GTAC Meeting Notice

To: Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee

When:

August 11, 1999 Wednesday 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Where:

Metro Regional Center 600 NE Grand Ave Portland, OR 97232 Room 370 A & B

AGENDA

1	Master Planning Guidelines√ Discussion, possible decision 	Jane Hart	1:00 – 1:30 pm	30 min.
2	 Chapter 3 Implementation Wrap up discussion: Year 2 work plan Presentation of draft definitions: Land Use/Land Cover mapping 	Jennifer Budhabhatti	1:30 – 1:45 pm 1:45 – 2:05 pm	15 min. 20 min.
3	Local Share Extensions	Mel Huie	2:05 – 2:25 pm	20 min.
4	1999 Regional Parks Inventory Presentation 	Jane Hart & Mark Bosworth	2:25 – 2:45 pm	20 min.

YOU ARE INVITED!!!!

Dennis Machida, executive officer with the California Tahoe Conservancy, will be giving a slide show/talk on **non-regulatory strategies to protect natural resources in Lake Tahoe** on August 19, 1999 at a brown bag lunch from 12 to 1:30 pm, at the Metro Regional Center, in Room 370 A and B.

The California Conservancy has acquired 5,500 parcels totaling 7,000 acres, completed more than 350 erosion control, and resource restoration projects. The conservancy has spent \$5 million to acquire more than 1.2 million square feet of impervious surface and has restored one-third of this land. The program has restored 1,500 acres of critical habitat lands and 20 miles of streams for riparian and fisheries habitat enhancement. Their accomplishments are endless....

Come find out from the executive director why the conservancy is successful in protecting natural resources? What are their strategies and funding structure to accomplish this successful program?

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. <u>2.A.</u> 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. <u>2. A.</u> 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. <u>2.A.1.</u> 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. <u>2.B.1.</u> Is Metro the 'governing body' or local governments? *THPRD*

Section 3 Implementation Alternatives

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

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

1

7. <u>3.B.</u> 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. <u>4.A.2.a.1</u> 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. <u>4.A.2a-h</u> 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. <u>4.A.2.b.</u> 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. <u>4.A.2.c.</u> What does identifying surplus land and determining alternative uses for those lands mean? *City of Portland*

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

13. <u>4.A.2.d.</u> 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. <u>Master Plan</u> Add ...'and guidelines' after the word establishes in the first line of the definition. *THPRD*

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

Land Cover Natural Area Classification System (April 6, 1999)

Water. This class includes major rivers, lakes, ponds, reservoirs, bays and other standing water. Minor streams are not included. The water class will be developed directly from Metro's existing hydrology data.

Barren and Sparsely Vegetated. The barren land class includes bare ground, sand, gravel, asphalt, structures, rock, and other media supporting less than 15% vegetated cover and less than 10% trees. Agricultural cover types are not included in this category.

Agriculture

Agricultural land is broadly defined as land used for production of food and fiber. Areas supporting scattered farm houses and other associated buildings and improvements will generally be included within the Agriculture class. There are two agricultural classes based on the relative degree of structure provided by the component vegetation.

Low Structure Agriculture

This includes pasture and other cultivated cropland with limited vegetative structure.

High Structure Agriculture

This includes agricultural areas with a relatively high degree of vegetative structure such as orchards, groves, vinyards, canes, nurseries, Christmas trees, etc.

Forest, Shrubland or Meadows

This category includes forest (10% crown closure of trees 15' in height), shrubland (15% woody canopy cover; <10% crown closure of trees 15' in height) and meadows that are exclusive of agricultural uses.

Forest (10% crown closure of trees 15' in height)

The forest types are defined as having at least 10 percent tree crown closure of trees greater than 15 feet in height, exclusive of nursery crops, Christmas trees and orchards. Forests are further classified by relative crown closure (Closed Canopy, Open Canopy, Scattered Canopy) and percent cover of deciduous versus coniferous trees (Deciduous, Conifer, Mixed). Recently harvested or clearcut forest land with less than 10% tree crown closure and less than 15% woody canopy will be classed as Meadow/Grass. Older clearcuts with advanced regeneration of trees and shrubs are generally found in the Shrub classes.

Closed Canopy. Forest areas with 75% total tree crown closure.

Deciduous Closed Canopy Forest. Closed canopy forest areas with 70% of total crown closure in Deciduous trees.

Mixed Closed Canopy Forest. Closed canopy forest areas with < 70% of total crown closure in Deciduous and < 70% total crown closure in Conifer trees.

Conifer Closed Canopy Forest. Closed canopy forest areas with 70% of total crown closure in Conifer trees.

Open Canopy. Forest areas with 25% total tree crown closure and <75% total tree crown closure.

Deciduous Open Canopy Forest. Open canopy forest areas with 70% of total crown closure in Deciduous trees.

Mixed Open Canopy Forest. Open canopy forest areas with < 70% of total crown closure in Deciduous and < 70% of total crown closure in Conifer trees.

Conifer Open Canopy Forest. Open canopy forest areas with 70% of total crown closure in Conifer trees.

