



**METRO**

## **February GTAC Meeting Announcement**

GTAC Meeting  
Wednesday, Feb. 13, 1 to 3 p.m.  
Metro Regional Center, Room 370

### **AGENDA**

1 - 1:15  
Introductions and announcements

1:15 - 1:30  
Let's Talk Regional Conference  
Ron Klein, Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

1:30 - 2:15  
\*Parks and open space estimates for the UGB decision  
Mark Turpel, Metro Planning

2:15 - 2:45  
Completion of the Regional Greenspaces System Map  
Jennifer Budhabhatti, Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

**\*SEE ENCLOSED MEMO**



## METRO

**TO:** Charlie Ciecko, Director, Metro Parks and Greenspaces  
**FROM:** Mark Turpel, Manager, Long Range Planning  
**DATE:** January 31, 2002  
**SUBJECT:** Future Park Acquisition Estimates - GTAC Advice

---

As you know, Metro is completing its Periodic Review of the region's urban growth boundary. Every five years, Metro has the responsibility to assess the capacity of the current UGB to accommodate the next 20 years of expected growth. For this most current effort (2002-2022), the State Department of Land Conservation and Development has approved Metro's work plan that includes completion of this comparison of expected demand with existing supply by the end of the December, 2002.

One calculation in this work effort is the estimated influence of new, additional parks and open spaces on the region's supply of buildable land. We hope to be able to complete an estimate by May 1 and would like to see what suggestions GTAC might have for how to best proceed with an estimate of future (additional) parks within the Metro urban growth boundary within the timeframe of 2002 - 2022.

In estimating the impact of future parks and open space, there are several approaches that we think could be used. These include:

- 1. Project on the basis of the past.** This approach would repeat what we did in previous efforts - that is, assume 20.9 acres per 1,000 population based the region's total actual ratio. This method may overstate the actual amount likely to be added to public ownership because the 20.9 acres statistic includes Forest Park, Tryon Creek State Park, etc and assumes that future acquisitions will occur at a similar pace as past efforts. This approach also counts Metro Greenspace acquisitions outside the UGB as contributing open space for urban residents' use and are so counted in this method.
- 2. Separate out Active from Passive Parks.** Use a method similar to 1, above, but exclude the large natural tracts like Forest Park, etc. to get an estimate of historical acreage used for active open space - parks and playgrounds (rather than natural areas that are not "developed" parks with play fields, etc.). Assume that the existing ratio of active parks to residential units is provided as development occurs. This approach would let the region's fish and wildlife program in progress define the acreage set aside for natural areas.
- 3. Use Local Standards or Capabilities.** This approach would not assume any park or open space set aside unless a local government has an adopted open space standard or the Metro Council adopts a functional plan requirement requiring local governments to adopt a standard and implement it through city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances.

A variant of this approach would be to solicit from each jurisdiction their park and open space acquisition goals or fiscal capabilities concerning additional park acquisition.

Accordingly, I'd like to come to your February 13, 2002 GTAC meeting and discuss this issue. GTAC's advice would be forwarded to a Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) that has constituted a Parks and Open Space Subcommittee that is scheduled to meet on February 27. Serving on this subcommittee are: Mayor Judy Hammerstad, City of Lake Oswego, Larry Cooper, representing special districts in Multnomah County, Nathalie Darcy, Washington County citizen and Jim Zehren, Multnomah County citizen. MTAC members Mike Houck, Audubon Society and Stephan Lashbrook, City of Lake Oswego also serve on the committee.

