

Minutes

SCORP Advisory Committee Meeting

April 2, 2002
10:00 – 3:00
Jenkins Estate

Meeting called by: Terry Bergerson, OPRD SCORP Planner

Type of meeting: SCORP Advisory Committee Meeting

Note taker: Tammy Baumann

Attendees: See below

Agenda topics

5

Welcome from OPRD

Michael Carrier

Discussion:

1. **Terry Bergerson** welcomed everyone and introduced Steve Bosak.
2. **Steve Bosak** welcomed everyone and gave a brief description of the Jenkins Estate facility.
 - Funded through two LWCF grants
 - At lunch, the Estate Supervisor will talk about the history and give a tour.
 - Estate is on the register of Historic places.
3. **Terry Bergerson** introduced Michael Carrier, OPRD Director
4. Michael Carrier
 - Acknowledged the group and the membership
 - Apologized for not attending the first meeting
 - Admired the amount of knowledge and experience around the table
 - This morning he was thinking about the SCORP process and what it has meant over the past 30 years and reflecting in his own career, working in Natural Resource agencies, how many times in those experiences they relied on the SCORP for guidance, justification, long range policy and program direction.
 - Today's work is based on 30 years of positive experience in using the SCORP as a tool.
 - OPRD has a leadership responsibility given through the Legislature. Reinforced through the NPS and Congress.
 - Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission adopted Target 2014 for the next 12 years, which establishes

- eight goals. The first of which is to promote outdoor recreation in Oregon.
- Select major issues to be addressed and secondly, working on developing goals, objectives and strategies...in that order for good reason, goal is the overall reaching, objective is how we get there and strategies are the tricks to make it work.
- After this updated plan is published, I want pledge to you to our commitment to look to those goals, objectives, and strategies.
- Commended Steve Bosak on being able to get the smell of horse out of the building on a shoestring budget.
- Thanked the group.

5. **Terry Bergerson** called for introductions (around the table counter clockwise)

Terry Bergerson	Rick Bastasch	Chuck Frayer	(Side tables)
Kathy Schutt	John Barnes	Kathy Ludlow	Gloria Shinn
Jim Hammet	Steve Dickenson	Brian Carroll	Marilyn Lippencot
Dave Wright	Scott Abdon	Mandy Cole	Craig Tutor
Doug White	Steve Bosak	Ann Rogers	Diane Betsom
Doug Tindall	Frank Jagodnik	Margaret Wolf	Tom Towslee
Wayne Shuyler	Becky Johnson		Tammy Baumann

10	Introduction and Meeting Objectives	Terry Bergerson
----	-------------------------------------	-----------------

Discussion:

Meeting Objectives:

1. Bring committee members up-to-date on SCORP planning progress.
2. Determine top Regional & Statewide recreational issues.
3. Develop a set of goals, objectives, and strategies for top Statewide recreational issues.
4. Finalize a framework for the Guidelines & Rating System Criteria used for evaluating LWCF grant proposals.

30	SCORP planning update	Terry Bergerson
----	-----------------------	-----------------

Discussion:

Presentation Highlights

What is SCORP?

- Qualifies state for LWCF funding
- Updated every 5 years
- Allocates limited LWCF funding dollars

Stateside LWCF Funding in Oregon

40% State Agencies 60% Local Government Agencies

Oregon SCORP Plan Components

1. Regional Planning Approach
 - 11 SCORP Planning Regions
 - Regions are destination areas for recreation trips
 - All data will be gathered at the regional level
2. Conduct Needs Assessment
 - Florida methodology is designed to:
 - Identify statewide and regional facility deficits
 - Prioritize facility deficits
 - 5-year assessment

Needs Assessment Components

1. Inventory of Outdoor Recreation Facilities
2. Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey
3. Outdoor Recreation Facility Use Guidelines
4. Needs Assessment Calculations

Conduct Needs Assessment

1. Inventory of Outdoor Recreation Resources & Facilities
 - Public recreation providers
 - Private-sector recreation providers
 - Public & private schools

Inventory Response

- 92% of public-sector providers
- 90% of public school districts
- Data from 1,944 public and private-sector

Final Product

- The 2001 Oregon Outdoor Recreational Resource/Facility Inventory Bulletin
- Data presented at the statewide, regional and county levels.

2. Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey

- Combination phone and mail-back survey
- Sample size of 5,200: 4,400 residents and 800 non-residents
- Statistically reliable regional & statewide results
- Initial results on SCORP planning website in June 2002.