Scattered Canopy. Forest areas with < 25% total tree crown closure, and 10% total tree crown closure.

Deciduous Scattered Canopy Forest. Scattered canopy forest areas with 70% of total crown closure in Deciduous trees.

Mixed Scattered Canopy Forest. Scattered canopy forest areas with < 70% total crown closure in Deciduous and < 70% of total crown closure in Conifer trees.

Conifer Scattered Canopy Forest. Scattered canopy forest areas with 70% of total crown closure in Conifer trees.

Shrub. Areas with 15% woody canopy cover; and < 10% crown closure of trees 15' in height)

The Shrub class is defined as having at least 15 percent crown closure in woody canopy cover such as shrubs or trees, and less than 10 percent tree crown closure of trees greater than 15 feet in height. The shrub class may, therefore, include young deciduous or coniferous trees. While recently harvested or clearcut forest land with less than 10% tree crown closure and less than 15% woody canopy remaining are generally labeled as meadow/grass, clearcuts with advanced regeneration of trees and shrubs are often labled as Shrub. The Shrub classes are exclusive of any agricultural types such as nursery crops, Christmas trees and orchards. The three Shrub classes are defined by relative crown closure (Closed Canopy, Open Canopy, Scattered Canopy)

Closed Canopy Shrub. Shrub areas with 75% total shrub/tree crown closure)

Open Canopy Shrub. Shrub areas with 25% total shrub/tree crown closure, and <75% total crown closure)

Scattered Canopy. Shrub areas with < 25% total shrub/tree crown closure, and 10% crown closure)

Meadow/Grass. Areas with 15% vegetative cover; < 15% woody canopy cover and < 10% tree cover. The Meadow/grass class is defined as having at least 15 percent vegetative cover but less than 15 percent crown closure in woody canopy cover such as shrubs or trees and less than 10% cover in trees. This class includes natural meadows or other areas covered by grasses, blackberries, ferns or herbs. This class does not include agricultural types other than areas used for grazing, but may include mowed grassy areas including parks and lawns.

Land Cover Map Classes

- 1. Water
- 2. Barren and Sparsely Vegetated
- 3. Low Structure Agriculture
- 4. High Structure Agriculture
- .5. Deciduous Closed Canopy Forest
- 6. Mixed Closed Canopy Forest
- 7. Conifer Closed Canopy Forest
- 8. Deciduous Open Canopy Forest
- 9. Mixed Open Canopy Forest
- 10. Conifer Open Canopy Forest
- 11. Deciduous Scattered Canopy Forest
- 12. Mixed Scattered Canopy Forest
- 13. Conifer Scattered Canopy Forest
- 14. Closed Canopy Shrub
- 15. Open Canopy Shrub
- 16. Scattered Canopy Shrub
- 17. Meadow/Grass

Urban Land Use Classification Scheme

The Urban classes include areas of intensive use with land generally covered by structures and dense road networks. Included in this class are cities, towns, strip developments, commercial and industrial complexes, and recreational areas and other land types that are essentially dedicated to urban uses. This class is intended to capture relatively extensive areas dedicated to residential or other urban uses. The urban category is subdivided into four classes: (1) Residential; (2) Low Density Residential; (3) Commercial/industrial; and (4) Other urban/developed.

Residential. Includes high-density urban areas dominated by residential dwellings with a density of less than 5 acres per house with a total minimum area of 10 acres. This class also includes schools, churches, cemeteries and other institutional uses that are part of or contiguous to residential communities.

Low Density Residential. Includes low density development between 5 and 20 acres per house clustered in areas greater than 80 acres in size.

Commercial/Industrial. Urban areas dominated by commercial and/or industrial uses.

Other Urban/developed. This class includes golf courses, cemeteries, recreational parks and other intensive uses that are isolated from urban centers defined by one of the three classes above.

Draft Methods for Identifying Natural Areas

Objective: Identify potential natural areas from the Land Cover map, rank their relative value as natural areas based on a limited set of adjacency characteristics, and use the natural area values to select a set of core natural areas.

Process: We will use a Five-step technical process outlined in the framework below. The specifics of this framework need to be refined through testing and adjustment. We propose to conduct a pilot possibly based on some of the completed parts of the land cover map currently under development, and suggest a close working relationship with Metro through the pilot – particularly around Steps 4 and 5 below.