Thank you for your consideration of the above. I look forward to GTAC's discussion and advice.

c: Andy Cotugno  
Mike Hogle  
Dennis Yee



## METRO

**TO:** Charlie Ciecko, Director, Metro Parks and Greenspaces  
**FROM:** Mark Turpel, Manager, Long Range Planning  
**DATE:** January 31, 2002  
**SUBJECT:** Future Park Acquisition Estimates - GTAC Advice

---

As you know, Metro is completing its Periodic Review of the region's urban growth boundary. Every five years, Metro has the responsibility to assess the capacity of the current UGB to accommodate the next 20 years of expected growth. For this most current effort (2002-2022), the State Department of Land Conservation and Development has approved Metro's work plan that includes completion of this comparison of expected demand with existing supply by the end of the December, 2002.

One calculation in this work effort is the estimated influence of new, additional parks and open spaces on the region's supply of buildable land. We hope to be able to complete an estimate by May 1 and would like to see what suggestions GTAC might have for how to best proceed with an estimate of future (additional) parks within the Metro urban growth boundary within the timeframe of 2002 - 2022.

In estimating the impact of future parks and open space, there are several approaches that we think could be used. These include:

- 1. Project on the basis of the past.** This approach would repeat what we did in previous efforts - that is, assume 20.9 acres per 1,000 population based the region's total actual ratio. This method may overstate the actual amount likely to be added to public ownership because the 20.9 acres statistic includes Forest Park, Tryon Creek State Park, etc and assumes that future acquisitions will occur at a similar pace as past efforts. This approach also counts Metro Greenspace acquisitions outside the UGB as contributing open space for urban residents' use and are so counted in this method.
- 2. Separate out Active from Passive Parks.** Use a method similar to 1, above, but exclude the large natural tracts like Forest Park, etc. to get an estimate of historical acreage used for active open space - parks and playgrounds (rather than natural areas that are not "developed" parks with play fields, etc.). Assume that the existing ratio of active parks to residential units is provided as development occurs. This approach would let the region's fish and wildlife program in progress define the acreage set aside for natural areas.
- 3. Use Local Standards or Capabilities.** This approach would not assume any park or open space set aside unless a local government has an adopted open space standard or the Metro Council adopts a functional plan requirement requiring local governments to adopt a standard and implement it through city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances. A variant of this approach would be to solicit from each jurisdiction their park and open space acquisition goals or fiscal capabilities concerning additional park acquisition.

Accordingly, I'd like to come to your February 13, 2002 GTAC meeting and discuss this issue. GTAC's advice would be forwarded to a Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) that has constituted a Parks and Open Space Subcommittee that is scheduled to meet on February 27. Serving on this subcommittee are: Mayor Judy Hammerstad, City of Lake Oswego, Larry Cooper, representing special districts in Multnomah County, Nathalie Darcy, Washington County citizen and Jim Zehren, Multnomah County citizen. MTAC members Mike Houck, Audubon Society and Stephan Lashbrook, City of Lake Oswego also serve on the committee.

Thank you for your consideration of the above. I look forward to GTAC's discussion and advice.

c: Andy Cotugno  
Mike Hogleund  
Dennis Yee



**METRO**

**TO:** MPAC Parks Subcommittee  
**FROM:** Mark Turpel  
**DATE:** February 13, 2002  
**SUBJECT:** Additional requested information

---

Attached please find a copy of the following:

**1. The Most Recent Acreage** The latest park acreage figures ( table titled "Open Space By Type within the Metro UGB - January 2002"

By way of illustration, some examples of "Private Parks" are:

- Keller Woodlands owned by Nature Conservancy
- Dawson Creek Park owned by Dawson Creek Park Owners

Examples of "Private Open Space" are:

- land owned by Oregon Parks Foundation
- Bronson Creek Estates Open Space owned by Bronson Creek Homeowners
- Cedar Mills owned by Wetlands Conservancy
- Nike Campus Open Space owned by Nike

It should also be noted that public and private school lands are not included in this table as they are accounted for separately in Metro's Urban Growth Report. However, they are part of Metro's parks and open space coverage data layer and do provide additional open space.

