

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREPARING A MEASURE) RESOLUTION 94-1961B
TO REFER A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND)
TO THE VOTERS NO LATER THAN SPRING, 1995) Introduced by Councilor
FOR THE AMOUNT OF APPROXIMATELY \$140) Sandi Hansen
MILLION TO FINANCE ACQUISITION AND)
DEVELOPMENT OF GREENSPACES AND TRAILS)

WHEREAS, On July 23, 1992, through Resolution No. 92-1637, the Metro Council adopted the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan recommends Metro to place a greenspaces funding mechanism before the voters of the region to establish a regional revenue source for the acquisition and capital improvement of greenspaces; and

WHEREAS, On September 23, 1993, through Resolution No. 93-1844A, the Metro Council stated their intent to submit to voters in 1994, a general obligation bond measure for the acquisition and development of a regional greenspaces system; and

WHEREAS, On December 9, 1993, the Metro Council approved Ordinance No. 93-516A, amending the Fiscal Year 1993-94 budget to augment funding for a consultant to examine issues concerning the referral of a potential greenspaces acquisition funding measure; and

WHEREAS, On March 30, 1994, the Metropolitan Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee formally recommended a bond referral package to the Metro Council; including bond amount, election date and Phase I list of acquisition areas and trail corridors; and

WHEREAS, On May 12, 1994 the Metropolitan Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee formally recommended a bond referral package to the Metro Council, including a bond amount of up to approximately \$140 million and an election date of Fall 1995; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council Regional Facilities Committee held hearings on April 20, 25, 26, 27 and May 18, 1994, to receive public testimony on whether to refer a greenspaces measure to voters, for what amount, in which election, and for which Phase I target areas and trail corridors; and

WHEREAS, On May 18, 1994 the Metropolitan Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee reconsidered its earlier recommendation of a September 1994 date and recommended a Spring 1995 election; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby determines that a General Obligation bond of approximately \$140 million shall be referred to the voters no later than Spring, 1995.
2. That the Metro Council requests the continued involvement and coordination of the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee and Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee in refining the components of the bond package prior to Council referral of a ballot title and explanatory statement.
3. That Metro staff shall prepare the appropriate Resolution and Ballot Title for approval by the Council at a subsequent Council meeting for submittal to the Elections Officer and the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission, in a timely manner as required by law.

4. That the General Obligation bond amount shall be applied to acquisition and development of greenspaces and trail corridors.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 26th day of May, 1994.



Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

REGIONAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 94-1961A, PREPARING A MEASURE TO REFER A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND TO THE VOTERS NO LATER THAN THE FIRST AVAILABLE ELECTION DATE IN 1995 FOR THE AMOUNT OF APPROXIMATELY \$140 MILLION TO FINANCE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF GREENSPACES AND TRAILS

Date: May 23, 1994

Presented by: Councilor Moore

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: At its May 18, 1994 meeting the Regional Facilities Committee voted 4-0 to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 94-1961A. Councilors Hansen, Gates, Moore, and Washington voted in favor. Councilor McFarland was absent.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ISSUES: Regional Parks & Greenspaces Director Charlie Ciecko discussed the background and status of the effort to place a Greenspaces bond measure on the ballot. He then introduced Pat McCormick of Conkling Fiskum & McCormick, who presented the report of the Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee, created by Council through adoption of Resolution No. 94-1942A in April. That committee recommended that a Greenspaces bond measure of approximately \$140 million be placed on the ballot in the fall of 1995 (report is attached). They also requested staff to prepare more information on specific sites, including cost-benefit analyses of each proposed site. Councilors discussed with staff some of the points in the Blue Ribbon Committee recommendation, particularly the recommendation that if the measure is to include a local share it not be a direct pass-through to local governments.

