

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUPPORTING) RESOLUTION NO. 88-933
A REGIONAL/LOCAL PARKS STUDY)
INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF) Introduced by the Council
AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN) Planning & Development
) Committee

WHEREAS, The Task Force on Metropolitan Regional Government is evaluating functions which might be provided in whole or in part on a regional basis; and


WHEREAS, The Task Force has requested that the Council of the Metropolitan Service District make recommendations regarding potential regional functions; and

WHEREAS, The District is currently conducting an inventory of regional parks through a cooperative effort with cities and counties in the region; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District supports continuing a study in cooperation with appropriate local governments which (1) identifies aspects of the parks function which can best be provided on a regional basis and aspects which can best be provided on a local basis, and (2) develops a plan of action to implement the regional/local parks system.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this 9th day of June, 1988.


Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Agenda Item No. 7.6, 7.7

Meeting Date June 9, 1988

Date: June 2, 1988

To: Metro Council

From: Councilor David Knowles -
Chair, Planning & Development Committee

Regarding: COMMITTEE REPORT ON JUNE 9, 1988, COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEMS:

Item 7.6 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-932, for
the Purpose of Supporting a Regional Library Study

Item 7.7 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-933, for
the Purpose of Supporting a Regional Parks Study

These resolutions were considered at the May 17, 1988, meeting of the Council Planning & Development Committee. Committee members in attendance were Councilors Knowles, Collier, Ragsdale and Waker.

Both resolutions were passed unanimously by the Committee. They were proposed as a result of a recent survey of Council members on issues being considered by the Task Force on Metropolitan Regional Government. As indicated in Exhibit A attached survey results show significant support of Council members for regional studies.

Both resolutions indicate support for doing cooperative studies with the appropriate local governments to 1) identify regional and local responsibilities, and 2) develop a plan of action to implement agreed upon changes to improve the provision of service.

It was the general opinion of Committee members that these study efforts should lead to improvements in the provision of service and not be "just another study."

DEC/gl
9646C/D1

EXHIBIT A

RESULTS OF COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

Boundary Commission

- Transfer the Boundary Commission to Metro (Metro to staff) 7 Collier, Cooper, Kelley Kirkpatrick, Knowles, Ragsdale, Waker
- Transfer the Boundary Commission to Metro (Boundary Commission to staff) 2 DeJardin, Gardner
- Maintain status quo 2 Bonner, Hansen
- * Councilor Kelley feels funding should not come from assessments to jurisdictions. Councilor Kirkpatrick feels the Commission must maintain a non-political status. Personnel could be transferred if more efficient for operation.

Libraries

- Regional system funded/managed by Metro 1 Collier
- Regional system funded by Metro with Metro in oversight role 3 Bonner, DeJardin, Waker
- In-depth study, recommendations to Metro and/or 1991 Legislature 8 Collier, Cooper, Gardner, Hansen, Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Knowles, Ragsdale
- * Councilor Collier voted for two items. Councilor Kelley feels the study should be similar to the parks study.

Parks

- Regional system funded/managed by Metro 1 Collier
- Regional system funded by Metro with Metro in oversight role 2 Bonner, DeJardin
- In-depth study, recommendations to Metro and/or 1991 Legislature 7 Cooper, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Knowles, Ragsdale, Waker
- Other 1 Kelley
- * Councilor Kelley feels Metro should act as a regional funding source.

Tax Conservation and Supervising Commission (TSCC)

- Metro exempt from budgetary review by TSCC 1 Knowles

METROPOLITAN REGIONAL RECREATION: 1995 AND 2010

Preliminary Report Outline
June 9, 1988

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Project Scope

- 1, Metropolitan Area's Regional Recreation Resource Needs for 1995 and 2010
2. Looking at recreation resources of metropolitan area wide interest in and around the urban areas. The Metro. Service District Boundary serves as a rough project boundary for this study.
3. An "Overview"

B. History of Project

- 1, How project came to be done.
2. Why Metro is doing the study.

