tim Raphael commented that without setting some goals, it will be hard to determine that detail. If there are goals and end products in mind, the work schedule will probably be obvious.
- Meetings will be held the fourth Thursday of each month (which may or may not be the last Thursday of each month).
- For the present, the beginning meeting time will be 5:30 p.m.
- It was suggested the Chair and staff work together to produce a work plan based on the evening's discussions. The work plan will then determine the length of future meetings.
- If meetings begin to draw larger numbers of the public, a larger meeting room may be necessary.
- Basic by-laws should be established. Staff will draft a set to be reviewed at the April meeting. Metro Policy Advisory Committee by-laws will be used as a guideline.

- May be beneficial for committee to visit local park sites/facilities within the regional system.
- Consider whether necessary to establish a Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee-like body. If so, will it play the same or a different role than GTAC?
- The need for as much communication and feedback from local park providers in GPAC's process was emphasized.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.