Mr. Ciecko discussed a document (attached) outlining three alternatives for a bond measure: a \$100 million measure with no local share; and two \$138.95 million measures with a \$25 million local share. The differences in the two larger packages represented changes that came from public hearings held in April. Councilor Gates asked whether a ballot title would include specific properties, be more general, or provide some flexibility for acquiring different properties. Planning Director Andy Cotugno said the Council could structure the measure however it wanted, but he recommends that leeway be provided to adjust acreages or acquire different sites in the Greenspaces Master Plan.

Mr. Ciecko outlined three alternatives staff had developed for committee consideration. First was to do nothing and not plan for referral of a measure; he did not recommend that. Second was to proceed with the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee's recommendation of a September 1994 measure of \$138.95 million with the local share. Third was to proceed with the Blue Ribbon Committee's recommendation, which would require more specific information from that committee on items they have not yet decided.

Mr. Chris Beck of the Trust for Public Land testified on the proposed resolution. He read from his May 16 memo to Chair Hansen (attached) in which he recommended proceeding with an election in the spring of 1995. He discussed the difficulty in extending real estate options beyond one year, arguing against the Blue Ribbon Committee's recommendation of an election in fall of 1995. He encouraged Council members to make the Greenspaces program the first implementation piece of the Region 2040 plan. Councilor McLain agreed that some action needs to take place, but was not sure what the best action is. She and Mr. Beck agreed that it is important for the Council to decide soon on an election date to provide certainty for all those interested in the program.

Councilor Gates said he does not want the Greenspaces program to conflict with securing a funding source for growth management planning, which he considers to be Metro's primary responsibility. He said the committee should wait two weeks to decide when to put the Greenspaces measure on the ballot; he wanted to give the Council the opportunity to have its May 25 meeting on funding issues first. He added that discussion of a measure in the spring of 1995 should refer to the first available election date, rather than citing March or May, because a ballot measure on the November 1994 statewide ballot would limit elections to two dates a year and those dates would have to be set by the 1995 Legislature.

Councilor Moore asked Mr. Beck if there is momentum that would be lost by further delay. Mr. Beck said there is much potential interest among grass roots supporters, and the civic leaders involved have created considerable momentum for their part. He said delay until November of 1995 would probably stop some activity that's going on now.

Councilor Gates moved to table the resolution to the next committee meeting. Councilor McLain argued against that, saying the Regional Facilities Committee needed to make a recommendation to present to the Council and the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee. Councilor Washington said he supports the Blue Ribbon Committee's recommendation. Councilor Moore said the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) is getting frustrated with the lack of action from the Council. Councilor Gates said he strongly supports the Greenspaces program, but wants to fund the overall planning program before anything else. The motion failed 3-1, with Councilor Gates in favor, and Councilors Hansen, Moore, and Washington opposed.

Mr. Cotugno advised that it might not be timely to adopt a resolution now unless it was for September, 1994. He said it is important to get the support of both the Blue Ribbon and Policy Advisory Committees, and some mutual agreement must be reached to get the support of both groups. Councilor Hansen said she read the committee's will as being in favor of the committee's taking formal action at this meeting. Councilor Washington asked

Council Analyst Casey Short how to structure a formal action that satisfied everyone. Mr. Short said that could not be done because the two advisory groups had submitted conflicting recommendations, and that Mr. Beck had proposed a third. He referred to the resolution before the committee, saying that all parties have agreed on the size of the measure so the first thing to decide is a date. He suggested that a resolution could either pick a date or establish a method for finding agreement among the parties. Mr. Cotugno suggested a resolution recommending a date and directing that the advisory committees be consulted. He added that the issues of sites and local share must also be addressed.