- Step 1 All of the forest, shrub and meadow/grass types will be extracted from the Land Cover pixel map and classified as potential natural areas, to the exclusion of all other cover types. [Reasoning: although some natural areas may eventually include non-vegetated classes, it is the vegetated types that define the primary context for natural areas]
- Step 2 Any isolated barren areas and areas of water that fall within potential natural areas will be brought back in and clumped with the potential natural areas. [Reasoning: much of the barren areas on the Land Cover map will be pavement, buildings and other non-natural cover, but some small natural rock outcrops or other barren spots, as well as water bodies, may be components of larger natural areas within the context of forest, shrub or meadow types.]
- Step 3 Isolated pixels within the potential natural area set that form islands or units that are less then 2 acres in size will be sieved out. [Reasoning: 2 acres is the minimum mapping unit for natural areas. Eliminating these isolated pixels will reduce considerably potential confusion -- from urban street trees in particular.]
- Step 4 Individual pixels within the potential natural area set will be assigned ratings along several parameters that effect their relative value as natural areas. Values assigned may be positive or negative based on the effect on natural area value. These values may be summed as a natural area value index.
 - Proximity to roads, or road density (higher negative values will correspond to higher road density or proximity).
 - Proximity to urban land use types derived from the Urban Land Use layer (high density residential will receive higher negative values than low density, and negative values will decrease with greater distance)
 - Proximity to streams and water bodies (higher positive values will correspond to higher proximity to streams and water).
 - Proximity to selected types within the Natural Heritage Database (pending availability and review of data).

[Reasoning: these are some of the primary factors that affect the relative value of forest, shrub, and meadow/grass types as natural areas. The resulting natural area value index provides an opportunity to select a subset of potential natural areas based on a range of their relative value.]

Step 5 The natural area value index will be used to exclude pixels with low ratings (what "low" means will be determined by iterative testing along the index scale), and to identify a set of "core" natural areas. This process will eliminate most small potential natural areas that have too many overwhelming negative attributes (proximity to roads and high-density urban areas). It may also have a tendency to eliminate the edges of some core natural areas. Nonetheless, these edge pixels will be brought back in based on their adjacency to the core areas.



DRA

Goal: To protect plant and wildlife biodiversity and provide citizens access to nature.

Objectives:

DRAFT

疥

- To inventory, analyze, map and protect an interconnected system of parks, natural areas, trails and greenways for fish, wildlife and people.
- To adopt a Parks and Natural Areas Protection Plan (Metro functional plan) that will consist of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to protect the system. Regulatory tools include Goal 5, title 3 and other related regulatory measures. Non regulatory tools include acquisition, conservation easements, education and other appropriate tools.

PHASE II – FY 1999-2000

Policy Background:

Chapter 3 of the Regional Framework Plan gives Metro the policy direction to continue pursuing the goals of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan by developing a Parks and Natural Areas Protection Plan. The Plan will be implemented using regulatory and non-regulatory standards, guidelines and recommendations for protecting regionally significant sites, corridors and trails, and by developing a plan to finance the protection and management of regional sites.

Project Background:

The project has been divided into three phases. This outlines the highlights of Phase II of a three-year project.

Phase I: In Phase I, (FY 1998-99), the Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces staff worked with the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee (GTAC) to identify a planning boundary, initiate an inventory of parks and natural areas inside that boundary, and to develop a compendium of regulatory and non-regulatory policies used locally, nationally and internationally to protect natural resources. Metro's consultants are using satellite imagery, in conjunction with aerial photo-interpretation, to map the forest canopy, land cover, land use and natural areas inside the planning boundary.

Phase II: In Phase II, (FY 1999-00), products will be developed and reviewed by Metro staff and a technical team consisting of GTAC members, non profit, state and federal natural resource agencies (among others). These products will be reviewed by the following:

- Technical groups such as GTAC and Goal5 technical committee, if appropriate
- Policy bodies such as Metro Policy Advisory Committee and Metro Council
- Public groups, including Metro citizen advisory committees and the general public.

The Metro Council adopts the Regional System Map by resolution.

Phase III: In Phase III, (FY 2000-01), public workshops will be conducted for four to five "pilot" areas identified in the Regional System Map. These workshops will test application of regulatory and non-regulatory tools for protecting regional system components. The results

generated through these workshops and Phase II products will provide the basis for the Parks and Natural Areas Protection Plan (Metro functional plan).

3

Tasks/ Products/Timelines for Phase II

Task 1: Review the policy compendium document.

Metro staff and the technical team will highlight the results of the policy compendium and other policy related recommendations from the Regional Goal 5 workshops to identify preferred strategies for protecting natural resources in the Portland Metropolitan area.

- **Product**: A technical document recommending a range of regulatory and non-regulatory strategies for protecting regionally significant natural resources.
- Timeline : July November, 1999

Task 2: Review and analyze natural area maps for habitat-wildlife relationships. Metro Parks and Greenspaces, United States Fish and Wildlife (USFWS), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and the Oregon Natural Heritage Program will map natural areas with high habitat value and associated potential presence of wildlife. USFWS and ODFW are funding this task with Metro providing base maps and technical assistance.

- **Product**: GIS map layers identifying at-risk wildlife species habitat within the regional boundary study area, including areas that aid in supporting viable populations and/or provide linkages to other habitat and a report summarizing the methods used to accomplish the process.
- **Timeline:** August November, 1999

Task 3: Define and map existing regionally significant natural areas, open spaces, trails, corridors and parks.

Using existing definitions of "regionally significant" from the Greenspaces Master Plan, "regionally significant sites" will be mapped. In addition, the definition of "regionally significant" will be refined and new areas will be mapped using GIS modeling.