**2. Long Term Past Acreage** Data from 1977 from the Urban Growth Boundary Findings showing the number of acres of parks and open spaces for each county and for the whole urban growth boundary (14,926 acres within the area proposed in 1977 as the region's urban growth boundary). Members had asked that we go back for a twenty-year period for data to provide more perspective. This is the only region-wide park acreage data of this vintage of which I am aware.

Comparing the 1977 data (about 14, 926 acres) with the 2002 data (26,380 acres), it shows roughly a difference of about 11,454 acres, assuming that the data are identifying "parks and open space" in the exact same way. This averages to be about 458 acres per year added within the region's urban growth boundary over this 25 year period.

### **3. GTAC Advice**

The Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee (GTAC), composed of local government park planners met today and discussed the three identified approaches. While there was not one perspective, there was an extensive discussion of options. Following is a summary of GTAC comments.

**Project on the basis of the past.** Many GTAC members supported this approach. The past ratio - 20.9 acres per acre - was seen as a level below which the region shouldn't drop. Many expressed concern that if option 2 or 3 were used, some might use a lower ratio out of context and confuse an aspirational goal with actual numbers. That is, if a lesser number were used, some might propose that the lower ratio is all that needs to be achieved. Others suggested that the current ratio should be used, but that a higher aspirational ratio should be identified and a lower ratio was what was currently being financed - just like transportation planning. Still others supported the ratio (20.9) but asked what was the need - that it could be substantially higher. Some suggested that the higher aspirational goal might be informed by national standards. Others also suggested that the current ratio should be maintained within the current UGB, but in areas newly added to the UGB, a higher standard should be established because the outlying areas were more hilly and areas like Forest Park, Powell Butte, etc. were needed as additional open space to provide a view of greenspaces and so that residents didn't feel like urban development went on indefinitely.

**Separate Out Active from Passive Parks** GTAC members recognized that active parks often required "developable" lands (flat lands for ball fields, etc.), and that natural areas could and often were less developable lands (steep slopes, streams, etc.). Some suggested that lands owned by the public as "people places" - not just unusable areas left over from development - should be addressed.

**Use Local Standards or Capabilities** Members recognized that local System Development Charges (SDC's) were available to buy additional parks and open spaces. As part of the work needed to approve SDC's local governments put together a land acquisition forecast. Some suggested that these should be gathered from the local governments and used as a basis for an estimation. It was pointed out that the SDC's, by law, could only keep a current ratio and could not address deficits, that they only covered a portion of total costs and that they did not address land price increases.

#### Other GTAC Comments

**Combine All Three Methods** - Some GTAC members suggested that the three methods all had strengths and weaknesses and by combining them a better estimate could be obtained.

**Consider Federal Purchases.** - It was pointed out the Federal Government was planning additions to the wildlife refuge in the Sherwood/Tualatin area.

**Use State Survey** - a new State survey of parks and open space has been completed and could help inform the process.

**Fill Any Gaps with a Regional SDC** - Some suggested that where there was a gap between the region-wide level and local park ratio, a regional SDC surcharge should be explored to help ensure that in the long run the gap would be addressed.

**Double Edged Sword.** - Some indicated that the question was difficult to answer as an estimate of the amount of estimated future parks provided no guarantees that additional parks would actually be acquired and that it could be that the region's UGB was expanded, in part to accommodate new parks, but the reality could be that few additional new parks might be added.



# URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY FINDINGS

---

**Metropolitan Service District**  
November, 1979

---

Public and Semi-Public Land Requirements

Public and Semi-Public Lands include:

Semi-public (schools, city and county courthouses and other government owned structures (including state and federal), airports, hospitals, etc.)

Railroad and Freeway Rights-of-Way

Streets

Parks and Open Space

Following is the acreage of public and semi-public land for each county compared to existing urban-developed private lands (residential, commercial and industrial lands net of all public streets and rights-of-way).

