

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Mike Ragsdale, Chair



MEETING NOTES

Thursday, March 24, 2005
5:30 to 8:00 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 501
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Committee members present: Chair Mike Ragsdale, Betty Atteberry, Scott Burgess, Ernie Drapela, Gary Evans (representing Kim Gilmer), Steve Greagor, John Griffiths, *Faun Hosey*, Mike Houck, Esther Lev, Zari Santner, Dick Schouten, Don Trotter, Jim Zehren

Committee members absent: Jill Zanger

Metro staff and elected officials present: David Bragdon, Chris Carlson, Jim Desmond, Heather Nelson Kent, Lia Waiwaiole

Guests:

Convene

The meeting was called to order by Mike Ragsdale at 5:30 p.m.

Committee members and guests introduced themselves and welcomed new members Scott Burgess and Betty Atteberry.

Mike Houck moved and committee unanimously approved the vision document . . .

Mike Houck: can we give the draft to the parks forum

also council could "accept" the report . . . formal and on the record

Zehren – we had talked about doing a check-in with the council . . .

Task forces

Mike Ragsdale explained that he and Chris both saw the seven objectives falling into four categories that would work well to organize task forces around.

Houck: i know there is angst on any committee about how long things take. I don't share that angst . . . I think it's natural. The bond obviously has some necessary urgency time-wise but for some of the tasks on the list, 90 days seems aggressive.

Ragsdale: to clarify, I do not intend for the task forces to do this work, but to outline the work and come back with a work plan and clear recommendations about how to proceed.

Houck: other comment, parks forum actually created three work groups: funding, messaging and the bond. I'm pleased that these are somewhat in alignment with those. I hope that we will be working closely with them, as experts.

Ragsdale: back to the subject matter. for the funding committee . . . what do we need to do to get all of the funding strategies identified.

Burgess: until you know what the system is, you might leave out a funding source.

Esther Lev: what we're doing is really a 10-year outlook

MR: there will be overlaps, but each group will look at things from a particular perspective

David:

In our strategic planning, we emphasized natural resources as a priority for all seven of us, but we also emphasized doing it in a different way. We are really looking at dismantling some of the barriers that have existed between the departments. We want to look at the work we are doing related to natural resources in a new way. We are looking at the whole agency and all of its related work.

We also have been devoting significant resources to Goal 5 in the planning department and the data resources center . . . we want to leverage that . . .

At the zoo . . . the emphasis is not africa and far away places, but the northwest, also about conservation

natural gardening

resevoirs of expertise and money in our organization

how do we pool that and bring it together under the heading of Nature in Neighborhoods

we will have a big need to message

we are trying to develop the system

biodiversity plan, work like that

we think we've been successful in playing a role with funding, with the 1995 measure, we can definitely present a message about building on our success, 10 year anniversary

we expressed our intent to go to pursue a bond measure in the context of goal 5. the fact that the intent to do that was in a goal 5 resolution in no way shortchanges the other values and functions of a bond measure . . . there's a lot of overlap

1. we have a lot of work to do to define the emphasis of the bond, especially in relation to recreation, relative to natural resources (pristine, no-touch)
2. in terms of the acquisition aspect of the program, we focused on target areas in the bond measure . . . the council recognizes that that method works . . . that being specific about what you are going to get is effective . . . but we are not committed to go right back to those target areas . . . that question is still on the table
3. there was a significant local share portion in the last bond measure, and we feel that was successful and want to do it again. we'll be looking to our partners to help define the scope, etc. should there be a challenge grant? we also recognize that there are other partners that are doing work in this realm that are not quote park providers but could also be partners (water-related, etc.)

we also want to look at non-acquisition captial improvements and restoration projects which could be eligible in a property tax measure

the role of the non-profit sector is another question

the role of trails . . . we see it as very popular and very regional . . .

these are the major questions that we would pose to groups like GPAC's related task force and in other public outreach

we are also going to be working to determine the appropriate roles of different agencies . . . for example, Metro is managing "regional parks" that are primarily in east Multnomah County, meanwhile there are municipalities managing what really regional parks (like forest park)

clackamette park example . . . erasing the boundaries . . . apply the transportation model or thinking . . . metro doesn't own a single inch of the regional transportation system, but is the keeper

is operating our strength? i think we do have strenghts in the arena of education and restoration, but i don't know if operation is our strength . . . especially given that other people are doing it already

we can't have a ballot measure to just buy more stuff without having a better conversation about who is going to take care of it. i hope that gpac will help answer that question as well.

it's going to have to be about what's best for the region. we will have to put our institutional egos aside and

everyone i've run this by is really excited about the work you are doing and

we'd like for chris and mike to come to the april

JZ: it's so great to have such a high level of interest from the council

how do we get that message out about it not just being about goal 5 . . . a lot of confusion about that out there

you've talked about target areas . . . seems like that makes sense if you know you are going to site something big . . . but if we decide to do something else . . .

db: target areas might not just be geographic, they could be thematic or functional as well

jd: fanno as an example; what the target areas do is give you specificity when you are talking to taxpayers