Councilor Moore said she disagreed with Mr. Cotugno, saying it is time for action from the committee and Council. She wanted to preserve the September option recommended by the Greenspaces PAC, and she supported amending the resolution to call for a measure of approximately \$140 million to be put on the ballot no later than the first available election date in 1995. She said that would provide leeway for either this fall or next spring, while providing some certainty. Councilor Washington asked whether the two advisory groups have ever met. Mr. Ciecko said they have not, explaining that the Blue Ribbon Committee's tight time frame did not give them time to meet with PAC members. He added that the Chair of the Blue Ribbon committee did not feel it appropriate for them to negotiate their recommendations, saying it is the Council's job to make these decisions. Mr. Ciecko added that one committee's reconsideration of its recommendation on dates might lead the other to reconsider its recommendations, on the issues of timing and local share. Councilor McLain said that was not enough, that the committee must take some more specific action because this is Metro's program and Metro must be taking the lead rather than any of the advisory committees.

Councilor Moore moved to amend the resolution to call for a measure of approximately \$140 million, an election no later than the first election date in 1995, and addition of a Be It Resolved to state that the Metro Council requests the continued involvement of the advisory committees. Mr. Short suggested the committee direct staff to prepare a resolution which would include Councilor Moore's points, allow for cleaning up some language in the current resolution, and provide time to prepare the Exhibit referred to in the resolution. Committee members discussed some of the points to be included in the exhibit, particularly the local share. There was no consensus on how to construct the local share, and staff reported that the Blue Ribbon Committee was not specific on this issue. That committee agreed only that they did not want the local share to be an entitlement. Councilor Devlin spoke in support of a local share, saying his own opinion is that a local share ought to be dedicated to acquisition and preservation of natural areas and related programs. He added that it would take a lot of coordinating work among local governments to build support if the local share were deleted.

Following further discussion of the local share issue, Councilor Moore moved to amend her motion to delete reference to Exhibit A in the final Be It Resolved. The committee approved that motion, and voted 4-0 to recommend Council adoption of the amended resolution.

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

121 S. W. SALMON STREET

PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

(503) 464-8913

FRED D. MILLER
VICE PRESIDENT
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Date: May 18, 1994
To: Metro Council
From: Fred Miller
RE: Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee recommendations

At your request, the Blue Ribbon Committee has met to develop a recommendation on a bond measure to acquire regional greenspaces. We have decided most of the issues the council asked us to consider; we plan to meet once more to develop a final recommendation. This memo summarizes our decisions to date; a more detailed account of our discussions is attached.

Referral, timing, amount

Metro should refer a bond measure to voters in fall of 1995, for up to \$140 million. The Council should refer the measure by fall 1994, to allow maximum time to educate the public.

Capital Improvements

The measure may include a small amount for capital improvements, if it is a set amount and is restricted to improvements necessary for public use of newly acquired lands.

Local Share

The measure should not include an unrestricted entitlement, or "pass-through," to local governments. If a local share is included, the amount and use should be strictly limited.

Target Areas

Target areas to be acquired should be identified as part of the measure. The committee has asked staff to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of recommended target areas and rank them according to set criteria. The BRC then will finalize its recommendation.

Leveraging

Metro should seek out opportunities to leverage regional acquisition funds. This should include identifying opportunities to combine public acquisition with land that, through development restrictions or landowner intent, will remain undeveloped.



Metro Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee Summary Report Discussion of Key Issues

Process

The Blue Ribbon Committee appointed by Metro Council has met twice. The first meeting was spent reviewing the committee's charter, studying Metro's greenspaces program, reviewing the civic/business leader survey and public opinion poll conducted by consultants, hearing from a greenspaces advocate and asking questions of staff and consultants. The only issue discussed in significant detail was local share; a straw vote showed little support for local share on the committee at that time.

Between the first and second meetings, most committee members met individually with representatives from the project consulting firm (Conkling Fiskum & McCormick.) During these meetings, committee members requested additional information, raised questions and discussed concerns. These meetings helped shape the agenda for the second meeting.

At that meeting, the committee heard a presentation from the Gladstone mayor on the value of a local share to local communities. The committee spent the remainder of the meeting deciding key questions surrounding a ballot measure. The committee asked staff to develop further information on target areas, and will meet again in the next few weeks to finalize its recommendation.

