

**Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee**  
**Mike Ragsdale, Chair**

**MEETING NOTES**

Thursday, September 22, 2005  
5:30 – 8:00 PM  
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 270  
600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR

---

Committee members present: Chair Mike Ragsdale, Ernie Drapela, Kim Gilmer, John Griffiths, Faun Hosey, Esther Lev, Dick Schouten and Jim Zehren

Committee members absent: Betty Atteberry, Scott Burgess, Steve Greagor, Mike Houck, Zari Santner and Don Trotter

Elected officials, staff and guests present: Chris Carlson and Pat Sullivan

---

**GENERAL UPDATE**

Mike Ragsdale called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm. At the August meeting, he reminded the committee, he had accepted the responsibility to check with those members who have been consistently absent to find out their intentions to serve on the committee. Although he has not yet performed this task, he will do so before the October meeting.

Mike then turned over the facilitation of tonight's meeting to Kim Gilmer who had chaired both meetings of the Bond Subcommittee (BSC). It was the work of that subcommittee and of the full GPAC, at its August 25, 2005 meeting, which is being considered as the basis for the recommendations to the Blue Ribbon Committee.

**BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE**

Chris Carlson reported that members of the Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC) are currently being recruited (BRC). The roster should be finalized by the end of this week. **A list of those BRC members will be sent to GPAC members at that time.**

The BRC will meet three times: Tuesday, October 25 and Wednesdays on November 2 and 9.

The agendas have been roughed out as follows:

Meeting #1 – a briefing from Jim Desmond on the Bond Measure; Patricia McCaig will review the poll results, Target Areas (TAs) will be discussed including draft recommendations from GPAC.

Meeting #2 – Target Areas in more detail

Meeting #3 – Local Share Components.

The agendas may change after the selection of the Chair is made.

The BRC will be asked to make recommendations on the following:

- 1) Total amount of the Bond
- 2) Total percentage of the Local Share
- 3) TAs (see additional notes) \*
- 4) How far outside the UGB the program should extend

\* Target Area input not to be in great detail. The Council is interested in where the money should be spent – whether to focus on a particular region, or spread funds throughout the region.

In addition to the above four items to consider, the BRC will be asked its opinion of the value of the Nature in Neighborhoods Opportunity Fund; is it a good idea? It was emphasized that one important purpose of the Fund is to encourage project participants to build partnerships.

Two members of GPAC, Mike Houck and John Griffiths, have been mentioned as appointees to the BRC.

To sum up, what would be most helpful input from GPAC to the BRC would be what is the substance of the bond measure, what is the core essence of what's being asked of the voters.

Identify as the “Regional Portion” (or something comparable) the segment of the fund generally considered as “the rest.” In GPAC's recommendation to BRC, it should be specifically named.

The work of the BSC was submitted to the full GPAC for review and finalizing at tonight's meeting. Consensus from GPAC is being sought. Any recommendation on which consensus is not reached, will be pulled from the list being presented to BRC.

The *Draft 2006 Bond Measure Recommendations (September 19, 2005)* were discussed section by section.

### **Target Areas**

The subcommittee had two recommendations related to Target Areas: 1) agreement with Jim Morgan's map of TAs remaining from the 1995 bond measure and prioritizing particular locations within those TAs and 2) adding two new sites to the list.

Discussion included:

- The list of eight was not accurate.
- (Esther) Request was made that GPAC be provided with the original 1995 Target Area list and also with the list of areas discussed recently by Jim Morgan and staff with**

**biologists and other scientists. This information was requested in writing before the next meeting.**

- That work has already been done by staff and scientific criteria applied to reach the list of eight in the BSC's recommendations.
- The names of some TAs have changed over time and were not all recognized.
- The 4<sup>th</sup> TA listed should read Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge (from the Tualatin River to the Willamette River).
- Is it difficult to break down acreages and values in TAs.
- (Dick) There was concern about lack of TAs in Washington County.
- The success of acquisitions in the Cooper Mt. Target Area and continuing now with the master planning process was a counter comment.
- (Mike) The timing of the Bond Measure is out of sync. GPAC's task force work should have been completed first.
- **(Mike) Needed from the staff is clarity of what the list (of TAs) would say if GPAC were to recommend what staff asked for at the last meeting. Urged Dick Schouten (or anyone else who thinks there should be something on the list that isn't) to provide the group with list of projects. Saw no reason why GPAC should work only from the list of eight TAs to choose from.**
- (Ernie) If property fits today's criteria (biodiversity, etc.) it should be included regardless of political jurisdiction. Politics should not be included. The TA definition is what should be honored.
- Kim recollected that at last GPAC meeting Jim Morgan was using criteria to define the TAs and reviewing the 1995 potential acquisitions based on that. **GPAC can ask what that criteria is for the next meeting to reconfirm, if it feels necessary. (This was not confirmed.)**
- (Jim Zehren) At 1<sup>st</sup> BSC meeting a list of TAs that were scientifically identified as qualified candidates was presented, and BSC was to look at how those would be viewed to get regional support.
- **(Kim) suggested that all recommendations be removed from the Target Areas section and that the material be brought back to the October meeting to hold another discussion on the topic.**
- **The Target Area question referring to deletion of the Chehalem Mts. will not be forwarded to BRC.**
- **Chris requested clarification on what request(s) are being made of staff and she suggested that the October meeting be moved to week of Oct 17. (First BRC is Oct 25 and next GPAC meeting is Oct 27.)**
- **It was decided that Metro staff will contact GPAC members for October date earlier than the 25<sup>th</sup> that will be convenient for greatest number – early evening will be targeted.**
- **(Kim) suggested staff put all recommendations (other than TAs) in packet for upcoming presentation to BRC and leave a placeholder for the Target Area section. Continue with discussions and when a decision on TA recommendations made, insert in packet.**
- **Requested that material? be sent out in the next week and GPAC begin drafting revised Target Area recommendations by e-mailing around to one another.**

