

**Metro Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee**  
**July 2, 1997 Summary Meeting Minutes**  
**6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., Metro Regional Center**

Present: Bob Akers, Seth Tane, Faun Hosey, Ivy Frances, Jim Battan, Rick Charriere, Julie Garver, Charles Ciecko, Ron Klein, Jim Desmond, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Mark Turpel, Nancy Chase, Hal Busch

Bob Akers called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Jim Desmond provided an update of open spaces acquisition activities. Eighteen acquisitions were closed during the last quarter of FY96-97, ending the year with 2,354.77 acres acquired to date. Highlights include: 1) Metro and Hillsboro Parks and Recreation have been working out management arrangements for Rock Creek acquisitions; 2) Metro is in the process of closing the deal with PGE for the OMSI to Springwater Corridor, but need to continue to reach a cooperative agreement with the train operator (SamTrack); 3) Burlington-Northern corridor is not likely to happen anytime soon as BN is working out an agreement with a shortline operator instead of abandoning the line. Repairs to the track will cost over \$500k so Metro will not consider reallocating the BN funds to another target area until the RR is repaired and operating; 4) about 23% of the local share money has been spent on 33 projects throughout the region.

Charlie Ciecko noted that the contracted operator of Glendoveer Golf Course has proposed to invest \$1 million in capital improvements in exchange for a 10 year extension of their contract. The current contract expires in the year 2002. Ciecko recommended a 7-member citizen panel to review the proposal; 3 members coming from the RPAGAC. Ciecko estimated it would likely take 2-3 meetings to do the review. RPAGAC members will be appointed at the next meeting on August 5.

Mark Turpel of Metro's Growth Management Dept. gave an overview of the Regional Framework Plan process (see handout). The current draft version available is a discussion draft. It is intended to provide an indication of the scope of growth management policies to be adopted by Metro Council in December 1997. Comments submitted for the current version will identify any omissions, deletions or modifications necessary. The Council will issue a final draft in the fall. The Regional Framework Plan integrates all existing and proposed growth management policies.

Ivy Frances noted that the plan should address how new development should be financed; there should be a good economic analysis to determine the best model to support new development.

Seth Tane said that carrying capacity of the region should be seriously addressed. The realities of implementing the plan are not realistically covered.

Rosemary Furfy (Metro Growth Management Dept.) gave a summary of how Water Resources are being addressed in the Regional Framework Plan. This section promotes a watershed approach to water management. Currently the plan covers water quality and floodplain management in detail, but Goal 5 resources will be addressed in the next 18 months. The primary placeholders in the framework plan are watershed planning and Goal 5 resources. Metro produced a technical report that provides the scientific basis for WRPAC's recommendations on water quality and floodplain management.

Jim Battan asked what Metro is proposing to protect water supplies outside its jurisdiction (e.g. Bull Run). Taking water conservation measures is the most effective indirect action that can be taken. Conserving water resources reduces demand and delay of new water supplies.

Furfy also noted that the water policies will be founded in the Regional Water Supply Plan.

Faun Hosey would like to a more equitable treatment of watersheds in the region. It seems that Bull Run gets all the attention. But the Willamette and Clackamas watersheds as well as water resources in Washington County also need to be addressed in detail.

Ivy Frances felt that resource protection measures taken "...to the extent practicable..." leaves somewhat of loophole to not seriously deal with the issue.

Rick Charriere asked if a regional water budget has been conducted (no). It is important to know how recycling, gray water and conservation affects the water management system to make better planning decisions. Rick noted that working on the water delivery system would likely save more water than any conservation effort because the older systems are losing tremendous amounts of water during transmission.

Charles Ciecko suggested that a representative of the RPAGAC serve on a special MPAC committee to review Chapter 3 of the Regional Framework Plan Discussion Draft on Parks and Open Spaces and make recommendations to MPAC. The committee selected Seth Tane and Ivy Frances (alternate) to serve. The committee also expressed the desire to develop their own comments in the fall including testimony by the committee chairman. Bob Akers also encouraged committee members to get involved as individual citizens.

Rick Charriere suggested that it would facilitate involvement if the primary park and greenspaces concerns were identified up front. Five areas of concern were identified: 1) park policies tend to get "watered down" and become less effective in protecting park resources; 2) parks are an essential service in a livable community; 3) the parks policies need a functional plan to implement the policies; 4) parks and greenspaces require a source of long-term, stable funding; 5) there needs to be flexibility in the UGB to assure an adequate park and greenspace supply within the UGB.

Charles Ciecko reviewed a Metro resolution to establish general policies related to granting easements on park property for non-park uses. There was concern about how the "significance" of a proposed project would be evaluated. The test of significance could be easily applied inconsistently and allows political influence to be more of a factor. Ciecko indicated that standard biological criteria would be applied by staff and the project would be subject to review by the RPAGAC, Regional Facilities Committee and Metro Council.

Faun Hosey said the resolution should state that the RPAGAC could approve or disapprove an easement proposal. The resolution only allows for approval. The RPAGAC moved (Tane; Battan 2nd) to approve the Metro easement resolution as presented except to allow for committee disapproval of proposed easement projects. Approved 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

**Next RPAGAC meeting on Tuesday, August 5, 1997, Metro Regional Center, Room 270**