Table 6  
Public, Semi-Public Land Use

Multnomah County

	1977 <u>Acres</u>	% of <u>Private</u>
Private land	42,366.1	--
Public, Semi-Public	34,886.2	82.3
Semi-Public	6,125.0	14.5
R.R. & Freeway ROW	2,159.3	5.1
Streets	15,401.4	36.3
Parks & Open Space	11,200.5	26.4

Washington County

	1977 <u>Acres</u>	% of <u>Private</u>
Private land	21,104.2	
Public, Semi-Public	11,010.9	52.2
Semi-Public	2,984.4	14.1
RR & Freeway ROW	726.3	3.4
Streets	5,718.8	27.1
Parks & Open Space	1,581.4	7.5

### Clackamas County

	<u>1977 Acres</u>	<u>% of Private</u>
Private land	16,547.8	
Public, Semi-Public	9,661.8	58.4
Semi-Public	2,158.4	13.0
RR & Freeway R&O	656.9	4.0
Streets	4,702.6	28.4
Parks & Open Space	2,143.9	13.0

### Total Oregon--UGB

	<u>1977 Acres</u>	<u>% of Private</u>
Private land	80,018.1	
Public, Semi-Public	55,558.9	69.4
Semi-Public	11,267.8	14.1
RR & Freeway ROW	3,542.5	4.4
Streets	25,822.8	32.2
Parks & Open Space	14,925.8	18.7

Source: Columbia Region Association of Governments, "Land Use Inventory," 1977, unpublished.

Growth of public and semi-public land area is projected to decline, particularly in the semi-public and parks and open space categories.

Approximately 16 percent of the total regional semi-public land is the Portland International Airport which is not expected to increase appreciably in land area. It would not be appropriate to assume growth in semi-public land use to increase proportionately to private land development.

Parks and open space includes the 3,750 acre Forest Park in Portland, 25 percent of the region's parks and open space. Additional parks of this size are not expected to be developed by the year 2000.

Subtracting these areas from the regional total reduces the ratio of public, semi-public land to private developed land from 0.694-to-1, to 0.624-to-1.

Continued expansion of freeways and railroad rights-of-way also seems unlikely. In the last decade, many proposed freeways, including the now-defunct Mt. Hood Freeway, have been abandoned in lieu of future mass-transit options. Also, with expected increases in land-use densities, fewer residential streets will be required. For



## Urban Forestry Summit 2002 ~ Developing Green Infrastructure

# DISCOVER HOW URBAN TREES HELP CONTRIBUTE TO LIVABLE AND HEALTHY ENVIRONMENTS FOR PEOPLE AND WILDLIFE

Holiday Inn ♦ Wilsonville, Oregon ♦ Friday, March 8, 2002

### PROGRAM

- |       |   |       |   |
|-------|---|-------|---|
| 8:00  | Registration  | 12:00 | Lunch (included with your registration)   |
| 9:00  | <b>Welcome and Opening Remarks</b><br><i>Ric Catron, President</i><br>Oregon Community Trees<br>Parks Planner, Gresham Parks and Recreation   |       | <b>Oregon Community Trees' 2001 Urban and Community Forestry Awards – Announcement of Recipients</b><br><i>Mark Choitz, Awards Committee Chair</i><br>Oregon Community Trees                    |
| 9:10  | <b>KEYNOTE</b><br><b>The Human Benefits of Urban Forests</b><br><i>Dr. Kathleen L. Wolf, Research Assistant Professor at the Center for Urban Horticulture, University of Washington</i>  | 1:30  | <b>A Tree Technical Manual From Planning to Preservation</b><br><i>Dave Dockter, Planning Dept. Arborist</i><br>City of Palo Alto, California   |
| 10:10 | <b>Enhancing Livability Through Community Trees-A Local Perspective</b><br><i>Charlotte Lehan, Mayor</i><br>City of Wilsonville   | 2:10  | <b>Metro's Green Streets Handbook</b><br><i>Tom Kloster, Transportation Planning Manager, Metro</i>   |
| 10:30 | Break   | 2:40  | Break   |
| 10:50 | <b>The Urban Forest Canopy, Seeing The Forest &amp; The Trees: For Fish, Wildlife and People</b><br><i>Mike Houck, Urban Naturalist, Audubon Society of Portland and Chair, Natural Resources Working Group, Coalition for a Livable Future</i> | 3:00  | <b>The Importance of Urban Trees in Salmon Recovery</b><br><i>Jim Middaugh, Endangered Species Act Program Manager, City of Portland</i>  |
| 11:20 | <b>Portland's Heritage Trees</b><br><i>Phyllis Reynolds, Co-Author</i><br><u>Trees of Greater Portland</u>  | 3:30  | <b>CAPSTONE</b><br><b>Benefits and Costs of Urban Trees in the Pacific Northwest</b><br><i>James R. Geiger, Director of Communications, Center for Urban Forest Research, Davis, California</i> |
|       |   | 4:15  | Adjourn   |