The following describes the consensus opinion, rationale for the committee's recommendations, and concerns expressed by committee members.

Should Metro refer a bond measure for greenspaces?

Majority supports referral; two express concern.

Rationale:

- Greenspaces contribute positively to our quality of life.
- Greenspaces are disappearing.
- Growth management is a top community leader concern.
- Water quality and preservation of wildlife habitat is important to the community.

Concerns:

- Other public priorities, including education, remain unresolved.

What's the best timing for a measure?

Fall of 1995 received the greatest support. Several members (but not the majority) also supported spring of 1995. One member supported fall 1994.

Rationale:

- Provides time to develop finely-tuned measure.
- Provides time for public education and for campaign organization.
- Avoids conflicts with other measures.
- Allows political leadership to emerge.

Avoid fall 1994 because:

- Confusion is likely between City of Portland Parks measure (November 1994) and Metro greenspaces measure.
- Political leadership is critical, but unavailable for 1994 campaign.
- More time is needed for the public education effort required of Metro.
- Timing is too short for a significant campaign effort.
- The public mood remains anti-tax, anti-government.

Avoid spring 1995 because:

- A contentious legislative session may result in anti-government mood.
- The legislature may refer a finance measure to voters.

Concerns that fall 1995 is too late:

- Greenspaces will continue to disappear.
- Land will get more expensive.
- Environmental/Friends groups are ready to campaign now.
Note: John Sherman reported that Friends of Forest Park and the Audubon Society had received campaign commitments of \$20,000. They also had secured a commitment from Bud Clark to head up a campaign effort.

What dollar amount should be put on the ballot?

The committee considered three options: \$50 million, \$88 million and \$139 million. The first straw vote showed more support for \$88 million. After committee discussion, a revote showed majority support for \$139 million, with two members expressing concern.

The committee also agreed that a "retail number" should be used (as opposed to a round figure.)

Rationale:

- Lower amount doesn't buy enough sites, particularly if election is put off until fall of 1995.
- Lower amount doesn't allow adequate geographical distribution of site acquisition.
- With more time for a campaign, voter support of higher amount is more likely.

Concerns:

- A lot of private land will remain "greenspaces," through development restrictions or landowner intent. By combining purchases with these properties, land can be set aside for a lower bond amount.
- Polls demonstrate a lower number is easier to pass.
- Metro should consider a series of smaller, more frequent bond measures.

Should capital improvements be allowed?

Majority supported funds for capital improvements; three expressed concern. After discussion, the committee agreed that any funds for capital improvements should be strictly limited, and be restricted to improvements necessary for public use (as opposed to interpretive centers.)

Rationale:

- Public should be able to use greenspaces they purchase.
- Trails help reduce trampling of environmentally sensitive areas.
- The more people are able to use greenspaces, the more they will support future bonds for acquisition.
- A strict limit will maximize dollars available for acquisition.

Concern:

- Limited public funds should be used to acquire land now, before prices go higher or more greenspaces disappear. Capital improvements limit funds available for acquisition.

The committee considered recommending a percentage limit for capital improvements (i.e.. 5 percent), but agreed to hold off for now on setting a specific number.

Should a local share be included?

The committee was unanimously opposed to an unrestricted entitlement, or "pass-through," to local governments. After the presentation from the Gladstone mayor, discussions with staff and concerns raised by members, the committee agreed that a local share could be considered, **if the amount and use were strictly limited**. For example, local share might be used for acquiring local greenspaces or making capital improvements for public access. The committee is clearly opposed to acquisitions for park improvements such as tennis courts, swimming pools and play equipment.

Committee members suggested that the local share might be provided through a competitive grant program.

Rationale:

- Local government officials will publicly support a greenspaces measure that includes a local share.
- The public may perceive more local benefit from a local share.

Concerns:

- A local share confuses the greenspaces issue in the minds of voters.
- Metro should preserve its regional greenspaces mission, and leave local park issues to local governments.

