

Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING NOTES: *Wednesday, August 11, 1999*
 1 to 3 p.m.
 Metro Regional Center
 Room 370 A & B

Master Planning Guidelines

Began the discussion of the comments received from GTAC in response to the draft of the Master Planning Guidelines. Discussion will be continued at the October GTAC meeting. *See enclosed Summary Minutes from GTAC Discussion on Master Planning Guidelines.*

Chapter 3 Implementation

Jennifer Budhabhatti presented the latest draft of the Year 2 work plan for more comment. Jennifer Budhabhatti presented the draft definitions for the Land Use/Land Cover mapping project. For more information or to comment further, please call Jennifer Budhabhatti at 797-1876. *See enclosed Draft Methods for Identifying Natural Areas and Land Cover Natural Area Classification System.*

Local Share Extensions

Mel Huie reported on the status of the Local Share projects. 60% of the money has been spent; 10 of 26 projects are completed. Please call Mel at 797-1731 for more information about extensions (available to December 31, 2000).

1998 Regional Parks Inventory

Jane Hart and Mark Bosworth (of Metro's Data Resource Center) presented the completed 1998 Regional Parks Inventory. Maps of local park jurisdictions were distributed for review. When the corrections are made, the inventory database and GIS graphic files will be made available. Call Jane Hart at 797-1585 for more information.

Please note: the September GTAC meeting has been cancelled

Next Meeting: *Wednesday, October 13, 1 to 3 p.m., location to be announced*

**Summary Minutes from GTAC Discussion on Master Planning Guidelines
August 11, 1999**

The following is a summary of the discussion on the June 1999 draft Master Planning Guidelines that took place at the August 11, 1999 GTAC meeting. The discussion was based on a handout (attached) that summarized the written comments on the draft guidelines that had been received by Metro Parks staff as of August 1, 1999. The discussion generally followed the guidelines in consecutive order of the sections and got as far as the beginning of Section 4. The June draft has been updated to include GTAC recommendations made by consensus at the August 11, 1999 meeting. The revised draft is attached for your review. Please be prepared to discuss and finalize the guidelines at the October GTAC meeting.

1. Issue: Site Master Planning in Context of the Regional System

Comments:

- When individual sites are being master planned, the inventory of existing conditions should be conducted in context of the surrounding landscape and the Regional System.
- There needs to be a contextual link between what is being recommended at a specific site and the Regional System.

Recommendation: See proposed text change in Section 4,A.,2.,b,1.

2. Issue: What is the definition of Regionally Significant?

Comments:

- There were several comments and questions about which parks and natural areas will be identified as 'Regionally Significant' in context of the Regional System.

Recommendation: None. GTAC will discuss the definition of 'Regionally Significant' at a future GTAC meeting.

3. Issue: Master Plan vs. Management Plan & Requirement to update existing Master Plans every 10 years.

Comments:

- Include a management plan as an alternative to preparing a master plan
- The master plan provides the vision and a management plan implements the master plan. Master plans are generally not done over; instead management plans are used to make adjustments along the way.
- Need to justify need for a new master plan and triggers (thresholds) could help address the need.
- Meeting certain thresholds would lead to a management plan and others would lead to a master plan.

- Threshold requirements for a new master plan should not be tied to timeframe but to change in use, expansion in use or new public use.
- The debate is not about if planning is needed, how to pay for it is the larger issue.
- A management plan is usually less costly.
- The suggested 10 year timeline in Section 2., A., 2. is arbitrary. What is important is to conduct planning, public involvement, site inventory, and receive formal adoption by a governing body.
- A management plan can still be needed in areas where there is no public use allowed.

Recommendation: See proposed text changes in Section 2., A., 2. and Section 3., A., 2.

4. Issue: Applicability of Guidelines

Comments:

- Metro clarified that public use includes a trail traversing a portion of a site identified as a component of the Regional System.
- Metro clarified that the planning guidelines do not apply to 'local' sites that received Metro open space bond funds assuming it is not part of the regional system.

Recommendation: None.

5. Issue: Three Year Timeframe for Compliance with Guidelines

Comments:

- Extensions to the timeframe should be allowed under certain circumstances.
- What is the hammer for not complying?
- Achieving compliance needs to be scheduled in to budgets and work plans
- What would the check point for compliance be? Periodic Review?
- Another incentive for compliance would be to create a regional funding source for preparing master plans.

Recommendation: None. Consensus was achieved on the need for extensions but no criteria were developed. Extension criteria should be recommended at the next GTAC meeting.

Summary of GTAC Comments on Draft Master Planning Guidelines
(Presented in order of section in the document that they apply to)

August 11, 1999 GTAC Meeting

General Comments

1. Rather than considering each public property independently, the work described in the Parks and Natural Areas Protection Plan should be used to identify parks that are best suited for natural area protection vs. recreation depending on the natural resources at the site, and how the site fits into the regional system.