3. Facility Use Guidelines

- Hiking- 20 users per mile per day
- Tennis- 30 users per day per court
- Golf- 200 users per 9 hole course per day

4. Needs Assessment Calculations

- Combines resident & tourist participation
- Statewide adjustments to reflect population density
- Determines average weekend/holiday use
- Identifies need for additional facilities

Assessment of statewide recreation issues

- Series of regional “issues workshops”
 - Public-recreation provider sessions
 - General public sessions

Regional Issues Workshops

- Held between October – December 2001
- Total of 130 people attended a workshop
- Included representation from 70 public sector provider organizations
- Total of 360 issue comments generated

The Workshop Process

- 1) Each participant stated their issues
- 2) LWCF issues were separated from general issues
- 3) Public providers voted for top 3 LWCF issues
- 4) Issues Placed On SCORP Web site
 - Letters sent requesting review & comment
 - 102 additional issue comments collected

Top Statewide Issues

- A. Major Rehabilitation of Recreational Facilities
- B. Recreational Trails/Connectivity
- C. Land Acquisition

Categorical Analysis

- Individual comments assigned to 23 specific issue categories
- Summaries prepared for the 23 categories

SCORP Advisory Committee Voting Process

- Identify the top 2 "Other LWCF Issues"
- Identify the top 3 "General Issues"

SCORP Planning Website (www.prd.state.or.us/scorp.php)

- Quarterly SCORP planning newsletters
- 2001 Resource/Facilities Inventory Materials
- Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey Materials
- Major Rehabilitation Measurement Materials
- Regional Outdoor Recreation Issues Information
- SCORP Advisory Committee Information

SCORP Planning Website Weekly Visitation

- Serving 1,000 web pages
- Serving an estimated 200-500 unique visitors
- Sending out 200+ downloadable documents
(Acrobat files, Text files, Maps, etc.)

SCORP Project Timeline

- Recreational Resource/Facility Inventory (11/00-10/01)
- Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey (3/01-2/01)
- Conduct Public Workshops (10/01-12/01)
- Data coding, analysis & report writing (3/02-5/02)
- Plan completion (12/02)

30

Discussion:

Presentation Highlights

Oregon Outdoor Recreation Survey: April 2002 Update

PURPOSE

- Assess outdoor recreation participation in Oregon, and combine this information with resource/facility capacity to determine outdoor recreation needs for the future.

METHODS

- Survey of regional recreation participation
- Sampling frame
 - 400 in each region
 - 800 out-of-state
- Surveys
 - Phone, mail back, on-site, web (<http://outdoors.orst.edu>)

PHONE SURVEY

- No. of visits in past 3 and 12 months in aggregated activity categories
 - By location
- Gather names & addresses for mail back
- The Research Group, Market Decisions
- 4 waves
 - 50% Spring, Fall, & Winter
 - 50% Summer

MAIL SURVEY

- Detailed visitation by activity, past 3 months
 - By location
 - By weekend, type of trail/water body, etc.
- ROS – actual vs. preferred
- Crowding
- Demographics

ON-SITE SURVEYS

- Summer season
- Administer phone survey, handout mail back
- Recreation sites, general public places
- ~ 80 on-site surveys complete

STATUS

- All waves complete
 - 55,275 calls made
 - 6,687 refused
 - 5,216 completed phone surveys
 - 4,794 names/addresses to send surveys
 - Last mail back surveys received March 25th, 2002
 - Data entry complete
 - As of third wave, 2,233 returned surveys (55.1% response rate).

Statewide Participation

Statewide Participation by Activity

Determining Demand

- Participation in outdoor recreation activities is expressed in a standard unit: user occasions
- The survey data collected will allow user occasions to be calculated by activity, both regional and statewide

CARRYING CAPACITY

- Use guidelines for resource-based outdoor recreation activities.
- For each activity, guidelines list resource and facilities needed per user occasion.
- Examples:

Fishing pier use -> anglers per linear feet of pier -> 5 linear feet per user per day.

Picnic table use -> users per picnic table -> 8 users per table per day.

Jogging trail use -> user per linear trail mile -> 100 users per mile per day.

DETERMINING NEEDS

- Quantitative comparisons of outdoor recreation demand with the supply of existing recreational facilities

NEXT STEPS

- Data checking and analysis
 - Data entry error
 - Non-response bias
- Develop sample weights for estimating population totals
- Combine use estimates with supply estimates to determine needs

10 minute Break to resume at 11:15

Discussion: Passed out voting dots. 3 red dots for general issues voting and blue for other issues.
Voting completed.

