GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
INSTITUTIONS NETWORK TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 25, 2005
5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

Present: Zari Santner, Jim Desmond, Chris Carlson, Tim Woods, Jayne Cronlund,
    Sue Marshall, David Yamashita, Ernie Drapela, Kelly Punteney,
    Mike Ragsdale, Sandy Jamison

Absent: Charlie Hales, Charlie Cameron, John Griffiths, Scott Burgess

GPAC BACKGROUND INFO
About a year and half ago, David Bragdon, Metro Council President, formed a committee
fashioned after the Metro Policies Advisory Committee (MPAC) to advise the Metro
Council on issues related to parks and recreation, open spaces, and trails. The charge
of this committee was:
-   to develop a vision (what the entire services of parks and recreation, trails, and
    green spaces would consist of for the region)
-   to work towards implementation of the vision

The committee has come up with a draft vision statement (an outcome). In order to get
to implementation of that statement, the chair of GPAC and Jim Desmond agreed that
there needed to be subcommittees (small groups with people from outside not GPAC
members) to develop a road map for implementation in four specific areas: (1) System,
(2) Funding, (3) Communication to Public, and (4) Institution Network.

TASK FORCES
System Task Force – This group will further describe the physical system and its
components, and outline short and long-term strategies for its establishment and growth
over time.

Funding Task Force – This group will review new and existing funding sources and
propose ways of combining them more effectively to fund the acquisition, operation and
management of the regional system in perpetuity.

Message Task Force – This group will help frame message(s) that describe the civic
wealth that parks and open space provide to all residents of the region, and outline tools
and strategies for reaching multiple audiences. The work will eventually lead to the
crafting of message(s), or the 'buzz', that builds community support for the vision and
system.

Institution Network Task Force - This group will focus on how to build more effective
partnerships and leadership among existing institutions and organizations, clarify roles,
encourage new partners and propose more efficient or new mechanisms to develop,
support and implement the system in perpetuity.

GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
INSTITUTIONS NETWORK TASK FORCE

The Task Force committees are asked to report back to the overall committee the steps that are necessary to get to complete the work plan in the area that they have been designated to look at.

INSTITUTIONS NETWORK TASK FORCE
The charge to this committee is to go as far as you can to talk about specific items but to come back with a report to GPAC on the committee's recommendations of the steps that are necessary to accomplish the objectives that have been handed to this committee. Example: the committee identified some research that needs to be done and the source of the research funding would be this or that; identified steps where other jurisdictions other than Metro would be involved and the steps and the timeline for these items would be so on.

This is not a committee that is being asked to implement anything at the moment. It is to develop clear guidelines on what should be implemented.

DISCUSSION
Zari: There is a lot of interest in looking at all of the institutions in the region that do this business and see whether there are any redundancies; whether there are gaps in institutions or partners; if there is unevenness. First take a look at that and then identify if you have a system. Then take a look and see if the system you're envisioning could have another way of providing these services. Can we come up with another approach? Come up with pros and cons. What we have right now – what works and what doesn't work. In order to make it work better what are the things that we need to have.

Chris: It is important to note that in the vision statement there are some values that I think are fairly clear. In certain words such as: "multi-jurisdictional interconnectedness" which applies to relationships between parks providers. There is an underlying interest in collaboration and multi-jurisdictional cooperation. There is another one that talks about stewardship, education advocacy – so there is also a real underlying interest in many players performing many different roles. It's not really that this group is starting from scratch. There are some presumptions about the kind of institutions or relationships that are?????.

Are we going to know what the other committees come up with? Yes, Chris will report back on the other committees.

Chris: When GPAC tried to break out the vision. There were some underlying themes throughout all of the committees work and clearly one of them was to get a better handle on what the system really is from neighborhoods all the way up to regional/landscapes. The other was clearly an issue about money. There isn't any. Are there new ways of pooling resources or capitalizing on sources of money that haven't been thought of in addition to solving this really chronic serious issue of operation. We need to figure out a mutual strategy on how to get there. Clearly the institutional relationship and whether it's working or not is a

new model that could be explored. The notion of message. The bond clearly coming up will have a message but there is a larger concept about how you talk about parks and open space to various audiences. Have those audiences been captured are they new audiences that have never been tapped. Is there a larger overarching message about parks and open space that would appeal to everyone in the region in a way that makes everyone feel that they're part of the process. So the groups were organized knowing full well that there would be overlap but it's so complicated and big that they had to start somewhere. So this is where they started and we'll see where we go between now and June.

Zari: Do we think today's system of providing service is the best system? First we need to evaluate what we have now. What are the tasks the committee needs to use to find out what exactly what exists and how they work?