What sites should be included?

While the committee agreed that target areas should be identified in a bond measure, most members said they did not know enough to be able to choose one area over another. The committee has asked staff to develop a cost-benefit analysis on each area, and rank them according to set criteria, including cost.

In both meetings, the committee emphasized the importance of "leveraging" regional acquisition funds. This should include identifying opportunities to combine public acquisition with land that, through development restrictions or landowner intent, will remain undeveloped.

What's Next?

The committee agreed that the Metro Council should refer a specific measure by fall of 1994.

Rationale:

- Referral now would provide the time needed for a public information effort and citizen campaign on greenspaces.
- Action should be taken by the current council, which has been involved in this process.

The BRC agreed to meet again within the next few weeks to review staff work on target areas, and finalize a recommendation.

METRO Greenspaces

Blue Ribbon Committee

Contact List

(Rev. May 11, 1994)

Gail Achterman

Stoel Rives Boley Jones & Grey
900 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 2300
Portland, OR 97204
Phone 294-9123
Fax 220-2480

Pauline Anderson

Oregon Yacht Club, #11
Portland, OR 97202
Phone 235-4072
Fax NA

Sam Brooks

S. Brooks Temporary Services
3575 NE Broadway
Portland, OR 97332
Phone 284-7930
Fax 284-7977

Jon Chandler

Executive Director,
Metropolitan Homebuilders Assoc.
15555 SW Bangy Road, Suite 301
Lake Oswego, OR 97035
Phone 648-1880
Fax 648-0588

Andy Cotugno (*non voting member*)

Planning Director
METRO
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232
Phone 797-1755
Fax 797-1794

Sheila Holden

District Manager,
Pacific Power & Light, Rose City District
3345 NE 82nd Avenue
Portland, OR 97220
Phone 256-6020
Fax 256-6030

Barbara Hutchison

10101 SW Riverside Drive
Portland, OR 97219
Phone 636-6415
Fax NA

Gordon Jones

Clackamas Sand & Gravel
12000 SE Capps Road
Clackamas, OR 97030
Phone 656-2891
Fax 656-9453*2

Mary K. Mark

5341 SW Patton Road
Portland, OR 97221
Phone Unlisted
Fax NA

Jack McGowan

Executive Director,
Stop Oregon Litter & Vandalism (SOLV)
P.O. Box 1235
Hillsboro, OR 97123
Phone 647-9855
Fax 647-0159

Dr. Mike McKeel
108 NE 2nd
Gresham, OR 97030
Phone 665-8888
Fax 666-0529

Pat McCormick (*non voting member*)
Conkling Fiskum & McCormick, Inc.
900 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Portland, OR 97204
Phone 294-9120
Fax 294-9152

Fred Miller (*BRC chair*)
Vice President of Public Affairs,
Portland General Electric
121 SW Salmon, Suite 1700
Portland, OR 97204
Phone 464-8913
Fax 778-5566

Bill Naito
Norcrest China Company
55 W Burnside
Portland, OR 97209
Phone 228-7404
Fax 273-8313

Josephine (Joey) Pope
Friends of the Arboretum
1852 SW Highland Road
Portland, OR 97221
Phone 223-8881
Fax NA

Roger Qualman
Norris Beggs & Simpson
121 SW Morrison, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97204
Phone 223-7181
Fax 273-0256

Lindsay Stewart
NIKE, Inc.
One Bowerman Drive
Beaverton, OR 97005
Phone 671-5453
Fax 671-6300

(Alternate:
John Coburn
NIKE Inc.
Phone
Phone: 671-3167)

John Sherman
Friends of Forest Park
P.O. Box 2413
Portland, OR 97208
Phone 241-9348
Fax NA

Bill Wessinger
Wessinger Foundation
121 SW Salmon, Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97204
Phone 274-4051
Fax 464-2299