Top Statewide "Other Funding Issues"

Need for water based recreational facilities is top other funding issue (12 dots).

Need for basic recreational services/facilities (9 dots).

Top Statewide "General Issues"

P. Resource Protection/Environmental Education (12 dots).

L. Recreational Planning/Technical Assistance (10 dots).

A. Recreational Funding/User Fees (10 dots).

Introduced example goals, objectives and strategies. Start off this afternoon with developing G/O/S and start with the top 3 LWCF issues

Consider writing top two GOS for the other issues and GOS for top three on the General issues. This afternoon, we will start with top 3 LWCF issues, then to other issues and finally to the general issues.

Opened the floor to give folks a chance to do some writing.

1 Hr	Lunch	
Discussion: Jenkins Estate supervisor presented a history of the estate.		
2 Hrs	Development of goals, strategies and objectives	Kathy Schutt
<p>Discussion: Began at 12:45¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have two hours to brainstorm through eight issues. • Begin the process, and hear what all have to say about what is foremost on your mind. • This exercise is not the end to this process. We will post what we have on the web site for 2-3 more weeks and provide opportunity to comment and revise the goals, objectives, and strategies if necessary. • Not married to samples but wanted to get away from the semantics of what is a goal, objective and strategy, etc. • What Terry did in going from the statements to goals was to end up with one goal and one objective but we could come up with more if you want to. • Spend 5 minutes on the goals, then move onto the objectives and then spend most time on the strategies (work tasks) • Top LWCF Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need for Major Rehabilitation of Existing Recreational Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Goals: Reducing the number of facilities in need of rehabilitation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide on going funding for maintenance [Mandy Cole] 2. What is best funding, structure to avoid back log [Doug White] 3. Process to ensure facilities are needed in future [Brian Carroll] 4. Build a model that shows the level of service to be provided [Doug White] 5. Is the best structure to avoid backlog – fee related? No at what point do you rehab vs. letting it go. It is a timing issue. 6. Funding development plan (development strategies). 7. Reduce to what level (performance measure) [Rick Bastasch]. 8. Process to ensure facilities are needed or that there are alternate uses for the facility before we discontinue the facility [Ken White]. 9. Look at design of facility – ability to last and designed for the environment [Brian Carroll] 10. Could be part of scoring criteria [Gloria Shinn] 11. Cost effectiveness [Gloria Shinn] Use life cycle costs to quantify. 		

¹ An attempt has been made to correctly identify the author of all comments. If a comment is incorrectly credited or no credit is identified, please contact Terry Bergerson for correction.

12. What about appropriateness? Balance long life design with architectural values.
13. It is a subjective measure, resources that dictate what you build but you are required to meet state standards, but to judge a structure on materials because of cost. [Steve Bosak]
14. Smaller communities should build stable structures in the forefront because they cannot afford to rehab it in 10 years.
15. Take off last sentence of strategy #3.
16. The need for rehab of existing outdoor rec. facilities. The discussion is not what this issue is about. Assess the long term of the facility – do you need it or not. If yes, what will it take to rehab it and then what would it take to keep it maintained? Sift some of this stuff out and don't lose it.
17. Rehab can be the whole park not jus the whole building. The design criteria is important [Brian Carroll]
18. Minor betterment issue – provisions not subject to the stringent requirements. Check with zoning to get the rehab done without going through the expensive land use issues. Improvements should be easy to do but it is up to the local zoning.

2. Need for Recreational Trails/Trail Connectivity

i. Goals:

1. Share discussion that led to this view – compressed timeline to get SCORP on the street. [Scott Abdon]
2. Wondering if we should put additional information about trails because it is such a large issue. Discussed trails plan rather than just a little information that would not be a lot of help to people.
3. May want to have a target or benchmark date built into this for when the trails plan should be done to get detailed information into SCORP plan.
4. Trails connectivity is a good description. Use it in the goal. The connectivity concept should be imbedded in the goal.
5. This goal is to promote instead of provide which would imply that someone else will provide the trails.
6. Good point so unless it specifically states that the state will supply, the provider should be defined. Provision was intended not promote. Substitute the word provide for the word promote.
7. Is it okay that we left out some of the sub issues? [John Barnes]
8. A lot more players here than we have identified.
9. Emphasize the connectivity. Implying that there is leverage for other resources with other partners. [Mandy Cole]

