

# Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee

---

**MEETING NOTICE:**      *Wednesday, July 14, 1999*  
                                    *1 to 2 p.m. (meeting); 2 to 3 p.m. (tour)*  
                                    *Metro Regional Center*  
                                    *Room 370 A & B*

---

**AGENDA:**

<b>1:00</b>	<b>Chapter 3 Implementation: Year 2 work plan comments from GTAC</b> Jennifer Budhabhatti 15 min
<b>1:15</b>	<b>Master Planning Guidelines comments from GTAC</b> Jane Hart 15 min
<b>1:30</b>	<b>Regional Trails Update</b> Mel Huie 30 min
<b>2:00</b>	<b>Sneak Preview Tour of the Eastbank Esplanade floating trail</b> George Hudson from Portland Parks & Recreation 60 min

**PLEASE NOTE:** *The ESA briefing at 2:30 on July 14<sup>th</sup> is now for elected officials and planning commissioners only. There will other opportunities for GTAC members to attend ESA-related workshops in the near future. Please call David Moskowitz at 797-1579 if you have any questions.*

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


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: 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 of 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.



TUALATIN  
HILLS  
PARK &  
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

Dear Ms. Hart: *Jane,*

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 and guidelines 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.

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: 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 of 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 your 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?



name	July	organization
------	------	--------------

MEL HUIE

Chris Wayland

SCOTT TALBOT

Diane Kean Campbell

Jennifer Thompson

Peg Butler

Diane Roberts  
Jenisea Smith

PAM ARDEN

Margaret Benson

Cherokee Richards

Dawn Uchiyama

BEN SHOOP

George Hudson

Valerie Lantz

METRO.

WASH. CO.

City of Hillsboro

NCPRD

U.S. FWS

PARKS / METRO / PORT

City of Tigard

Cg Beaverton

40 Mile Loop

J.M.I. L.E.

City of Milwaukie

Portland Parks

Portland Parks

PP&R

City of Troutdale

# PLEASE SIGN IN

---

name	organization
SEAN LOUGHREAN	STATE PARKS & REC.
Preston Beck	Port of Pullman
TIM O'BRIEN	CITY OF FOREST GROVE
David Bragdon	Metro
Don Bartz	SEATTLE.
Jared Pruitt	Metro Council
Deborah Lev	City of Lake Oswego
John Andersen	City of Fairview
MARTIN ZARKIN	
STEVE WEIR	40 MILE LOOP
Bob AKERS	" " "
Libra Walker	" " "