- **Product**: Revised definition for "regionally significant". Database and map of regionally significant natural areas, open spaces, parks, trails, corridors and wildlife connections.
- Timeline: September November, 1999

Task 4: Identify areas that are "deficient" in regionally significant natural areas, parks, open spaces, and areas that lack connectivity for wildlife and people.

Develop criteria to determine areas with a "deficiency" in regional sites and connections. These criteria will be used to map "deficiencies" using GIS modeling.

- Product: Definition for "deficiency". Maps will illustrate "deficiency areas".
- **Timeline**: November 1999 February 2000

Task 5: Identify opportunities and constraints that relate to the Regional System

Inventory and map existing information on opportunity areas such as trails, brownfields, utility corridors, and abandoned roads. Areas identified as "deficient" (Task 4) will be the focus of studies for opportunity areas. Restoration opportunities will also be identified using current and historic vegetation maps. Constraints such as transportation corridors and proposed urban expansion areas and development sites will be identified and mapped.

- **Product:** Maps and associated database showing potential opportunity areas, restoration opportunities and constrained sites.
- **Timeline**: October 1999 February 2000

Task 6: Identify and map the "Regional System".

Metro staff and technical team will generate regional scale maps showing existing and potential regional sites for fish, wildlife and people. These maps will be presented to the general public for input and comment and then forwarded to the Metro Council.

- **Product:** A Regional System Map and associated database will be generated through this process. Maps will be refined to depict the public's input for regionally significant sites and corridors. Public comments will be documented.
- Timeline: March June, 2000



RECREATION DISTRICT administration office

15707 S.W. Walker Road • Beaverton, Oregon 97006 • 645-6433 • Fax 690-9649

July 8, 1999

Ms. Jane Hart Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces 600 NE Grand Avenue Portland, OR 97232-2736

Re: Review Comments on the Master Planning Guidelines

(IALATIN

દ

Dear Ms. Hart: June,

Per your request at our last GTAC Meeting I would like to offer THPRD's comments on the referenced document. Overall, this is a very good document. Please allow me to share some questions and suggestions which are of concern to us.

- 1. Do the planning guidelines apply to Local Share Program acquisition and development projects that we financed with Metro funds, or do they just apply to components of the Regional Park System?
- 2. What is the Regional System? We consider it to be Metro owned sites only, and not local parks. Please clarify further in Section 5.
- 3. Section 2.B.1 Please clarify whom this refers to when you state "reviewed, updated and adopted by a governing body....." Is Metro the governing body? Local governments?
- 4. Section 3.B Compliance with the 3 year requirement may be too short. We've got the resources to do the planning, but I'm not sure we can make it within that time frame. What about the smaller local governments who don't have the resources? They may not even get off the ground to start the planning process within 3 years.
- 5. Section 4.A.2.a.1 We suggest allowing local governments to establish one project advisory committee to study all sites assisted by Metro. Individual committees for each different site will be an administrative nightmare. Please consider allowing standing committees which are currently in place to function in this capacity if desired by the local government (such as our Nature Park or Trails Advisory Committees).
- Lastly Does Metro have the staff, time or interest to be involved in this process? This will be very time consuming.
- 6. Section 4.A.2.a.5 Please again clarify who the governing body adopting the plan will be.
- 7. Section 4.A.2.c Who defines what is "surplus property" and what is not? Local governments or Metro?
- 8. Section 5 Please consider adding the underlined to the following sentence: The document which formally establishes direction <u>and guidelines</u> for the development, operation, maintenance, management and programing.......greenways.
- 9. Section 5 Please consider adding "Surplus Property" to your list of definitions.

Again, this is a good document. I hope our comments are helpful, and we thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Bosak, CLP Superintendent of Planning & Development

Sent by fax to 797-1797 and mailed on July 8, 1999 (1 page).

Jennifer Thompson's comments on June 1999 Draft Functional Plan for Components of the Regional System

General Comments:

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.

Recommend developing a policy that prohibits allowing mitigation on public property, unless the impact is to occur on site.

Section 2. A.

Define "formal public use" (i.e. does it include passive recreation/trails/etc.?)

Section 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 & wetlands; developing BMPs 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; etc.

H:\WPDATA\2040\gtacplan.wpd

Portland Parks and Recreation 1120 SW Fifth Ave., Ste. 1302 Portland, Oregon 97204 Phone (503) 823-PLAY



Dedicated to enriching the lives of citizens and caring for Portland's natural beauty

July 19, 1999

MEMORANDUM

To:

33

Charlie Ciecko, Parks Director Metro

From: John Sewell, Chief Planner, Portland Parks

Subject: Draft Functional Plan for Components of the Regional System, June 1999

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the June 1999 Draft Functional Plan for the Components of the Regional System, hereafter referred to as the Functional Plan.