10. Because this issue is so big, give yourself time to do it right. All of these sub issues should be addressed in the bigger trails plan. [Scott Abdon]
11. Realize that connectivity goes across state boundaries. [Ann Rogers]
12. Put priority on local/regional trail plans. A lot of planning going on and they should be coordinating. Run those plans together and you could almost have a state plan. Without a state plan being done, these smaller plans could suffice. Many chunks are already done – be good to pull it all together for the state plan – connectivity then comes into play.
13. In terms of prioritization, can we carry over promoting/encouraging new ways of thinking (innovation) in trails that connect? [Rick Bastasch]
14. No what is going on, do an inventory
15. The strength in this issue is whatever you put into SCORP for this will put into play the guidance for the statewide trail plan is developed. Should be enough meat in the SCORP regarding this issue to adequately guide what is coming next (trail plan). Put effort into placing sideboards for what is coming next. [Scott Abdon]
16. OHV issue [Ken White]
17. Feds have big role in OHV issue – state could bring feds together with planning process. [Jim Hammet]
18. DNR in Washington State has good model. [Scott Abdon]
19. Intent of SCORP to have a timetable?
20. Attempt to set up schedule for work tasks.

3. Need for Land Acquisition

i. Is the goal appropriate?

1. How do you define adequate? [Mandy Cole]
2. Good goal for state but cannot do a local plan at a state level. Local should compliment state plan but the state cannot get into the nitty gritty of what? [Steve Bosak]
3. Read two things: identify acquisitions that protect scenic areas and prioritize acquisitions where there isn't one. Did not see it try to take over the local process, but would like to see that you (local) have a plan and that this is in it. [Doug White]
4. Plans cannot be turned around quickly. [Steve Dickenson]
5. Need to frequently revisit the plan. [Steve Bosak]
6. Smaller communities may not complete a plan and will be more opportunity driven. Don't want to make it so that they do not qualify for money because SCORP requires a plan. [Dave Wright]
7. Agree, but want to encourage the development of the plan

8. Reward local planning and some of the loudest cries were from small communities, with technical assistance, they developed some plans, and they were singing praises of the plan because it allowed them to focus and prioritize – good tool for small towns to go through the exercise of planning. [Steve Bosak]
9. Offer resources to get them to the planning. [Steve Bosak]
10. Resistance to planning. Lots of technical assistance to planning available, not through OPRD, but should put in database what technical assistance is available. [Mandy Cole]
11. Fear is not against the constrictions in the planning, they get scared off, but it is important to have a plan but not so constricting that it does not allow them to take advantage of opportunities. [Brian Carroll]
12. Money earmarked for acquisition. [Jim Hammett]
13. Cannot ear mark – inappropriate for the program. [Gloria Shinn]
14. Acquisitions are very difficult to plan for but are very time sensitive. Should have money available, so if opportunity presents itself we can act on it.
15. Legislature is concerned about public acquisition. [Rick Bastasch]
16. Can you lease land or work with landowners to allow public access of private land, acquire fee titles to land or easements, etc. But here we are starting out with acquisitions. Should we broaden this to insure public access?
17. LWCF has limits on where you can spend the money. [Steve Bosak]
18. Can go to conservation easements.
19. Terry in traveling around the state, did you hear from private landowners large timber companies, etc.? [Brian Carroll]
20. Did not get a lot of participation from people like that. [Terry Bergerson]
21. Private landowners will respond to a local request, but when it comes from an entity in Salem, they are suspect. [John Barnes]
22. Local entities should make those contacts and to promote that connection. [Brian Carroll]
23. More gates going up then ever before, if we are talking about access and acquisition, they are locking people out because private landowners have had it. [Scott Abdon]
24. Long term access to ocean shore
25. Cannot foresee threats – need to be flexible.
26. Can we anticipate those threats? You have cities, ballparks, etc. You have the coast range and the cascades, but there is a whole area of possible recreation area in the valley – do statewide inventory and not just the coast. [Rick Bastasch]

