

GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
INSTITUTIONS NETWORK TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, May 4, 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 Puntenev,
Mike Ragsdale, Sandy Jamison, Scott Burgess, John Griffiths, Mary Swanson

Absent: Charlie Hales, Charlie Cameron

Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

It is official! We are changing our meetings from Monday to Wednesday evenings. We'll meet in the same location (City of Portland, Parks Conference Room, 1120 SW 5th Ave, 13th Floor) and at the same time 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 p.m.

VISION STATEMENT

Zari posed a question to non-GPAC members (Jayne, Sue, Tim) asking what was their feeling about the Vision statement and do they support it? The consensus was that the statement could be fine-tuned a bit but overall it's supported by all.

Are there any disagreements with the Vision statement? The point was brought up that if the Vision includes Vancouver, Washington then we need to have more contact with officials in Vancouver other than with Kelly Puntenev to get them involved and on board. Jim Desmond feels that should be taken care of by elected staff.

DISCUSSION

Are we making assumptions or is it just a matter of process. In other words, are agencies at different levels of process but will end up at the same place eventually?

One assumption is: A higher and more level standard of service should be available that is not dependent on the zip code.

The regional system is the sum of the parts. How can we work better/smarter, avoid duplication of efforts, and offer a better product?

The unevenness of agencies prevents us from achieving Goal #4 in the Vision statement.

Goal Objective #2 (Vision Statement): There is not enough knowledge by agencies of the benefits of utilizing non-profit agencies. This creates an obstacle.

Goal Objective #2 (Vision Statement):

Land Trusts: 1) Toolset – restoration/acquisition (understanding)

GREENSPACES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

INSTITUTIONS NETWORK TASK FORCE

- 2) Grant Sources (obstacles, need private/public funds, funds that are dependable year after year – most are not.)

We need to come up with an approach for looking at different areas for evenness. Areas such as: planning, programming, design, natural resource management, etc. Need a consistent set of guidelines – this could save agencies money. Example: The City of Gresham is constructing a bioswale. They could contact the City of Portland to get their most recent bioswale plan or contract with them to do the work because the City of Portland just finished constructing a bioswale. Gresham could get a ready-made plan, expertise, and save money in the long run because they have had to totally recreate the wheel . . . or in this case the bioswale.

There should be a clearinghouse function for expertise.

It might be useful to poll jurisdictions and staff and see just where the gaps are.

To aid in collaboration, you should ask the public first “What do you want?”. Then ask the jurisdiction. Somewhere in the middle you will get your answer. Ask the public what are they willing to pay for? Example: To send an employee to a conference to gain expertise or to obtain help from another jurisdiction that has expertise.

Discussed collaborating and sharing expertise. If we wrap around collaborating, we are enabling the Vision Statement objectives.

WORK PLAN

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

Task 6: Talk about resource sharing. (This would accomplish the objectives in the Vision Statement and save jurisdictions money.)

Task 7: Local forums should be brought back.

- Other task force items could be addressed at these forums.
- Survey the public and employees regarding “What do you need?”
- Provide adequate outreach

Task 8: Survey the public

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

- Incentives for cooperation
- What disincentive keeps you from participating?