**COST ESTIMATES:
\$100 Million Scenario
April 18, 1993**

Greenspace	Acres	Cost (\$)
Willamette River Greenway Willamette Narrows Canemah Bluffs Cathedral Park to railroad bridge Oaks Bottom to OMSI West side of Multnomah Channel	1,350	18.9 million
East Buttes Kelly Butte Mt. Talbert Mt. Scott	1,250	12 million
Newell Creek Canyon	400	7 million
Boring Lava Domes	1,200	7.2 million
Tualatin River Site/Greenway	850	3 million
Sandy River Gorge	1,000	7 million
Bull Mountain	180	12 million
Cooper Mountain	350	6 million
Buffer and expansion of Forest Park	<u>550</u>	<u>7 million</u>
Subtotal (does not include trails)	7,130	\$80.1 million
Trails		\$8.4 million
Peninsula Crossing Trail Fanno Creek Trail Sauvie Island to Hillsboro/Beaverton Trail (Burlington Northern)		
TOTAL ACQUISITION		88.5 million
+ options (sites and trails)		4.0 million
+ purchase costs (12%)		11.1 million
+ 1.25% bond issuance costs		<u>1.29 million</u>
GRAND TOTAL		\$104.89 million

OPTIONS

Terwilliger Blvd.	1.5 million
Hoyt Arboretum	0.5 million
Fairview Lake	0.5 million
Finley Nature Reserve	0.5 million
Miscellaneous	1.0 million
TOTAL	4.0 million for optioned properties

PAC RECOMMENDATION
Updated April 18, 1994

Greenspace	Acres ¹	Cost (\$) ¹
Willamette River Greenway	1,200	17.9 million
Willamette Narrows		
Canemah Bluffs		
Cathedral Park to railroad bridge		
Oaks Bottom to OMSI		
West side of Multnomah Channel		
East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes	1,250	12 million
Newell Creek Canyon	400	7 million
Sandy River Gorge	1,000	7 million
Bull Mountain	180	12 million
Cooper Mountain	350	6 million
Buffer and expansion of Forest Park	550	7 million
Jackson Bottom and McKay/Dairy	350	1.75 million
Creeks Addition		
Tonquin Geological Area	500	3.5 million
Tualatin River Greenway/Access	<u>300</u>	<u>3 million</u>
Points and Improvements		
Subtotal (does not include trails)	6,080 acres	\$77.15 million
Trails		\$16.3 million
Peninsula Crossing Trail (Improvements only)		
Fanno Creek Trail		
Sauvie Island to Hillsboro/Beaverton Trail (Burlington Northern)		
North Bank Clackamas River Trail and Access		
Beaver Creek Canyon Trail (Troutdale vicinity)		
TOTAL ACQUISITION		93.45 million
+ options (sites and trails)		4.0 million
+ local share		25.0 million
+ purchase costs (12%)		14.69 million
+ 1.25% bond issuance costs		<u>1.71 million</u>
GRAND TOTAL		\$138.85 million

¹Preliminary estimates based on recent sales; additional research underway.

**REVISED RECOMMENDATION TO
REFLECT PUBLIC INPUT**

Greenspaces Target Area	Acres	Cost (\$)*
Willamette River Greenway	1,200	17.9 million
Willamette Narrows		
Canemah Bluffs		
Cathedral Park to railroad bridge		
Oaks Bottom to OMSI		
West side of Multnomah Channel		
East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes	1,056	11 million
Newell Creek Canyon	400	7 million
Sandy River Gorge	850	6 million
Bull Mt/Cooper Mountain	450	3 million
Buffer and expansion of Forest Park	470	6 million
Jackson Bottom and McKay/ Dairy Creeks Addition	350	1.75 million
Tonquin Geological Area	500	3.5 million
Tualatin River Greenway/Access Points and Improvements	300	3 million
Farview Creek/Lake	150	3 million **
Rock Creek	<u>332</u>	<u>5 million ***</u>
Subtotal (does not include trails)	6,058 acres	\$77.15 million
Trails		\$16.3 million
Peninsula Crossing Trail (Improvements only)		
Fanno Creek Trail		
Sauvie Island to Hillsboro/Beaverton Trail (Burlington Northern)		
North Bank Clackamas River Trail and Access		
Beaver Creek Canyon Trail (Troutdale vicinity)		
TOTAL ACQUISITION		93.45 million
+ options (sites and trails)		4.0 million
+ local share		25.0 million
+ purchase costs (12%)		14.69 million
+ 1.25% bond issuance costs		<u>1.71 million</u>
GRAND TOTAL		\$138.95 MILLION