## Urban Forestry Summit 2002 ~ Developing Green Infrastructure

### INFORMATION

#### Registration

The conference fee for OCT members is **\$65**. The fee for non-members is **\$95** (includes individual membership in OCT for the year 2002). **After February 28**, the registration fee is **\$105** for all attendees. Fee includes instruction, handout materials, lunch, and refreshments. To register, complete and return the attached registration form with the fee, or contact the Conference Coordinator, PNW-ISA at 503/874-8263. Checks should be made payable to PNW-ISA. Purchase orders, VISA and MasterCard are accepted. For additional registration forms, visit the OCT web page, [www.odf.state.or.us/fa/uf/oct/index.html](http://www.odf.state.or.us/fa/uf/oct/index.html). CEUs are available for ISA Certified Arborists.

#### Location

The 2002 Summit is being held at the Holiday Inn in Wilsonville, Oregon on Friday, March 8, 2002.

**Driving Directions:** From the north: I-5 southbound towards SALEM, exit 286N WILSONVILLE/STAFFORD, right off exit, left at the next light (SW 95<sup>th</sup> Ave). The Holiday Inn is on the left. From the south: I-5 northbound, exit 286N WILSONVILLE/STAFFORD, left from the off-ramp, left at the 2<sup>nd</sup> light (SW 95<sup>th</sup> Ave). The Holiday Inn is on the left (25425 SW 95<sup>th</sup> Avenue).

#### Lodging

A block of rooms are reserved with the Holiday Inn in Wilsonville at the rate of \$59.00/night (single or double). To make reservations, call Holiday Inn at 503/682-2211. Visit [www.holidayinnselect.pdx.citysearch.com](http://www.holidayinnselect.pdx.citysearch.com) for more info.

**Exhibit Space is Available!** Reserve your space today!

**Questions?** Contact Rob Crouch at 503/823-4443 [rcrouch@ci.portland.or.us](mailto:rcrouch@ci.portland.or.us) or Chris Neamtzu at 503/682-4960, [neamtzu@ci.wilsonville.or.us](mailto:neamtzu@ci.wilsonville.or.us).



## Urban Forestry Summit 2002 ~ Developing Green Infrastructure

### REGISTRATION FORM (ONE ATTENDEE PER FORM PLEASE)

Attendees Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title & Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Work Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

#### FEES

\_\_\_ \$65 FOR OCT INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBER.

I have previously paid my individual OCT dues for 2002 (\$30).

We have previously paid our organizational OCT dues for 2002 (\$100).

We are sending our organizational dues for 2002 (**\$100**) with this registration.

Name of Organization \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ \$95 FOR NON MEMBER (INCLUDES OCT INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP FOR 2002).

\_\_\_ \$105 AFTER FEBRUARY 28 (ALL ATTENDEES).