C. General Topic Areas

1. Regional (Metropolitan/District) Parks
2. Rivers, Streams and Lakes
3. Urban Natural Areas.
4. Urban Trails and Path Systems.

D. Report Objectives:

Identify action recommendations for 1995 and 2010.

- * Development
- * Acquisition
- * Further study Areas
- * Coordination and Cooperation Measures

II. SUMMARY

A. Findings

B. Recommendations (1995 and 2010)

III. TRI-COUNTY AREA CHARACTER

A. Physical Environment:

1. Geographic Setting
2. Climate
3. Ecological Variety

B. Socio-Economic Environment: (demographics and human ecology)

C. Leisure Patterns and Trends: How Tri-County character translates into recreation trends and needs analysis.

D. Fiscal Environment: Funding sources and levels.

IV. NEED AND ACTION IDENTIFICATION

A. Introduction: Description of Methodology

1. Demand Approach - based on relationship to population.
2. Supply/Resource Approach

B. Needs Analysis By Resource Type:

1. Regional Parks (demand analysis)
2. Rivers and Streams (resource approach)
3. Trails and Pathways (resource approach)
4. Natural Areas (resource approach)

V. ACTION PLAN

A. Region Wide Fiscal Resources Analysis:

B. Prioritization and Action Selection:

- 1995: * Acute Need
 * Present Capital Improvement Plans
 * Budget Evaluation (Region wide expected resources)
- 2010: * Growth generated need
 * Goal attainment
 * Budget Evaluation

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

How can single jurisdiction implement multiple jurisdictional needs?

Where responsibilities lie and who might be the most effective implementing agents?

How can the process of identifying needs and reaching a consensus on action priorities be continued?

How can action be coordinated? ('Regional Recreation Coordinating Council')

DEMAND ANALYSIS APPROACH

Need is based on application of a 'population' to facility ratio.

Type of Feature:

1. Regional Parks
2. Golf Courses (Supported by a market analysis)
3. River Access Points for Boats (accounting for river capacity)

Demand Analysis Process:

1. Identify and quantify (number of acres) existing developed facilities by category.
2. Identify existing facility to population ratio.
3. Gauge present use levels in qualitative manner.
 - a. This should be related to user enjoyment, facility maintenance, or other carrying capacity type measure.
 - b. For purposes of this study, this will be determined by talking to park operators to gauge their 'intuitive' sense of use levels at various park sites. Actual user counts will be used where available.
4. Look at mitigating circumstances which would be affecting present use levels. These would be used to suggest a direction for adjusting ratio factor.
5. Identify population to facility ratio tailored to area conditions.
 - a. Compare ratio to that used by other recreation planning jurisdictions.
6. Use adjusted ratio and population projections to calculate approximate future need.

Action Analysis:

1. Distribution of existing parks - travel time based (1/2 to 1 hour travel time)
2. Look at where future growth is to occur.
3. Evaluate ability to meet need by further developing existing resources.

4. Evaluate need to acquire and develop sites in areas where present or future need exists. Look for potential (general or specific) site locations at special resource sites (rivers, lakes,...).
 - a. If 'special resources' aren't available in area of need evaluate other options.
5. Identify costs and relate to existing expenditure levels. (Do this as a review of expenditures for all features.)

6. Prioritization:

1995:

- * Existing general needs
- * Poor distribution
- * Present Capital Improvement Programs
- * Expenditure expectations.

2010:

- * Population growth generated needs
- * Meeting overall recreation goals.
- * Meeting broader recreational goals.
- * Expenditure expectations.

RESOURCE/SUPPLY RELATED APPROACH

Needs projections based on taking advantage of a recreation resource. Need not directly related to changes in population. This approach works to identify community values which will support actions and develop a consensus about what are suitable actions.

Type of Features:

1. River Systems
2. Natural Areas:
3. Trails, pathways and greenway corridors
4. Unique resources: viewpoints, cultural sites...