JZ: dots on the map make sense, but i was reacting to

houck: i am assuming that the jury is totally out as far as the council is concerned and that you are waiting to get some feedback on these questions

DB: the councilors have opinions, but there are no forgone conclusions

need a "please sign in" sign at the front

houck: when do we have our impact, when do we weigh in

bragdon: we won't make formal decisions until fall

burgess: sometimes the target areas can get you into trouble where you don't have flexibility . . . also have a question about how the functional plan for habitat protection fit into this . . .

jd: announcement . . . we are going to spend the day tomorrow with state parks guy to look at open spaces in the context of looking for a possible state park . . . more people are looking at these silos and relationships and thinking outside the box.

zs: i'm very encouraged to hear that you're thinking about regional stuff . . . could we accomplish that objective?

db: i don't think we can get operating money but yes i think we can

zs: if there's a local share, would the general pot be used, would metro own them?

db: again with the core competencies . . .

zs: our hope is that before we have formalized

db: let me say too on the division of roles, we're funding some things off the excise tax to the tune of 2 million, if it could be paid for another way, we could shift the excise tax into the naturalists for the education program and have three more naturalists doing programs all over the region

capital investments has to be

jz: what happened to the "big look", 2050
do you see connections with "centers"

mh: every presentation at the get centered event talked about parks

mh: i was really pleased to hear you acknowledge that on your staff you have the resources that you have on your staff because you have some of the best ecological experts in the nation;

db: we should consture the system as things other than what metro owns and that we should do more of some things and less of others

mh: there has been a dramatic shift in park providers interest in natural resources . . . there needs to continue to be an agency who's primary focus is natural resources to balance out the system; while portland has come a long way, they have a much broader function in the community and there should be an entity that is focused;

el: years ago we took on a lot of properties because different providers didn't have the capacity; you can do this gracefully and in a way that honors; everyone from different corners is coming to this vision; it's a great way ; more people involved less scary

staffing for the task forces . . .

db: we will be looking around the agency for people to help staff these task forces they way they should be staffed; also around the region;

jz: check in process is necessary; i would love to see this go to mpac;

list of people who should see the vision document:

mpac

parks forum

zs: we should talk to the staff who works for people on mpac also

mh: i'd like us to interact with the council, maybe in a work session or something

task forces

mr: i would like us to decide which task forces we'd like to serve on and take some responsibility for recruiting some people to work with us on these task forces; chris neamtzu and a person from a marketing firm were both thrilled at the possibility of being invovled

we will carefully define the charge of the task forces; they will not make decisions for the committee; chris and i will develop something like a scope of work for you to send to people; we think about the task forces and think about the best possible people to serve

also want to agree on a task force schedule; some will need more time than others; remember that we are not trying to do the work, we are trying to define the work;

sb: in terms of the folks you want to add to the task forces, how will we offer them long-term involvement; we might generate a lot of interest and that we don't want to just cut them loose before we actually develop the project;

mr: there will be definitely more opportunities for them to be involved. but i know that we will run across people who will be very zealous.

jz: is it more the merrier? or discrete?

mr: my view is that we appoint people, it shouldn't be totally open, we can have discussion about this, but it was my intention that it would be designated.

zs: as you mentioned there are two stages, defining the work and then doing the work; it seems to me that we want a few very expert people defining the work and then when we get to the work we will need our cast of thousands

dt: what is the timing

cc: it was the thought that by the may meeting, we would have enough work done that we could exchange information among the task forces and gpac could meet

	system	funding	message	institutional
chair	Esther	Dick	Betty	Zari and John
members	Esther Lev Kim Gilmer Jim Zehren	Dick Schouten	Mike Houck Faun Hosey Steve Greagor Betty	Zari Santner Scott Burgess John Griffiths Don Trotter Ernie Drapela
recruits	Dean Apostle (EL) David Aushman (EL) Bob Sallinger (EL) John Cristy (EL) Robin Grimwade (ZS) Deb Lev (ZS) Kendra Smith (EL) Clackamas County (Mary Swanson) (JD) Mary Wahl (EL, JD) Magne Burnhart (MR) Mel Huie	Dick Feeny (ZS) Carter Macnichol (MR) Tom Brian (DS) Congressional staffers (MR) Tim Raphael (DS) Jim Middaugh (JD) Dan James (MR) Jayne Cronlund (MH) Dee Craig (MH)	Joe Cortright (BA) Patricia McCaig (JD) Lane Marketing (MR) Rob Courtney (MH) Liz Kaufman (JD) Jack/Jan McGowan (FH) A/PR firms - W&K, Cappeli Gary Conklin (DT) Walt Peck (BA) Donna Matrazzo (MH) Charles Jordan Jerry Tippens Kim Stafford (MH) Bill Bulick (MH) Stephanie Mendoza-Gray (ZS)	Ethan Seltzer (MR) Bill Gaffy (DS) Charlie Cambron (JG) Kelly Puntney (ED) Paul Hennon Charlie Hales (ZS) Paul Koch (MR) Stephanie Mendoza-Gray (ZS)