First, I want to express my continuing discomfort with how you define a regional parks system. re: "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." I understand that Metro manages part of a regional park system, but does it not have a responsibility as a regional planning agency to plan for a system of parks in the region? It cannot assess and plan for parks, open spaces and recreational opportunities for a piece of the system any more than it can for urban form, housing, or transportation as examples. Portland continues to stress this issue. This is not a new concern about how Metro does its planning. Refer to Charles Jordan's memorandum to Mike Burton, John Fregonese, and Charles Ciecko of July 14, 1997, re "Portland Parks and Recreation Review of Metro's Regional Framework Plan." Our position has not changed, and we do not see that Metro has yet considered assuming its responsibility to plan for a system of parks, open space, and recreational opportunities in the region.

Now let me move on to the specifics of functional planning for the regional system.

Section 2. Applicability

We need a fine-grained approach for determining when a master plan is needed, and we may want to include management plans as an alternative. First, a master plan every ten-years is a very rough measure or trigger for undertaking plan updates. Let me give you an example. I believe Waterfront Park could ideally profit from a new master plan. The existing plan is 25 years old, and it would behoove the city to take a fresh look at the park. But it would take, I expect, a two-year effort and probably \$150,000 to do the plan. If we aren't expecting massive changes to the park, if the park's uses and improvements aren't expected to change dramatically in the foreseeable future could Parks justify or would Council approve an expenditure of \$150,000? I think not. The park has a new system of utilities and new management practices, and we will live with this system for the foreseeable future even though a new master plan would be desirable.

Using Waterfront Park as an example, we need refined measures for what may trigger a new master plan. These include: (1) significant degradation or overuse of the park or facility, (2) significant new demands on a park or facility, and (3) plans to invest a significant amount of money in capital improvements. If one or

more of these criteria doesn't apply, a calendar for plan updates seems arbitrary and the need less than apparent.

An option may be to include in Section 2 another plan category. This would be a management plan as an alternative to master plans. Our need to respond to changes in use, condition of the resource, and new regulations (local, state, or federal) could warrant new management plans on a fairly frequent schedule. Our experience is that management plans can be done faster and using fewer resources than full master plans require. And they often address the issues all of us need to be concerned about most frequently: and that is how our parks are managed, how they're maintained, how they're used, and how well we are meeting required regulations. Indeed, appropriately structured a management plan can establish monitoring criteria that could help us decide when a full master plan is required.

Section 4. Master Planning Guidelines

Article 2 lays out a minimum master planning process. It seems more than minimal if we are discussing regionally significant parks, open spaces, and facilities. Let me provide an example: We followed most of these steps for Woods Park in SW Portland, a habitat site where improvements will be minimal and our major emphasis will be on improved management. For larger, more complex resources, Gabriel Park could be an example; we would see a much more extensive process. You do say your process is the minimum, but it seems more than minimal and would usually prove to be inadequate.

Another question I have, and this may be my confusion over what Metro means by regionally significant parks, is does Metro want to assign staff to planning for all regionally significant parks, open spaces, and facilities whether or not they are owned by Metro? I don't have a problem with this desire to be involved. But I am unclear if this is what is meant or if Metro is interested exclusively in property it owns whether managed by Metro or locally.

Article 2 c.: I don't understand what identifying surplus land and determining alternative use for such property means? Again, as an example, if we are dealing with a park or cohesive piece or property, it uses will either be for active or passive recreation or natural resource protection. If we surplus property, a rare circumstance, it is usually of a stand-alone parcel of land that doesn't have much potential for recreational use or as a natural resource.

Article 2 d.: It may be fine to look at the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) in responding to recreation demands, but the SCORP is so general that it has little utility in determining demand for a particular site. An emphasis on existing use, surveys, and public meetings is a much surer avenue for gauging recreational demand.

Again, my major concern is with the emphasis solely on master plans and on a calendar for when they're updated. I believe management plans are a less expensive, flexible way to respond more rapidly to changing conditions and needs, and I believe a calendar is far too arbitrary as a means of deciding when we prepare new plans.



MEMORANDUM

CITY OF TIGARD

TO: Jane Hart

FAX: 797-1797

FROM: Duane Roberts

DATE: 7/30/99

SUBJECT: Proposed Park System Master Plan Guidelines

I have reviewed a copy of the June 1999 draft of the functional plan for parks and open space.

In general, the proposed guidelines reflect a traditional approach to park and open space master planning and do not appear to impose an undue burden on park providers.

We recently completed a planning process similar to the one you have laid out for a parcel located within the Tigard portion of the regional system. The only glitch in the process was the relatively high cost of consultant services.

The three-year compliance period appears to provide ample time for completing the required planning work. However, provision should be made for extensions of time under appropriate circumstances.

Would appreciate you comments on the following: Does the definition of formal 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?



R

0

Ε

М

Μ

D

Ν

М

U



Α

TO: GTAC Subcommittee for Region-wide Parks Inventory CC: Heather Nelson Kent, Manager, Planning and Education Div. Jane Hart, Metro Regional Parks FROM: DATE: July 22, 1998, 9/44 SUBJECT: July 29, 1998 GTAC Subcommittee Agenda

This memo and attached document provide the foundation for the upcoming GTAC subcommittee meeting regarding the Regional Framework Plan policy direction to develop a region-wide inventory of parks and recreational facilities. The meeting will be held on July 29, 1998 from 10:00 to 12:00 noon at Metro in room 101 in the Parks Department offices.