USFWS

2. Concern about how Metro defines a regional parks system. While metro only manages part of the regional system of parks, doesn't Metro have a responsibility as a regional planning agency to *plan* for the overall system of parks in the Region? *City of Portland*

Section 2. Applicability

1. 2.A. Need refined measures for what may trigger a new master plan. May want to include a management plan category in section 2. This would be a management plan as an alternative to master plans. Management plans can be done faster and for less money than a full master plan. Appropriately structured, a management plan can establish monitoring criteria that could help decide when a master plan is required. *City of Portland*

2. 2. A. Does the definition of public use include a trail traversing a portion of a regional component, when the trail alignment was developed through a formal master plan process with public participation? *City of Tigard*

3. 2.A.1. Do the planning guidelines apply to Metro local share program acquisitions and development projects that were financed with Metro funds, or do they just apply to components of the Regional Park System? *THPRD*

4. 2.B.1. Is Metro the 'governing body' or local governments? *THPRD*

Section 3 Implementation Alternatives

5. 3.B. Compliance with 3 year requirement may be too short, especially for smaller local governments who don't have the resources. *THPRD*

6. 3.B. Provision should be made for extensions of the three year compliance period when appropriate circumstances exist. *City of Tigard*

7. 3.B. A calendar is too arbitrary as a means of deciding when to prepare a master plan or a management plan. *City of Portland*

Section 4 Master Planning Guidelines

8. 4.A.2.a.1 Recommend allowing governments to establish one project advisory committee to study all sites assisted by Metro. Individual committees for each master planned property would be an administrative nightmare. Consider allowing standing committees, which are currently in place to function in this capacity if desired by the local government (i.e., Parks Advisory Committees)

Does Metro have staff, time or interest to be involved in this process with all local governments? *THPRD*

9. 4.A.2a-h This is too minimal of a planning process for components of the regional system. It seems that it would usually prove to be an inadequate level of planning. *City of Portland*

10. 4.A.2.b. Specific guidelines and/or performance standards should be developed for this section to ensure consistency and adequate natural resource protection. Issues include protecting/restoring natural vegetation adjacent to streams and wetlands; developing Best Management Practices for park maintenance and operations; leaving snags and downed wood in place in natural areas; providing stormwater management that doesn't impact quality or quantity of runoff into natural water bodies.

Develop a policy that prohibits allowing mitigation on public property, unless the impact is to occur on site. *USFWS*

11. 4.A.2.c. What does identifying surplus land and determining alternative uses for those lands mean? *City of Portland*

12. 4.A.2.c. Who defines what is 'surplus property' and what is not? Local governments or Metro? *THPRD*

13. 4.A.2.d. SCORP is so general that it has little utility in determining demand for a particular site. An emphasis on existing use, surveys, and public input is a much surer avenue for gauging recreational need. *City of Portland*

Section 5 Definitions

14. Master Plan Add ...'and guidelines' after the word establishes in the first line of the definition. *THPRD*

15. Add surplus property to the definition section. *THPRD*

**FUNCTIONAL PLAN
FOR
COMPONENTS OF THE REGIONAL SYSTEM**

**Title ____: MASTER PLANNING FOR PUBLICLY
OWNED COMPONENTS OF THE REGIONAL SYSTEM
OF PARKS, OPEN SPACES, NATURAL AREAS, TRAILS
AND GREENWAYS**

Section 1. Intent

Establish master planning guidelines that assure:

- a. a level of consistency and continuity in the development of master plans for publicly owned components of the Regional System.
- b. consistent management, development and operation of publicly owned components of the Regional System.
- c. protection of natural resources on publicly owned components of the Regional System.

Section 2. Applicability

- A. This Title applies to publicly owned components of the Regional System where formal public use is occurring or expected to occur in the future and:
 1. A master plan does not exist.
 2. ~~A change in use, expansion in use or a new public use is being proposed to~~ A ~~an existing~~ master plan exists but ~~that~~ was adopted or updated by a governing body ~~10 years or more~~ prior to the effective date of this Title.
 3. A master plan or master plan update was completed but not formally adopted by a governing body.

- B. This Title does not apply to publicly owned components of the Regional System when:
1. Master plans have been reviewed, updated and adopted by a governing body ~~within 10 years~~ prior to the effective date of this Title.
 2. A local park master plan has been adopted pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660, Division 34, section 0040, for amending an acknowledged comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance to implement a local park master plan.
 3. Master plans for state owned park lands have been adopted pursuant to OAR 660, Div. 34, sections 0000-0035.
 4. Lands are owned by the Federal government and Metro has no jurisdiction.

Section 3. Implementation Alternatives for Cities and Counties and State

- A. Managers of publicly owned components of the Regional System shall comply with this Title by:
1. Initiating and completing a park master planning process which addresses the guidelines in section 4 of this Title prior to the development of facilities that support formal public use of the site.
- Or
2. Updating an existing park master plans ~~which have not been reviewed that was adopted~~ by a governing body ~~within ten years of prior to~~ the effective date of this Title when a change in use, expansion in use or a new public use is being proposed, the effective date of this Title. Updated master plans will address the master planning guidelines in section 4 of this Title.