Jim D: He cited an example to think about: We have 20+ parks depts., they vary tremendously in size and capacity. Portland parks and Tualatin Hills are on one end of the spectrum – both being very large, very sophisticated, highly capable highly skilled, well-funded agencies. Then on the other end of the spectrum you have parks departments that literally consist of one person who is also responsible for the library and the cemetery – Oregon City would be an example of that. In 1995, Metro went out with the large bond measure that was very oppositional and at that time Metro had only been in the parks business for a year when Multnomah County put Metro in the operating business. There was some concern at that point about Metro owning and operating land in other people's jurisdictions. So, the last bond measure stated that any land that Metro bought they had to first give the local government the right of first refusal on management. It was expected that most of the land that Metro bought would be managed by someone else. Then Measure 47 passed, Measure 5 started kicking in and parks providers could barely take care of what they had. To make a long story short, we now bought 8200 acres of land and roughly 7200 of that is being managed by Metro. Metro was willing to let other people take the land and manage it but we never offered to pay anybody to do it. We now have developed tremendous expertise on natural area management. Our staff is very geared and focused on natural area management. Some of these other parks call and Metro shares expertise but there's never been any money shared. There has never been any discussion about this. We've never loaned staff to each other. In trying to think of all the ways that jurisdictions might collaborate or help each other solve the operation burdens that we all have by utilizing our existing resources and cross the turf or jurisdictional lines that we never even thought about. Much less the private sector and we keep going down that discussion about being more creative and more entrepreneurial but even within ourselves we have even started.

He pointed out a hand-out from fashioned from a model in Minneapolis. Metro put together a map that showed all the parks in the region and specified hiking, camping, picnicking, swimming, boating, etc. The maps show the distribution of where parks are and how many parks providers there are. Washington county does not have too many. There is no shared much of anything going on on that map today. In Minneapolis, they had separate parks providers but they had

common funding sources and they distributed money centrally per capitol on a very large basis and somewhat more modestly for operations but they had shared operations as well.

Ernie: Reviewed the vision statement and came up with some observations:

1) Political boundaries are a hindrance to comprehensive regional planning
2) Political boundaries are essential to the implementation, funding, and operations of our asset management collectively.

It is how we can communicate these issues amongst ourselves because the services and providers are so uneven.

As we look at what other players bring to the table, it will cross over to the other committees.

Things that are uniform to all providers and is a constraint and an incentive are:
1)   Scorp
2)   Programs (funding sources, may not be in apposition to put together a good request or have the match to make it happen)
3)   Find a remedy for this?

Zari: Agrees with Ernie but how do we show that to the public? What do we need to do that demonstrates that the political boundaries are an obstacle to a region-wide uniform delivery of this kind of service?

David: First steps would be to really flesh out what the issue is and if we did nothing would that be okay. Maybe it is maybe it isn't. Really identify what the issue is. Is it lack of coordination . . . unevenness of service delivery.

Zari: By identifying what services different providers provide, she was hoping this would demonstrate the unevenness.

David: Categorize the unevenness in different areas: Basic services (playgrounds) and at the other end inconsistent management of natural resources. Identifying those areas, that's another step.

The other thing is people don't have a handle on the demand for our parks. Collaborating on what's out there and what's coming at us.

Tim: How is the vision going to be adopted or accepted by the various jurisdictions? Example: We expect Tualatin Hills to jump on board but not City of Sherwood. We talk about unevenness in delivery of services what is that conclusion based on and to whose standard is that measured? Sherwood might be r4eal happy with one swingset and a ballfield. But we're not . . we might feel they need to have more.

JD: Pointed out that the Vision statement has not even been adopted by Metro Council yet. We need to get a buy in by Metro and then can start moving forward. There are various representatives on MPAC and they will get a presentation of the vision.

Zari: First we have to make sure everyone buys off on the vision. Right now what we are doing is trying to identify the work that needs to be done assuming that the visions is adopted and supported.

Jayne: In thinking of collaboration models, she thinks of case studies. Places where I've been where collaboration has worked effectively. This could be the next step: What are some case studies of how collaboration has worked in the past? (She thinks about them on two scales: a small geographic watershed based scale – West Eugene Wetlands (doesn't necessarily span an entire region but does address one particular area and has 12 different park providers, non-profits, and agencies who are all contributing and developed good niches. And then the Chicago Wilderness model scale which is more of a landscape scale and a broader coalition. That would be an important piece. Also keep in mind the Parks Forum group – which is an effort to provide a broader coalition that any non-profit, any agency, any business, any individual can be a participant in. It provides info about GPAC, provides feedback, networking, informal sharing that has actually adopted the Vision statement.

Zari: What I am hearing is: 1) we agree that we need to come up with steps that truly give us concrete information.   Where are we right now in terms of issues, in terms of providers? And the other is: What are the models out there that are working well that we could learn from?

Chris: It also sounds like there are key issues within all the parks providers at different scales. We ought to identify those. Because there also has to be some opportunity and maybe those we can identify in a similar scale. It sounds like there is this need for concrete information and there is also a need to capitalize on what's working and what isn't and how do we go about solving those.