Demand Analysis Process:

1. Identify and categorize resources.
2. Evaluate resources sites and features by category
 - * Present use and character
 - * Recreation goals
 - * General action proposals
 - * Problems and conflicts relating to recreation goals and general proposals
3. Consensus development:
 - * review general actions and conflicts.
 - * Develop a 'wish list'
 - * Prioritize projects
 - * Identify proposal costs.

Action Plan:

1995:

- * Immediate need (Preservation or acute demand)
- * Existing Capital Improvement Projects

2010:

- * attain overall recreation goals.
- * Tie to expenditure trends.

1. Identify goals for each category of resource. (Overlapping and inter-connected goals should be identified.)
2. Identify action needed to realize goals.
3. Identify general costs of actions.

4. Develop a consensus about the relative merits and priority of various actions.
5. Evaluate action recommendation in relation to all projects, their costs, and general estimation of expenditure possibilities.

7.6 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-932, for the Purpose of Supporting a Regional/Local Library Study Including the Development of an Implementation Plan

Councilor Knowles, Chair of the Council Planning & Development Committee reported the Committee recommended adoption of the resolution.

Motion: Councilor Knowles moved, seconded by Councilor Kirkpatrick, to adopt Resolution No. 88-932.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all eleven Councilors present voting aye.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

7.7 Consideration of Resolution No. 88-933, for the Purpose of Supporting a Regional/Local Parks Study Including the Development of an Implementation Plan

Councilor Van Bergen explained he had not responded to a survey of Councilors upon which Resolution Nos. 88-932 and 88-933 had been developed because he opposed that method of reaching a consensus. He thought the issues should have been discussed by the Council before the resolutions were written. The Councilor further explained he was sensitive to local government issues and thought the Council should be cautious and not jeopardize any favored, local projects.

Councilor Knowles, Chair of the Planning & Development Committee, explained the Committee had acknowledged that issue and had carefully worded the resolutions to reflect it would be the Interim Task Force on Metropolitan Governance's responsibility to request studies be done.

Motion: Councilor Kelley moved the Council adopt substitute Resolution No. 88-933A. Councilor Hansen seconded the motion.

Councilor Kelley explained she had introduced substitute Resolution No. 88-933A because it clarified that a regional parks study was already being done. Resolution No. 88-933 implied that no study was underway, she said.

Councilor Knowles did not support the substitute resolution because it advocated a strong endorsement of regional parks. He thought it premature for the Council to adopt such a position.

Don Carlson, Councilor Administrator, explained the current parks study was a work plan for a regional parks inventory. It would involve developing a database for all parks in the region.

The Council continued to discuss the merits of the substitute resolution. Several language changes were proposed. Councilor Kelley agreed to withdraw her motion after Councilor Knowles proposed an amendment to the main resolution to which she agreed.

Withdrawal of Motion: Councilors Kelley and Hansen withdrew the motion to adopt substitute Resolution No. 88-933A.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved, seconded by Councilor Waker, to adopt Resolution No. 88-933 and the "Be it Resolved" paragraph be changed to read: "That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District supports [undertaking] continuing a study . . ."

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in all eleven Councilors present voting aye.

The motion carried unanimously and Resolution No. 88-933 was adopted as amended.

8. ORDER

8.1 Consideration of Order No. 88-19, in the Matter of Contested Case No. 87-3, a Petition for Locational Adjustment of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) By Blazer Homes

Presiding Officer Ragsdale explained that at this meeting the Council would consider whether to accept additional evidence concerning the case. If the Council decided to accept the additional evidence, it would then determine whether to remand the case back to the hearings officer or to hear the evidence itself. If the Council decided to hear additional evidence, no further action could take place at this meeting in order to allow time to inform all interested parties of the new hearing, he explained.

Councilor Waker announced he knew the applicant personally and as a result of his membership in the Home Builders Association. The Councilor said he had no business dealings with the applicant and was qualified to deliberate and vote on matters relating to the case.

Councilor Van Bergen acknowledged he had received letters from interested parties concerning the case but explained it was his usual practice to destroy such correspondence once it was learned it related to a UGB matter.