

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Jim Zehren, Chair



MEETING NOTES

Thursday, July 22, 2004
5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 501
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Committee members present: Chair Jim Zehren, Faun Hosey, Esther Lev, Doug Neeley, Don Trotter, Zari Santner, Kim Gilmer, Dick Schouten, John Griffiths (by phone)

Committee members absent: Ernie Drapela, Steve Greagor, Mike Houck, Mike Ragsdale

Metro staff present: Jim Desmond, Lia Waiwaiole, Cary Stacey

Guests: Jill Zanger

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

Jill Zanger, a nominee to fill one of the committee vacancies, was introduced to the group. David Bragdon has appointed Jill to be a citizen representative to GPAC. Jill's appointment, along with one other will go to the Metro Council for confirmation.

Kim Gilmer gave an update on the progress of the Metropolitan Area Parks and Greenspaces Group. The group has begun work on developing and promoting a parks message in the region and plan to find a joint project to support that message. The group also plans to work on improving the coordination and integration of Goal 5 implementation and parks and greenspaces planning. The group also hopes to be in a position to support a future parks and open spaces bond measure.

Items from Metro Council/MPAC/JPACT

Doug Neeley wanted the committee to be aware of a discussion at the July 14 MPAC meeting about not using system development charges to protect Goal 5 resources. The following is an excerpt from the MPAC minutes (full version available upon request):

TUALATIN BASIN FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM

Brent Curtis gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Tualatin Basin Fish & Wildlife Program. Those slides are attached and form part of the record.

Doug Neeley asked if every jurisdiction was required to do the job.

Brent Curtis said that eventually everyone in the region would participate. If Metro made it part of their functional plan then each one of the local governments that was a member of the coordinating committee had said that they would take it to their local elected officials as ordinances to implement the program. Each one of those governments would then make a decision about whether they would implement the program in whole or substantial part.

Doug Neeley said that during the presentation Mr. Curtis had said something about not utilizing the System Development Charge (SDC) for Goal 5 resources, and he wanted to know if that would include park SDC or would they look at it in a different way by each jurisdiction.

Brent Curtis said a park was a park and not a Goal 5 natural resource. If a park had a Goal 5 resource but was chiefly a park they could then charge SDC.

Doug Neeley said that SDC could be used for purchasing new land for parks. Therefore, could an SDC for parks, or the procurement of open spaces, be included in the program?

Brent Curtis said it would have secondary or ancillary benefits as Goal 5 resources, and that was probably legal, but if the chief reason he wanted to use a park SDC was to buy and reserve natural resources that weren't for parks, that was a dubious legal proposition.

Vision and work plan discussion

The committee engaged in a thorough discussion of two drafts of the GPAC vision statement, one submitted by Jim Zehren and a revised version by Dick Schouten. The committee did a good deal of fine-tuning and wordsmithing, which will be reflected in the next draft of the vision statement. The following substantial issues were also discussed:

- **Inclusion of "recreational facilities" in the scope of the vision.** The committee decided that they did want to include this concept in the scope of the vision but decided to use the phrase "recreational opportunities" instead.
- **Use of the phrase "regional system."** The committee felt that use of the phrase "regional system" was potentially misleading – that people might assume that it means either a Metro system or a system made up of only regional scale facilities. It was suggested and agreed that the vision should use words like "region-wide" or "full-

spectrum" instead to connote a multi-jurisdictional and multi-level system and avoid confusion.

- **Simplify and shorten.** In general, the committee felt that the vision statement should be shorter and more concise. In several places, items that felt redundant were eliminated or consolidated.
- **The "how" section.** There was consensus that the last section of the vision statement should be a short, powerful description of how GPAC would approach the implementation of the vision – what it will take to make the system strong and sustainable. The group agreed that this should include the following:
 1. creating the ethic and culture that identifies the system as essential
 2. facilitating grassroots participation and support
 3. developing regional cooperation and partnerships
 4. establishing the tools (policies and funding) that will make the system work

It was agreed that Metro staff would write a new draft of the vision statement based on the committee's comments and circulate it for discussion and consideration before the next meeting. Metro staff will also draft a work plan to be discussed at the August meeting.

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