- * Preliminary estimates based on recent sales; additional research underway.
- ** This site in Multnomah County was recommended as an addition to the list. The three million was gained by subtracting one million from each of three other sites in Multnomah County (Sandy River, East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes, Forest Park).
- *** This site in Washington County was recommended as an addition to the list. The five million was gained by grouping Bull Mountain/Cooper Mountain as one target area and by reducing the acreage target for Bull Mountain in response to new available acreage information.

recitinv.doc

May 16, 1994

To: Councillor Sandi Hansen, Chair, Regional Facilities
Committee

From: Chris Beck, Trust for Public Land

Copies: Fred Miller, Judy Wyers, Richard Devlin, Pat McCormick,
Andy Cotugno

Re: Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee Recommendation and
Response from the Metro Council

As you know, the Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC) has completed its initial deliberations and is forwarding recommendations to the Metro Council. We are pleased with the BRC discussions and with the membership that was assembled in such a short period of time. Fred Miller deserves high marks for his handling of this speedy process.

The BRC has recommended that a bond measure be referred for the November 1995 ballot in the amount of \$139 million. I have some concerns about the timing aspect of this recommendation and hope that the BRC might still be receptive to a March 1995 election. Below are some thoughts for the Regional Facilities Committee and the Council to consider.

1. November of '95 creates continued uncertainty about whether Metro will actually refer a bond. The new Council and a potentially unsupportive Exec. would have ample time to shift gears and back off of a bond measure. A referral for the spring is less likely to be tampered with.
2. The Legislature could very possibly refer a tax measure for the September or November '95 ballots, complicating any Greenspaces effort.
3. The Portland School Board could refer a measure for any time in 1995. Near term action by Metro (i.e. within the next six weeks) to refer a bond for the spring '95 ballot would prevent the School Board from trying to preempt Greenspaces.
4. It will be extremely difficult to obtain options on properties if the November '95 date is targeted. Getting options (opportunities to purchase) on specific important properties will greatly enhance the whole Greenspaces effort. It is difficult to persuade landowners to grant options for 17 months (from today) through November 1995. On the other hand, I think we will be more successful in asking landowners for options through early

spring 1995. It is very difficult to ask a landowner to give up the right to sell to anyone else for such a long period.

In short, November 1995 is not a clear enough signal from either the BRC or Metro that this process is moving forward. It is too far off, and too much can happen before then to unravel the bond measure. I fear that we would revisit this whole issue after the upcoming November election and potentially lose our current resolve to move forward. The fall 1995 date also makes it difficult to convince potential campaign funders and landowners (who might be willing to grant limited option periods) that Greenspaces is real.

Finally, I am confident that we can win a March special election as easily as a November special election. We have the time to put it together if we act soon. The key will be getting a commitment from the business community (with BRC's support) to move this process forward now and begin playing an active role.