The attached document outlines goals, objectives, products and proposed database information related to developing the 1998 region-wide inventory of parks and recreation facilities. Please review the material and be prepared to discuss it at the upcoming meeting. We appreciate your interest in this work task and look forward to working with you.

AGENDA **GTAC Subcommittee on 1998 Parks Inventory**

 		0		
10:00 to	o 12:00	on July	29, 19	998

10:00 - 10:05	Introduction
10:05 - 10:30	Review/discuss/finalize Parks Inventory Goals and Objectives
10:30 - 11:45	Review/discuss Proposed Parks Database Purpose, design, data fields, park classfication system
11:45 - 12:00	Next Steps
12:00	Meeting Adjourned

Background Materials for July 29, 1998 Meeting of GTAC Subcommittee on Region-wide ¹ Parks Inventory

I. Regional Framework Plan policies related to creating a Regional System Plan:

3.2.1 Metro will continue to develop a Regional System of Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces Trails and Greenways to achieve the following objectives:

- 1. protect the region's biodiversity
- 2. provide citizens opportunities for, primarily, natural resource dependent recreation and education
- 3. contribute to the protection of air and water quality
- 4. provide natural buffers and connections between communities

<u>Regional System Plan Goal</u>: - Protect on a long term basis regional natural areas, open spaces, parks, trails and greenways to maintain habitat for wildlife and to provide citizens with access to nature and open spaces.

II. Regional Framework Plan policies related to Region-wide Parks Inventory: 3.1.1 Metro will inventory and identify regionally significant parks, natural areas, open spaces, vacant lands, trails and greenways at the watershed level using topographical geologic and biologic functions...

3.1.5 Metro, with the assistance of local governments shall update the parks inventory which was completed in 1988. The inventory will include acreage, facilities, environmental education programs, cultural resources, existing school sites and other information as determined by Metro and the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee. This inventory should be updated at (5) year intervals.

Region-wide Parks Inventory Goals:

- 1. Update 1988 parks database to create a 1998 benchmark for parks and recreational facilities in the region.
- 2. Link 1998 parks database with Metro RLIS park layer to be used as an analytical tool by local jurisdictions when creating local level of service criteria.

¹ Parks Inventory assumes that parks, trails, greenways and recreational facilities will be inventoried.

Parks Inventory Objectives:

- 1. Update the 1988 region-wide parks and recreational facility inventory.
- 2. Collect sufficient information as required in the Regional Framework Plan to support local Level of Service analysis.
- 3. 1988 and 1998 park databases are compatible electronically.
- 4. Define regionally significant criteria for parks and recreational facilities.

III. Products for Region-wide Parks Inventory:

- 1. Updated 1988 region-wide electronic database for parks and recreational facilities.
- 2. Maps for local partners showing parks and natural areas in each jurisdiction.
- 3. Map of region-wide parks and recreational facilities.
- 4. 1998 Parks directory report.

IV. Proposed Region-wide Parks Inventory Database

- A. What does updated database need to be able to do/provide for user?
- 1. easy to use (e.g. ArcView)
- 2. create maps
- 3. Compatible with the 1988 electronic parks database.
- 4. Compatible with RLIS parks inventory for LOS and other analyses.
- B. <u>How should database be designed</u>?
- 1. Serve as a 'snapshot' in time, a benchmark in which to compare the 1988 inventory and future updates.
- 2. Function as an analytical tool for local planners.
- 3. Update every 5 years.
- 4. Inventory will be done for facilities inside the 1998 Regional System boundary.

Questions for GTAC subcommittee:

Does this give us sufficient data for doing LOS analysis? Are there other functions the database should support?

C. <u>Existing RLIS Parks database: (this database exists at Metro and allows for maps to be created)</u>.

Name:

Owner:

Usage: Private or Public

Jurisdiction: Park Maintainer

Park ID:

Park:

1 = park

2 = open space

3-common space

4 = cemetary

5 = golf course

6 = school

7 = publicly owned land, not maintained as park

8 = water detention land

9 = fair grounds/stadium

10 = community centers, other buildings in the parks coverage that aren't really 'parks'

11 = sidewalk

0 = non-park within a park

D. Information collected in 1988 Parks inventory:

Site name: Park Operator: Developed: Semi-developed: **Undeveloped:** Natural area: Camping: **RV** Parking: Group picnic: Picnic tables: Soft trails: Walks: **Tennis Courts: Ball Field:** Swimming Pool: Football/Soccer Field: Basketball Court: Volleyball: **Playground:** Natural Water Body: Boat launch: Golf course: Equestrian Trail: **Recreational/Community Center: Restroom:**

E. Proposed additional data fields to be added to 1988 database:

Year acquired:

year of first improvements:

taxlot #:

*Acreage: *Existing School site: Cooking facility: Electric outlets, electricity: Picnic Shelter: Horseshoe pits: Performance area: Reception facility: Gymnasium: Paved all purpose area: Unpaved all purpose area: Trails (width/miles):

- asphalt
- soft surface
- chip seal
- concrete

Man-made water body: Docks:

*Environmental Education Program:

*Cultural Resources

Restoration/Enhancement opportunities:

agricultural Resources:

Senior Center:

Access to users:

- within 5 min. walk:
- within 1/4 mile:
- within 1/2 mile:

Inside Regional System Boundaryd: Outside Regional System Boundary: Inside UGB Outside UGB ADA accessible

^{*} Required by Regional Framework Plan

V. Proposed Park Classification System:

A park / trail classification system was not a component of the 1988 parks inventory. However, it may be a useful tool for LOS. The following park types and definitions were collected from several sources including NRPA, Greenspaces Master Plan, City Club of Portland Parks Report (1994) and Vancouver and Clark County Park System Master Plan and may or may not be representative of the parks in the region. In some cases several definitions are given for the same term for the sake of comparison. If we wish to include park types in the database, we will need to coordinate with the LOS subcommittee to select park types germane to our region and develop one definition for each park type.

<u>Regional Park</u>

- Large Urban Park(NRPA equivalent for Regional Park?) Serve a broader purpose than community parks and are used when community and neighborhood parks are not adequate to serve the needs of the community. Focus is on meeting community-based recreational needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. Usually serves the entire community and minimum of 50 acres (NRPA, 1996).
- Public park of larger size (often in excess of 100 acres) intended for use by residents of several cities and/or counties in a metropolitan area (1992 Greenspaces Master Plan).
- Regional Parks are typically located in areas with unique or significant features including rivers, streams, lakes, forest areas or sites with other features either natural, cultural or manmade. Desirable size 200 acres or greater. (Vancouver and Clark Co. parks).
- A significant natural resource that attracts park users from beyond the immediate area. It is primarily used for activities that require a large amount of space such as boating, fishing, camping, or extensive hiking. (City Club of Portland Report 12/94).

Community Park

- Serves a broader purpose than neighborhood park. Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. Usually serves two or more neighborhoods and between 30 to 50 acres (*NRPA*, 1996).
- Basic components of a community park open space, play equipment, irrigation, hard court play area, sport courts (tennis, roller hockey, basketball), picnic shelters, sportsfields, landscaping, trails, restrooms, parking, benches. 20 acres minimum (*Vancouver and Clark County Parks*).
- Located to serve residents from several neighborhoods. Should offer diverse opportunities ranging from intense recreational activities to natural areas (*City Club of Portland Report, 1994*).

Neighborhood Park

- Basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreational and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on informal active and passive recreation. 5 to 10 acres is optimal (NRPA, 1996).
- Public park, generally of small size (1-10 acres) is intended for use primarily by residents of the neighborhood in which it is located (Greenspaces Master Plan 1992).
- Basic components include open space, play equipment, irrigation, hard court play area, landscaping, asphalt trails, small backstop, picnic tables, benches. 3 to 5 acres in size (Vancouver and Clark County Parks).
- Central to a geographic area within easy walking or bicycling distance from local residences. Often adjacent to a school and has field games, playground equipment, wading pools. Ideally 1/4 is developed and 3/4 left open (City Club of Portland Report, 1994).

Mini-Park

- Used to address limited isolated or unique recreational needs. Between 2,500 sq. ft. and one acre in size (NRPA, 1996).
- A park located within a neighborhood or housing development and is often characterized as a tot lot or playground. Serves a limited.population or specific use (City Club of Portland Report, 1994).

<u>Private Park / Recreation Facility</u> - Parks and recreation facilities that are privately owned yet contribute to the public park and recreation system (NRPA, 1996).

<u>Sports Complex</u> - Consolidates heavily programmed athletic fields and associated facilities to larger and fewer sites strategically located throughout the community (NRPA 1996).

<u>Community Center</u> - A facility providing meeting, recreational, and social space for the neighborhood in which it is located (City Club of Portland Report, 1994).

<u>Special Use park</u> - Dedicated to a single activity such as golfing, gardening, or outdoor theater. Draws visitors from a large area (City Club of Portland Report, 1994).

<u>Conservancy Park</u> - Characterized by primary goal of protecting and managing the natural or cultural environment. Recreational usage is secondary goal (City Club of Portland Report, 1994). <u>Natural Area Park</u> - Large acreage park in natural condition. Little development. Use balanced between preservation of natural habitat and natural resource based recreation (e.g. hiking, non-motorized boating, swimming, picnicking). (Metro Parks staff definition).

<u>Natural Area</u> - A landscape unit composed of plant and animal communities, water bodies, soil and rock; largely devoid of human-made structures; maintained and managed in such a way as to promote or enhance populations of wildlife (Greenspaces Master Plan, 1992).

<u>Natural Resource Areas</u> - Lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, remnant landscapes, open space, and visual aesthetics/buffering (NRPA, 1996).