Jayne: I would not limit it to agencies/jurisdictions/non-profits.

Zari: Any industry that has a role in providing service – that includes all of us.

David: (Looking at the Vision statement) I see the word "recreation opportunities" it depends how we want to define recreation. When Metro did it's first 1990 inventory, they did both parks and recreation and all of a sudden they were inventorying bowling alleys and it got enormous. So in terms of project scope, it's either manageable or we limit it. Something to be aware of because that's a whole different area. We typically think of parks from the physical aspect to define but then we've got to deal with the recreation side. How do we deal with that?

Zari: Remember David, that's the job of the Systems Task Force.

JD: The word "recreation" was obviously intentionally chosen because a lot of discussion about this at the committee and they made a very clear and intentional decision to be more broad. The committee has also been very clear from the beginning that they did not want to be burdened by wording from the past. They

wanted to progress forward with get to the next level of sophistication. Don't want to be limited to merely the natural area side of the spectrum wanted to be as broad as possible.

Kelly: Pleased with the Vision Statement. Is still not clear on the division of the task forces because they are really inter-connected. However, if in fact we state Portland-Vancouver in the vision statement, then the message has to be taken to Vancouver and have them embrace that with us. Not Kelly being the only one talking to them. He takes that message back but it can't be broadly spread from just him to all of Vancouver.

A lot of our issue is about money and who pays for things. Cited examples of some sharing of resources: 1) this past weekend Vancouver hosted the Discovery Walk Festival (international festival) the only one in this country of 23 countries around the world. Three days of walking and yesterday a part of that walk came to Portland. They had decided that the region would be willing to do this. He spoke about people staying in Portland hotels, volunteers were from Portland, revenue was brought in for the region – not just Vancouver. 2) Friends of Trees, another example, from Portland (non-profit) and Vancouver is paying to have them come plant trees. 3) National Park Service has tied Ft Vancouver with John McGloughlin house in Oregon City would love a bicycle connection between the two 4) Would love to do a local state park for Lewis and Clark. There are many projects just waiting in the wings for joint funding/collaboration to get it done.

Zari: So this ties back to what Ernie said that the political boundaries could be a hindrance in getting these projects done.

Ernie: We are only going to be as strong as our weakest provider. So we need to bring the base of the operation up in whatever fashion whether it is through collaboration, through encouragement, through enlightenment- whatever means can be achieved. And then as a way to sort of analyze all our players. There is an old strategic model – SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities (what are the opportunities for them/for us), and Threats (obstacles/ why aren't they active players). It seems like we can learn something from these players by looking at these attributes. Seems some of the issues are agencies "turfs" and funding. Perhaps some other mechanism should be designed to do this: Park District. Then we could accomplish something comparable to Tualatin Hills.

Zari: This is very very critical. The City of Portland is the biggest parks provider in the region and we have our own financial struggles. Struggling with how do we continue providing the services that the public expects from us? By ourselves singularly we cannot accomplish what we want so let's bring our forces together. This is the perfect timing for this study to be done. We've got the vision for all of these organizations that are doing part of it. Let's find out where they're successful and where they're weak; what they need to have in order to be successful and what is the best model for the region as a whole. I would even look into the opportunity to see if it would make sense for the City of Portland Parks to be part of a district? Just because we've been part of the city government doesn't mean we

have to stay like that forever. If this model for the region demonstrates that having maybe three or four parks districts is the best way to provide the service. I'm more than happy to consider that or a combination of. This is the perfect timing because we know there are smaller providers that know they cannot provide the services.

Sue: Have we identified or defined who the institutions are that this is a network of? (Referring to hand-out Surveyof Park Providers in the Metro Region, Sept. 2004)

Zari: From this discussion, I can conclude that first we need:

Task 1: Complete list of all institutions, providers, including privately owned (non-profits)
Task 2: SWOT analysis
Task 3: Workable models
Task 4: What are the existing working relationships? (leveraging resources, collaboration, match money for grants)
Task 5: Come up with a set of assumptions

Tim: Need to identify our assumptions. A common assumption is that there is not enough operations and maintenance money. Another, that some jurisdictions do not have enough naturalist expertise.

THINGS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT
There needs to be some accounting of accountability
Small jurisdictions will accept guidelines to bring their standards up
Have to look at other jurisdictions programming, education, and maintenance

THINGS TO CONSIDER
After we do the research, what are the steps that need to be done/
What are the very key issues? Or the product that we will produce?
We need to identify all the steps for a scope of work that will go forward to Metro and the community.

FUTURE PLANS
Meetings: Monday nights, May 2, May 9 5:30-7:30 p.m.

AGENDA:

Identify the assumptions (come to the meeting with your assumptions written down)
What makes a good model?
Review last meetings notes
What are the components of this scope of work?