

Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee

Mike Ragsdale, Chair



MEETING NOTES

Thursday, July 28
5:30 to 8:00 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 501
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland

Committee members present: Chair Mike Ragsdale, Scott Burgess, Ernie Drapela, John Griffiths, Mike Houck, Esther Lev, Zari Santner, Dick Schouten, Don Trotter and Jim Zehren.

Committee members absent: Betty Atteberry, Kim Gilmer, Steve Greagor, Faun Hosey and Sue Marshall.

Elected officials, staff and guests present: Metro Council President David Bragdon, Steve Durrant, Patricia McCaig, Kelly Puntaney, Jim Sjulín, Mary Swanson, Chris Carlson, Jim Desmond, Jeff Tucker, Lia Waiwaióle and Heather Nelson Kent.

GPAC committee members and other community experts had worked in task forces since March to develop work plans for issues related to Vision funding, institutional relationships, the system and Vision messages. The July meeting was the first reconvening of the full committee and the first time that members had a chance to hear the respective scopes of work from each chair. It was estimated that about 365 hours had been expended by task force members in developing the work plans.

GPAC TASK FORCE PRESENTATION SUMMARIES

Institutional Relationships Task Force (Zari Santner)

Zari presented the tasks laid out in the scope that would culminate in a regional park forum focused on involving all jurisdictions and interests in a frank identification of effective partnering on park and open space issues. The scope would run through Fall of 2006, with an action plan initiated thereafter. Key issues raised by the task force included 1) understanding their charge, 2) concern over a 'Metro' rather than a true 'regional' agenda, 3) active participation by local park provider staff, even in the face of understaffed interests, 4) the need to engage Clark County and other agencies with responsibility for the Vision (e.g. BES, CWS, etc.) and 5) parity of level of service among communities.

Comments about the work plan included:

- Distinction between collaboration, cooperation and coordination

- Need to make a concerted effort to reach out to Vancouver and to engage its policy makers.
- Desire for this effort to look at some very different visions, radically different models than status quo.
- The whole issue of resources and staff is a big issue and no less so for NGOs. The real key is going to be what's the value added, needs to be a pay back.
- Issue of parity focuses on level of service and should be decided by the local community.
- We make assumptions about the likely relationships. The best thing would be to force us to think about all the people who should be at the table.
- This scope could also be used to bring the public along.

Message Task Force (Betty Atteberry)

Chris Carlson presented the group's work plan which focused on developing a communication strategy for the Vision while simultaneously building a constituency for its implementation. The work plan included results of exercises the group went through to identify various audiences and their values, regional themes and groups and outcomes from the Vision message(s).

Comments about this scope included:

- The work plan is more about advocacy and grassroots support than helping us articulate the Vision's message(s). What messages do we come up with?
- We need audience groupings so we can pare the message to them.
- Environmental groups should be added to the audience table.
- Isn't it GPAC that develops the message rather than GPAC asking people what they want?

System Task Force (Esther Lev)

Esther explained the group's struggle with how to manage the scale of the Vision. The group looked at and discussed several models for identifying the system, but was unsuccessful at identifying one that would work for the continuum of places and activities identified in the GPAC Vision. In the end, the group identified four pieces, each of which requires a scope of work:

1. Biodiversity as a baseline plan from Mt. Hood to the Coast (stewardship of assets)
2. Trails (self-recreating places)
3. Structured recreation
4. Spatial and geographic context to help identify what green infrastructures are needed for the region as it grows (places for the future)

The scope presented on the 28th was the biodiversity scope. Esther commented that the group went over the same ground that GPAC went over in its first six months. She also said that more people were needed at the table to come up with the right stuff. The group did not get to it all completely. She suggested everyone read the memo attached to the scope.

Comments about the systems work included:

- Need for the "Public realm" to be included – this scope is too limited.
- We have spent four meetings on 1 & 2 (stewardship of assets and self-recreating places).
- The Vision has great foresight but little definition.
- We are talking about the GPAC charge in this Vision. We need to use constraint.

Funding task force (Dick Schouten)

Dick Schouten summarized the Funding Task Force's work by presenting an additional memo outlining its task and areas of emphasis (see attached). The group identified current funding sources and how they are used, identified lack of operations and maintenance moneys as critical issues for long-term funding, and began to develop a breakdown of critical "essential" needs and desirable "quality of life" wants as a way to organize a workable financial plan. Dick emphasized collective action among not only park providers but allied public agencies as the way to develop long-term funding.

Comments about the work plan included:

- Good to see O&M included – it's often left out
- Absolutely critical to add allied public agencies to this work

Mike Ragsdale ended the presentations with "GPAC must be funded and staffed and therefore owned by everyone." He thanked everyone who participated and invited all to continue coming to GPAC meetings. The August meeting will focus on a discussion of the scopes of work in more detail and on how to proceed with the work itself.

REGIONAL BOND MEASURE

Patricia Mccaig presented results from the recent poll of 600 households taken to gauge interest in a 2006 bond measure. The poll was built on the research done in 2002 and other studies around the country. Its purpose was to:

- test ballot titles
- examine funding thresholds
- test support
- identify messages and messengers

Findings indicate that:

People are satisfied with quality of life in the region (82%), and that there is strong support across the three county area for a ballot measure that focuses on protection of natural areas for water quality and maintenance of the region's livability, and that directs Metro to proceed with acquisition. In general, Patricia said that the poll results were favorable for a successful campaign, if there is no organized funded opposition.

David Bragdon discussed the structure of the bond. There will be a local share and a challenge grant program that, together, will provide double the amount that was available in the 1995 bond. Metro will not retain any moneys for itself as a park provider. David will organize a Blue Ribbon Committee of business people who, by October, will help frame the level of the bond, that of the local share, and report to Council on other bond-related policy decisions. GPAC will be represented in that group and that representative(s) will be the liaison to GPAC. GPAC will have an opportunity to hear and review the Committee's work.

David acknowledged GPAC's larger Vision work and reiterated Metro's interest in their support of the bond measure. GPAC members asked about GPAC's role and requested that the bond be first on the August agenda.

Schedule

The next GPAC meeting will be on August 25, 5:30 – 8:00, Metro Rm. 370.