I suggest that the Metro Council make the following recommendations:

1. Metro should state its desire to place a Greenspaces measure on the March 1995 ballot and ask the BRC to reconsider the timing issue for the above-mentioned reasons. The BRC should be asked whether it can support this date and play an active role in a campaign.
2. Affirm Metro's support for a Bond measure in the \$140 million range.
3. Express a desire to formally refer a Greenspaces measure as early this summer as possible and no later than July 15.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREPARING A MEASURE)	RESOLUTION 94-1961A
TO REFER A GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND)	
TO THE VOTERS IN THE _____ ELECTION)	Introduced by Councilor
NO LATER THAN THE FIRST AVAILABLE)	Sandi Hansen
ELECTION DATE IN 1995 FOR THE AMOUNT OF)	
_____ APPROXIMATELY \$140 MILLION TO)	
FINANCE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF)	
GREENSPACES AND TRAILS)	

WHEREAS, On July 23, 1992, through Resolution No. 92-1637, the Metro Council adopted the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan recommends Metro to place a greenspaces funding mechanism before the voters of the region to establish a regional revenue source for the acquisition and capital improvement of greenspaces; and

WHEREAS, On September 23, 1993, through Resolution No. 93-1844A, the Metro Council stated their intent to submit to voters in 1994, a general obligation bond measure for the acquisition and development of a regional greenspaces system; and

WHEREAS, On December 9, 1993, the Metro Council approved Ordinance No. 93-516A, amending the Fiscal Year 1993-94 budget to augment funding for a consultant to examine issues concerning the referral of a potential greenspaces acquisition funding measure; and

WHEREAS, On March 30, 1994, the Metropolitan Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee formally recommended a bond referral package to the Metro Council; including bond amount, election date and Phase I list of acquisition areas and trail corridors; and

WHEREAS, On May 12, 1994 the Metropolitan Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee formally recommended a bond referral package to the Metro Council, including a bond amount of ~~_____ up to approximately \$140 million,~~ and an election date of ~~___ Fall 1995,~~ and Phase I list of target acquisition areas and trail corridors; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council Regional Facilities Committee held hearings on April 20, 25, 26, 27 and May 18, 1994, to receive public testimony on whether to refer a greenspaces measure to voters, for what amount, in which election, and for which Phase I target areas and trail corridors; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby determines that a General Obligation bond of ~~___ approximately \$140~~ million shall be referred to the voters for the election held on the ~~___ day of ___, ___~~ no later than the first available election date in 1995.

2. That the Metro Council requests the continued involvement and coordination of the Greenspaces Policy Advisory Committee and Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee in refining the components of the bond package prior to Council referral of a ballot title and explanatory statement.

2 3. That Metro staff shall prepare the appropriate Resolution and Ballot Title for approval by the Council at a subsequent Council meeting for submittal to the Elections Officer and the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission, in a timely manner as required by law.

3 4. That the General Obligation bond amount shall be applied to acquisition and development of greenspaces and trail corridors ~~in the approximate configuration in Exhibit "A" attached (will be provided prior to May 18 meeting) and incorporated herein.~~

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ____ day of ____, 1994.

Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

**Possible Agenda Items for May 18, 1994
Regional Facilities Committee Meeting**

A report will be made to the Regional Facilities Committee by Conkling Fiskum McCormick consultants on the progress of the Greenspaces Blue Ribbon Committee on the matter of referring a greenspaces bond measure to the voters. The Blue Ribbon Committee is meeting on Thursday afternoon, May 12 and may formalize a recommendation to Metro Council on the referral of a bond measure. However, it is possible that they will decide that more time is required before making a recommendation. Depending on the outcome of the May 12 Blue Ribbon Committee meeting, the following agenda items may be part of the May 18, Regional Facilities Committee presentation:

- 1) Informational update on the Greenspaces BRC by Conkling Fiskum and McCormick.
- 2) Presentation of Blue Ribbon Committee Recommendation by Conkling Fiskum & McCormick.
- 3) Presentation by Parks and Greenspaces staff of staff report and draft resolution regarding bond measure referral.

If a recommendation is provided by the Blue Ribbon Committee at their May 12 meeting, a written summary of the recommendation will be provided to Council staff on May 13, 1994.

If a resolution is to be provided for the Regional Facilities Committee meeting, a written staff report and draft resolution will be provided to Council staff on May 18 or before.