Or

3. Demonstrating that a local park master plan was prepared and adopted pursuant to OAR 660, Div. 34, section 0040.

Or

4. Demonstrating that a master plan for state owned park land was prepared and adopted pursuant to OAR 660, Div. 34, sections 0000-0035.
- B. Managers of publicly owned components of the Regional System that are open to formal public use at the effective date of this Title, shall demonstrate compliance of those components with the provisions of this Title within three (3) years of the effective date of this Title.
- C. Any variation to a master plan adopted pursuant to this Title shall be incorporated by an amendment process. Amended master plans shall be consistent with the master planning guidelines in section 4 of this Title, be publicly noticed and be adopted by the same governing body that adopted the master plan.

Section 4. Master Planning Guidelines

A. Master Planning Guidelines

1. The purpose of these guidelines is to assure a level of consistency in the management of components of the Regional System for the protection of fish, wildlife, botanic, scenic and cultural values and the provision of primarily natural resource dependent recreation and education opportunities.
2. In developing a master plan, managers of components of the Regional System shall conform to the following guidelines:
 - a. **Provide Meaningful Public Involvement**
At a minimum the master planning process shall include:
 1. Establishment of an independent project advisory committee that includes but is not limited to representatives of park constituents, Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, relevant resource / planning / regulatory agencies, general public,

and local park advisory board members, or other appropriate stakeholders.

2. Creation of a project mailing list and notification to interested citizens about project information.
3. Delivery of at least two public workshops.
4. Publication of a draft master plan for public comment and review. Public review period shall last not less than 3 weeks.
5. Formal adoption by the appropriate governing body.

b. Assure Resource Protection

1. Inventory Existing Site Conditions in context of the surrounding landscape and the overall Regional System. At a minimum, describe and map existing conditions including natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources, ownership, zoning, land use regulations, topography, infrastructure and easements. If applicable, "existing conditions shall also include park facilities, visitation, budgetary and operations information.
2. Assess the occurrence, value and sensitivity of the site's natural, cultural, recreational and scenic resources.
3. Identify strategies to protect and / or enhance natural and cultural resource values
4. Identify and evaluate issues and needs and constraints and opportunities.
5. Identify management practices to protect natural, cultural and scenic resources from inappropriate use and development.
6. Identify strategies to avoid or mitigate significant impacts from adjacent land uses on site uses, facilities and resources.
7. Identify strategies to avoid or mitigate significant impacts from park use on adjacent lands.

c. Identify Surplus Property

Identify lands that are surplus to the needs of the master plan and recommendations for alternative use.

- d. Respond to Regional Recreation Demands and Trends
Master plans will be responsive to recreation demands and trends identified in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).
- e. Identify Appropriate Public Uses and Activities
Provide appropriate natural resource based recreation, education, interpretive and stewardship opportunities and related facilities at the site.
 - 1. Identify a preferred range of public opportunities.
 - 2. Identify and locate necessary site improvements to support preferred public uses.
- f. Achieve Land Use and Zoning Compatibility
Master Plan must be compatible with relevant statewide goals and laws and the relevant sections of local comprehensive plans and zoning codes.
- g. Produce Master Plan Document
At a minimum master plan document shall include sections on:
 - 1. Existing conditions
 - 2. Issues and Needs
 - 3. Resource Protection and Management
 - 4. Recommended public uses and activities
 - 5. Recommended site improvements
 - 6. Implementation
 - 7. Public Involvement
- h. Adoption
 - 1. Present draft master plan document to parks advisory board, if applicable, and appropriate governing body for approval and adoption.
 - 2. Provide Metro with a copy of the adopted master plan.

Section 5: Definitions¹

Formal Public Use – Public access and use is intentionally provided and managed by a park provider. Necessary site improvements are present to support preferred public uses.

Governing Body – The official decision making body for a local jurisdiction, park district or land owning agency.

Master Plan – The document which formally establishes direction for the development, operation, maintenance, management and programming for specific units of land assembled as part of the Regional System of parks, open space, natural areas, trails, and greenways.

Natural resource based recreation – Recreation activities which require a specific natural resource, or are customarily pursued in a predominately natural setting. Examples include, but are not necessarily limited to picnicking, camping, fishing, hiking, wildlife viewing and boating.

Regional Component – An individual park, natural area, open space, trail or greenway that is part of the overall landscape identified to be included in the Regional System.

Regional System – The interconnected system of regionally significant parks, natural areas, open spaces, trails, greenways, for wildlife, fish and people as described in Metro's Regional Framework Plan.

Surplus Property – Property within the master planning study area that is not needed to satisfy goals of the master plan.

¹ Definitions based on Greenspaces Master Plan and Park Planning Guidelines 3rd Edition (NRPA 1997)