

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Jim Zehren, Chair



METRO

MEETING NOTES

Thursday, May 27, 2004
5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 501
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Committee members present: Chair Jim Zehren, Ernie Drapela, Kim Gilmer, Faun Hosey, Esther Lev, Doug Neeley, Mike Ragsdale, Don Trotter, Steve Greagor

Committee members absent: John Griffiths, Zari Santner, Dick Schouten, Mike Houck, Tim Raphael

Metro staff present: Heather Kent, Lia Waiwaiole, Paul Garrahan

Guests: Holly Pruett

Convene

The meeting was called to order by Jim Zehren at 5:35 p.m.

Comments from Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement and guests

None

Items for the good of the order

Kim Gilmer announced that an ad hoc group of parks and greenspaces professionals and advocates have met periodically since the dissolution of the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee (GTAC) last winter. The group plans to meet quarterly and has been working to identify some potential forum topics. Kim circulated the results from a recent survey. Top-scoring subjects were: funding strategies/advocacy, the role of non-profits, natural area acquisition and restoration, promoting a "parks message" in the region, and joint projects.

Items from Metro Council/MPAC/JPACT

Heather Kent announced that the Metro Council voted unanimously to approve the \$1.50-per-ton excise tax funding for regional parks. The funds will be used to maintain the 8,000 acres of open space Metro has acquired, as well as Metro's existing regional parks. Funds also will be used to convert four open spaces into parks – Mt. Talbert, Cooper Mountain, Graham Oaks Natural Area (Wilsonville Tract) and Willamette Cove.

Jim Zehren announced that he was invited to come to a Metro Policy Advisory Committee -- PAC) meeting to talk about GPAC. He said that he planned to wait until sometime after the retreat when GPAC has a clearer vision and purpose to share.

Jim Zehren also announced that he was approached by some people who are interested in the potential connections between the farmers' markets and regional centers. MPAC has a new committee focusing on how to make the centers work. There seems to be a growing interest in developing and promoting urban open spaces in addition to greenspaces in the region.

Reading assignments

Three documents were provided to GPAC members for their review – Metro's "Future Vision" document that was referenced in Ethan Seltzer's presentation, Title 11 of Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and the MPAC Parks Subcommittee Report.

Implementation of Chapter Three of the Regional Framework Plan

Heather Nelson Kent presented a review of the work that has been done to date to implement Chapter 3 of the Regional Framework Plan. A detailed handout was provided; a copy is on file and available upon request.

GTAC report on the Regional System

Heather Nelson Kent presented GTAC's report on the regional system, a document called "What does it mean to be in the Regional Greenspaces System?". The document, developed by GTAC in January 2002, details three levels of participation for public and non-profit landowners of properties in the regional system. The three scenarios range from the most basic, where no regional funding is assumed, to the more involved, where some greater share of regional funding is available to support organizations and agencies that sign on as "cooperators". Heather also explained that this part of GTAC's work on the regional system was not completed or adopted.

Approval of minutes for the April GPAC meeting

The meetings from the April GPAC meeting were unanimously approved with no changes. (Don Trotter, Doug Neeley and Jim Zehren abstained because they were each absent for part or all of the April meeting.)

Adoption of GPAC By-Laws

Doug Neeley made a motion to adopt the pending GPAC By-Laws with the one change to the beginning of Article IV, Section 3 (version three of the text from Jim Zehren's e-mail dated 5/24/04). Kim Gilmer seconded the motion. Committee members voted to adopt the by-laws (nine in favor, none in opposition, no abstentions).

Committee vision discussion, facilitated by Holly Pruett

Holly Pruett, who will facilitate GPAC's vision retreat on June 24 and 25, explained that the purpose of the evening's discussion was to arrive at a common sense of the purpose for the retreat.

People discussed with their neighbors why they felt the vision work was needed and then shared some highlights with the group.

Why is a vision needed?

- Who do we serve?
- Scope of our work?
- Where will it lead/outcomes/accomplishments?
- Unleash creativity
- Create ownership of the direction the committee takes
- Bring legacy of past documents to life
- Identify intended products/deliverables
- Is it a vision for the committee or a vision for the region?
- Foundation for action plan
- Function and purpose of ??
- How to advance 2040 for the next 20 years through policy
- Paradigm shift – natural area approach, broader spectrum?

What questions should the vision answer? What conflicts should it resolve?

- Scope
- Outcome
- What does it encompass (just natural areas and nature-based recreation or other public spaces and types of recreation?)
- Past versus creative future
- What does it mean to be part of the system?
- How to extend the dialogue
- "What" versus "how"
- Interconnectedness of greenspaces
- Timeframe
- Include recreation needs and spaces?

Who's points of view need to be included? What data is needed?

- Models from other jurisdictions
- Past planning products/policies
- Current experience of implementations on the ground (rather than just reviewing policies and documents)

Esther Lev and Mike Ragsdale suggested that all the GPAC members should make an effort to talk to the people they know and work with about GPAC in an effort to get some input from the larger communities the members represent.

Heather Nelson Kent will provide GPAC members with the summaries of interviews Metro conducted with local elected officials and park directors in 2000 and 2002 about the bond measure and Metro's role in regional parks and greenspaces.

Pitfalls of past visioning process

- tangents
- getting too into the implementation
- time management

Adjective that you hope will describe the finished vision and visioning process

- audacious
- inspiring
- forward-looking
- practical and doable
- creative
- exemplary
- startling ("I'll be damned!")
- fun

The retreat subcommittee will meet via conference call to finalize the retreat agenda and discuss the best way to get the input of members who cannot attend. Details will be given to the rest of the committee as soon as they are available.

Note

Committee members were given three-ring binders at the meeting to help organize committee materials. Jim Zehren requested that Metro staff provide a list of documents that have been sent or given to GPAC members to date, so that members can make sure their materials are complete.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.