

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

**MEETING NOTES**

Thursday, May 25, 2006  
5:30 – 7:30 PM  
Metro Regional Center, Rm. 501  
600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR

---

Committee members present: Chair Mike Ragsdale, Scott Burgess, Ernie Drapela, Kim Gilmer, Faun Hosey, Mike Livingston, Mike Houck, Tim Raphael, Linda Robinson and Dan Zinzer.

Committee members absent: John Griffiths, Sue Marshall, Zari Santner, Dick Schouten and Mike Sykes.

Elected officials, staff and guests present: Jennifer Budhabhatti, Jim Desmond, Christy Owen, Pat Sullivan, Jeff Tucker and Mary Logalbo.

---

Chair Mike Ragsdale called the meeting to order at 5:35 pm.

**Status Reports**

Finance. Jeff Tucker provided the committee with the final version of the *GPAC Finance Report – Part 1 – Existing Financing Environment (see attached)*. He referred to three changes made since the April 27 meeting.

- Grant information was added from Bureau of Environmental Services, Watershed Environmental Services and Clean Water Services.
- Oregon State Parks also provided information on the Portland Metro region. It was noted that it is often difficult to obtain grant information from non-profits, that they perhaps see Metro as competition.
- A map was also distributed of property tax compression caused by Measure 5? (*see attached*).
- Jeff and Christy Owen were asked to research about a dozen non-profits to learn about their funding resources and the amount of success they have had in obtaining funding, particularly grants. It turned out to be very difficult or impossible to obtain such information (except from Portland Audubon Society); the non-profits perhaps see Metro as competition. It is unlikely that Christy will have any further success in this research.

Part I of the GPAC Finance Report is now complete. Jeff and Christy Owen will identify potential and new funding sources and provide a draft set of recommendations in the fall.



Institutions. Christy is also researching financial comparisons among jurisdictions throughout the country. Christy asked the Committee if she is going in the right direction and what other questions she should be asking when contacting them. Several specific contacts were also given to her.

Suggestions included:

- Learn from each of the jurisdictions being questioned how each developed and what might be applicable in our region.
- Emphasize jurisdictions that can model cooperation, collaboration and integration as opposed to a new super regional entity.
- Search for collaborative models not just in funding but in other areas such as trail maintenance (e.g. how is responsibility divided and shared among large and small jurisdictions).
- Search for models where parks, trails, open space and natural areas are understood to be part of a basic, fundamental infrastructure.

Systems.Data Inventory. Jennifer Budhabhatti provided an update on the following map layers for the system inventory:

- Natural areas Community and neighborhood park areas
- Publicly owned recreational facilities
- Publicly owned other open spaces (e.g. cemeteries special gardens)
- Existing regional and local trails

She described the data makeup of the five layers and distributed a data list (*see attached*). Clark County data is also included. Another layer, proposed parks, trails and natural areas is to be developed but only two of the jurisdictions included in the inventory have provided this information to date, and some data is not available in GIS. The issue of bio-diversity is entering the discussion.

Systems – Parks Directors’ Report. Kim Gilmer, Dan Zinzer and Zari met with local parks directors in April about the recreational piece of the system which needs to be defined and a baseline established. The parks directors agreed it would be beneficial for them to look at what has currently been mapped, review it for accuracy, identify gaps and consider where and how to proceed from there. Kim asked if jurisdictions’ comprehensive plans could be mapped.

The parks directors group discussed holding quarterly meetings. Kim mentioned that the GPAC work could be an agenda item each quarter. Map layers could be brought to each meeting and revisions could be made and returned to staff. This would keep the updating process moving along. Kim requested enlargements of each jurisdiction so future planning efforts could be understood and coordinated. Kim also requested labeling types of facilities on the maps. Chair Ragsdale suggested and it was agreed that Kim, Dan and Zari meet with Chris and Jennifer to decide which map layers should be sent to the parks directors and when. Kim will take the lead on getting the directors together.



Systems Subcommittee –Mike Houck, chair of the systems sub committee, said the group will focus on the landscape scale component of the system. He has arranged a workshop for June 20, 12:00 – 4:00 at Metro with David Hulse, faculty in landscape architecture at the University of Oregon and author of the Willamette River Basin Atlas. Hulse, Houck, GPAC members and several professionals involved in regional work will identify what key natural resources should be included in the system at the regional scale. The workshop will use the GPAC map layers and New Look maps to study lands inside and outside of the UGB. Mike distributed the GPAC Vision Statement with highlighted sections of system language to further inform the committee of the workshop’s intent.

Systems criteria. Jim Desmond spoke of threshold issues that Metro staff has struggled with such as the public land/private land interface and whether privately owned property should be included in the system. He also spoke of the importance of knowing the ecological significance and condition of an area and how it functions in order to be able to discuss issues such as new park sites, opportunities for connectivity, and the locations of major gaps in the system. He said it will be difficult to discuss where to take the system over the next 20 to 50 years without having a grasp of such issues. Jim said a list of descriptors characterizing what should be in the system might be applied. An early draft list includes location, linkage, size, number of residents (high density areas that are underserved), aesthetics (including views) and ecological function. Such criteria could help define that part of the system that is future-looking – 20 years or 50 years out.

He also said Metro staff initially struggled with but has become more comfortable with the active recreation component of the system. Metro Council understands that active recreation and ‘natural’ components of the system are closely connected in the public’s mind.

Jim asked the committee to come to the June meeting with information that staff could provide in order for GPAC to more easily make informed decisions (e.g. where are the information gaps?)

### **Other Information**

NRPA Conference: Jim Desmond reported on the NRPA Conference he attended last week in Chicago with Zari Santner and Mike Houck. The agenda focused on the urban park community’s effectiveness when banding together to both restore and attract federal, state and outside funding. The conference also emphasized the economic value of parks. A brochure from the conference “A Call to Action: A National Agenda for Urban Parks and Recreation in America” was distributed to the committee (*copy attached*).

Committee members expressed interest in forming a speaker series over the next year or two to help spread the discussion on institutional collaboration and funding related to parks.

Chair Ragsdale described the June 27, 2006 Metro Council work session and his discussion with the Council on the work GPAC is doing.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.