**TOTAL ENCLOSED \$** \_\_\_\_\_

#### METHOD OF PAYMENT

\_\_\_ Check payable to PNW-ISA \_\_\_\_\_ Purchase Order #: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Visa \_\_\_ MasterCard Account # \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. Date \_\_\_\_\_

Printed name as it appears on the card \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

MAIL TO: **PNW-ISA, OCT SUMMIT REGISTRATION, PO BOX 811, SILVERTON, OR 97381**

FAX TO: **503/ 874-1509**

### Open Space By Type within the Metro UGB - January 2002

Ownership	Open Space Type	Acres
private	Park	130
public	Park	16,321
private	Open space	188
public	Open space	3,310
private	Common area of a subdivision or condominium complex.	1,323
public	Common area of a subdivision or condominium complex.	67
private	Cemetery	904
public	Cemetery	510
private	Golf course	1,394
public	Golf course	1,669
public	Pool	18
private	Tennis Courts	6
public	Tennis Courts	9
private	Fairgrounds/stadium use	21
public	Fairgrounds/stadium use	89
private	Community center	11
public	Community center	336
private	Trail/Path	4
public	Trail/Path	57
public	Community Garden	12
<b>Total</b>		<b>26,380</b>

Source: Metro DRC J.O. Price 2/11/02

Table 1

Allocation of Buildable Land Needed to be Set Aside in the Metro Region to Maintain "Status Quo" of Park and Related Lands and Facilities, 1998-2017, by Jurisdiction, Based on Allocation of Housing Targets in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

(Source: MPAC Parks Subcommittee, Final Report, April, 2001)

Jurisdiction	New Park Acres	Percent of Total Housing	Housing Target
Beaverton	228	6.2%	15,021
Cornelius	15	0.4%	1,019
Durham	4	0.1%	262
Fairview	44	1.2%	2,921
Forest Grove	44	1.2%	2,873
Gladstone	9	0.2%	600
Gresham	255	6.9%	16,817
Happy Valley	31	0.8%	2,030
Hillsboro	225	6.1%	14,812
Johnson City	3	0.1%	168
King City	3	0.1%	182
Lake Oswego	51	1.4%	3,353
Maywood Park	0	0.0%	27
Milwaukie	53	1.4%	3,514
Oregon City	93	2.5%	6,157
Portland	1,072	29.0%	70,704
River Grove	0	0.0%	0
Sherwood	76	2.1%	5,010
Tigard	92	2.5%	6,073
Troutdale	57	1.6%	3,789
Tualatin	55	1.5%	3,635
West Linn	39	1.1%	2,577
Wilsonville	67	1.8%	4,425
Wood Village	6	0.2%	423
Clackamas County	296	8.0%	19,530
Multnomah County	47	1.3%	3,089
Washington County	834	22.5%	54,999
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,700</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>244,010</b>

Other Park Statistics

In 1999, inside the Metro urban growth boundary there were:

3,086 acres of open space owned by Metro

23,336 acres of open space owned by local governments

for a total of 26,422 acres of publicly owned open space within the Metro urban growth boundary.

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*please sign in . . .*

name	organization
RIC CATRON	CITY of GRESHAM
Barbara Fayer	City of Beaverton
Lisa Hamerlynk	Lake Oswego
Joann Herrigel	city of Milwaukie



GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*please sign in . . .*

name	organization
Jim Sjulian	PORTLAND PARKS
KEN WORCESTER	CITY OF WEST Linn
Liane Roberts	City of Tigard
Dee Chaeoy	COC PARK



February 13, 2002

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*please sign in . . .*

name	organization
Mary Swanson	Clackamas County
Michelle Healy	N. Clackamas Parks & Rec
Joanne Rice	Washington County
Chris Neunger	C of Wilsonville
Julie Reilly	Tualatin Hills Park & Rec.
Dawn Hartman	THPRD
Deb Lev	Portland Parks
Jennifer Thompson	U.S. FWS
S.A. Talbot	Hillsboro