## Cost of Bond Package

It was explained that the BRC will be provided with acreage and value information on the TAs to assist in their decision-making. **A request was made that that information also be provided to GPAC and as early as possible.** Discussion included relation to the 1995 bond measure, possible conflicting measures, making a strong statement with requested amount, GPAC role as advocate and the connection to Measure 37.

This section was revised to read:

### ***Recommendation #1***

**GPAC recommends the 2006 bond measure be (set at) \$270 million with the regional portion equal to 60%, the opportunity grant fund equal to 20% and the local share equal to 20%. Additional language may include the reason GPAC believes that total amount is justifiable. Add some nice prose. A consensus was reached that this revised recommendation be distributed by e-mail to GPAC members present at this meeting for confirmation.**

## Signature Projects

(Kim) The assumption is that funding would come out of the Regional component. The recommendation could be expanded to include specifically the types of projects, e.g. only on land that was purchased from the last bond measure or only projects based on a theme, e.g. in connection with water trails.

Background: Open Space acquisitions were winding down. A Green Ribbon Committee was convened to learn if there were a few properties that could be improved; that might be opened to the public. There were four projects that were proposed for capital development.

The only project discussed in the BSC meeting #2 that received any consensus was the Columbia Slough.

The question asked of GPAC tonight - is there agreement that the Committee should recommend three or four Signature Projects and secondly should the Committee identify specifically what those are or identify only a theme?

***Recommendation #1: Motion was made and passed that GPAC recommend three to four capital development projects with region-wide appeal to help sell the bond measure.***

## Local Share

Discussion included how flexible the Local Share component should be.

(Sue) The context for which this bond measure became an immediate issue to be put on the 2006 ballot was the Goal 5 Fish & Wildlife Protect Plan. There was a compromise that Metro Council arrived at that rather than have some Metro regulatory protection on 8,000 acres of regionally significant habitat to have a component in this bond measure. So it's here; its origins are Goal 5

Fish & Wildlife Protection. What was given up was some nature of regulatory protection. If this bond measure is being sold as clean water and habitat, the program should have some flexibility but not to the extent of tennis courts, for example, which are the antithesis of those qualities.

(Dick) In jurisdictions where there are few significant natural areas still available or affordable, flexibility in type of projects funded will be even more crucial.

(Kim & Ernie) The importance of being absolutely clear with the voters about this flexibility was emphasized.

***Recommendation #1 was revised to read: Since the regional component and the opportunity grant fund will focus on natural areas, the local share should be flexible. Any park-related land acquisition or capital project to improve access or public use and enjoyment of the park should be eligible. Vote was taken; all in favor.***

***Recommendation #2 was accepted as presented.*** Discussion included need for education for the public regarding new rules about easements.

### **Opportunity Fund**

***Recommendation # 1 was struck and removed from recommendations to BRC.***

***Recommendation #2 became #1. Now reads:***

**Selection criteria for Nature in Neighborhoods Opportunity Fund should:**

- Give high priority to existing restoration projects identified in existing watershed plan.
- Comply with park master plans and/or agency priorities.
- Have available operation and maintenance funds.
- Advance of park/green spaces development in “undernatured” areas of the region.

***Recommendation #3 now #2 was revised to read:***

***The local share match should be at least 33% of the grant funds with 67% (or the balance) to be provided by bond funds. The local match can consist of cash or in-kind contributions with no minimum requirement for either category. Project costs that would otherwise be eligible, that are expended within the year prior to grant submittal, may also be used for the match. Voted was taken, all in favor.***

Dick brought up at the first meeting the idea of changing the structure of the grant selection committee. GPAC thought the general premise was sound making it a non-political decision, and that weighting the decisions with two Metro Councilors and additional Metro staff with the addition of some “outside” people may make it political. So the BSC did recommend the possibility of looking at an alternative structure.

(Dick) responded that the process of “who pays” and “who gets” is the very essence of politics. We should leverage that in a positive way. He had referred to JPACT as a model

exhibiting a lot of energy and involvement. A mechanism for this group to really mean something is to make decisions that stand up to final approval. That is a political process and it needs to be a broad process, which could mean including elected people as well as others.

(Faun) added that the people evaluating the projects should be technical grant reviewers who know how to read and evaluate proposals. The process will require a lot of “hand-holding”.

OWEB and USF&W were referred to as models. Metro administered restoration and environmental education programs that were funded by USF&W for years and has had much success in such programs. It was suggested to carry this discussion over to the next meeting.

**SCHEDULE:**

Next GPAC Meeting: XXXXday, October XX, 5:30 – 7:00, Metro Rm. XX