<u>Urban Open Space</u> - Provides visual and psychological relief from man-made development within the urban area. They provide for natural buffers between land uses of different intensities, such as residential, commercial or industrial developmental. Open space areas can be corridors along streams, provoked connections between neighborhoods or attach to other parks. Such areas may also provide valuable wildlife habitat and other ecological or cultural benefits. Open space development may include interpretive signage, trails, benches, wetland and habitat restoration, reforestation, parking (Vancouver and Clark County Parks).

<u>Open space</u> - Developed parks with active recreational facilities such as ball fields, tennis courts, playgrounds, community gardens, golf courses, cemeteries, vacant lands with the potential of becoming a park or natural areas (Greenspaces Master plan, 1992). A site which is open to the elements and available for public congregation. It can be landscaped, natural or paved (City Club of Portland Report, 1994).

<u>Greenway</u>

- Effectively tie park system components together to form a continuous park environment (NRPA, 1996).
- Generally linear vegetated corridors associated with rivers and streams that are shared by both humans and wildlife (Greenspaces Master Plan, 1992).
- A continuous, linear planted area that separates and buffers adjacent uses (City Club of Portland Report, 1994)

Linear Park

- Located along a corridor and is used for recreational travel such as hiking, bicycling, and canoeing (City Club of Portland Report, 1994).
- Same as above but add *and/or commuting purposes* after recreational and omit travel (Metro park staff addition.)

7

<u>Trail</u> - Multi-modal/recreational (e.g., hiking, biking, pedestrian, equestrian) alignment generally used by people (Greenspaces Master Plan, 1992). <u>Park Trail</u> - Multipurpose trails located within greenways, parks, and natural resource areas. Focus is on recreational value and harmony with natural environment.

- 1. Type I: Separate/single-purpose hard-surface trails for pedestrians or bicyclists / in-line skaters.
- 2. Type II: Multipurpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians and bicyclists/inline skaters.
- 3. Type III: Nature trails for pedestrians. May be hard- or soft-surfaced (NRPA. 1996).

4.

<u>Connector trail</u> - Multipurpose trails that emphasize safe travel for pedestrians to and from parks and around the community. Focus is as much on transportation as it is on recreation.

Type I: Separate/single-purpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians or bicyclists/in-line skaters located in independent ROW.

Type II: Separate/single-purpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians or bicyclists/in-line skaters. typically located within road ROW (NRPA, 1996).

<u>Water_trail</u> - A segment of stream/river with public access for non-motorized recreational boating (Metro park staff definition).

<u>On-street bikeways</u> - Paved segments of roadways that serve as a means to safely separate bicyclists from vehicular traffic (NRPA, 1996).

<u>All-Terrain Bike Trail</u> - Off-road trail for all terrain (mountain) bikes. Usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas (NRPA,1996).

<u>Equestrian Trail</u> - Trails developed for horseback riding. Loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas. Sometimes developed as multipurpose with hiking and all-terrain biking where conflicts can be controlled (NRPA,1996).

NAME	ORGANIZATION	FAX	EMAIL
Peborah Lev	hty of Lake Oswigo	635-0269	dlevæci.os.wego.or.us
sue Engels	City of sherwood	625-5524	engelss@sherwood.or.us
Valerie Lantz	City of Troutdale	665 3711	VIZNTZ@ci. troutdzle.or.n
Junifer Thomps	on USFW	231-6195	Jennifer_Thompson @ Mail. fors.g
Justin Patturson	by of Happy Val	ey 760-9397	jmano I@ POL. com
blunn lamb	Vancour Wark Pu	r.	glamb@ci.vancouver.wa.us
Dan Kaler	Uark Lonty		DKALER & CO. CLARK. WA. US
ong Entts	Uncleanas Lo		
tim Obnin	Forist brove	359-3207	
Heatser			



GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMÍTTEE

Please sign in . . .

name organization email Jennifer Thomasson (2) Jennifer Thompson U.S. FWS FUS, GOV Three Rivers/and Com Jayne Cronlund Anderseuje ci. tairvieu. ohn Indersen City of Fairview MBTWING TELEPOT, CON SIMITIF 1. anna Happy Valley joaldwell Dci. hapry-valley. or. US City of HESP'C. Colo Tim OBNen Forstfra CUM Gł C vlantz@Clitrout he. Towtople Blen's Dowtz Stene Bassk SbosALQTADRD.Cont HPRD holly, b, michael @ Holly Michae stale or us allen @ Ocpw.com OREGON City Parks Hen Thomas KICHARD REED Or. City Vacks Dept. RICHARD DOCPUSCOM Washington County SWCD MaH-Dunnahoce Matt Dunnchue or. nacchet. org CA Baserias Jeria Enoll Lidby a ci. gutedian. it you Guadana ks & Krowntici

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

•

Please sign in . . .

name	organization	email	
CHRIS NEAMTZU	COM OF WILSONVILLE	neamtzue ci. wilsonville	or
JACK Wrley	at. Partis	-	
Kin Worcester	lity of westin	n	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
			ļ