Other funding issues

1. Need for water-based recreational facilities.
 1. The primary idea people trying to convey is that we have to acquire enough water access to provide for current and future use. A lot to do with land acquisition and facility development. Because there is usually only one opportunity to purchase, you will regret later if you do not purchase when the opportunity comes up. [Terry Bergerson]
 2. Problem with interface between land and water.
 3. Minam?
 4. Where places there are no public land adjacent, there are some limitations on use.
 5. Goal could be to increase access for motorized and non-motorized watercraft for appropriate water based activities in remote urban settings. [Mandy Cole]
 6. Water trails need to be addressed, other states have addressed well but we have not. [Scott Abdon]
 7. Include in the trails plan.
 8. Limitation is a lack of access to water
 9. Limitation is a lack of water
 10. There are some folks that don't have water, to put it as a priority in SCORP really penalizes those folks. What do we do about that? [Steve Bosak]
 11. Water is a destination type activity [Dave Wright]
 12. But in competing for money, is it fair to prioritize a feature that you cannot get to? [Steve Bosak]
 13. But there may be other features that you have access to that others do not [Mandy Cole]
 14. What about wetlands [Doug White]
 15. If you are bird watching in a wetland you are water based recreation [Rick Bastach]
 16. Define what is water based, walking along the water and looking...etc. [Steve Bosak]
 17. Environment education would give those activities points [Brian Carroll]
 18. You may not get the water but you get the population where some counties will get the water points but not the population points. [Brian Carroll]
 19. Can you purchase water rights with LWCF dollars? It has been done. (Depend on who owns water) [Gloria Shinn]

20. Before you delve into that issue, talk to legal counsel...walk very gingerly around this issue. [Scott Abdon]
21. May find similar plans that address issue like the salmon plan, etc. [Rick Bastasch]
22. People in this state value water based recreation. 2/3 of the state water based recreation is very limited. Should not avoid the issue because it is difficult. Can avoid solution but not the issue. [Jim Hammett]
23. Legal can help raise the issue [Scott Abdon]
24. We have some experience in language [Kate Schutt]
25. Can we tie the rehab issue into this i.e., reservoir, etc? Rehab of facilities like dams and reservoirs (Devil's lake) rec. opportunity that is inundated with plant life that is minimizing recreation. Manage resource to maintain recreational opportunity. [Steve Dickenson]
26. Natural resource management is different than rehabilitation regarding LWCF – not a crossover.
27. Does SCORP want to address navigability? Is this a recreational issue that fits in here somewhere? Definitely third rail. [Rick Bastasch]
28. Not knowing ownership becomes a source of conflict.
29. Need to be careful that we do not get too broad in how we define water based. Don't water down recreation with environmental issues. [Steve Bosak]
30. Could be for streams and rivers that are navigatable there is less of a need to acquire public land because it is already there. [Kate Schutt]
31. John Day, the public is saying you cannot even drop an anchor because they own the water. They have stretched fences. [Brian Carroll]
32. I raise this only because it is a limiting factor re water-based recreation. [Rick Bastasch]
33. No other issue more limiting. [Jim Hammett]
34. Talk to legal so issue can be raised, but not cross over that flash point so that the public gets angry. [Scott Abdon]
35. If you cannot rationally go into a direction in a plan, but you have to dance around the issue and not give direction, then why deal with it at all. Don't dance so much that it becomes meaningless. [Doug Tindall]

2. Need for Basic Recreational Services/Facilities (Baseball, soccer etc. and support facilities such as restrooms, parking etc.)

1. Suggestion right off the top – build “team sports facilities” etc. into a strategy and not put it into the goal. Good for the goose is good for the gander. Leave the goal more general. [Scott Abdon]

2. Talks just about sports. What about other recreational facilities. [Frank Jagodnik]
3. Need to properly identify. In condensing this information, they are also asking for playground facilities and the elderly. [Terry Bergerson]
4. How were you voting? [Kathy Schutt]
5. Most were voting for sports fields.
6. I viewed it as more general, but that is just perspective, but more overall recreation facilities. [Brian Carroll]
7. The majority of comments were for more sports facilities especially team sports facilities. [Terry Bergerson]
8. Rephrase title to include “sports” and make it less general.
9. The word basic is also confusing. What is basic? [Gloria Shinn]
10. Basic to him is barebones stuff, ball fields not stadiums. [Terry Bergerson]
11. Is it economic emphasis? [Gloria Shinn]
12. Just basic because there is a shortage of those places and they are playing in inappropriate places and damaging those areas. [Terry Bergerson]
13. I’ve been involved in the City of Gresham; the long-term maintenance responsibility is a problem. They avoid the issue - not a priority. [Ken White]
14. Specifying population segments and awarding points for that? [Mandy Cole]
15. Yes. [Kathy Schutt]
16. Used existing OPSP framework [Terry Bergerson]
17. There will be a lot of resources coming down for Diabetes prevention...preventing obesities. [Frank Jagodnik]
18. It is becoming a priority for LWCF. [Gloria Shinn]
19. The more you can elevate that focus on health and wellness the better. [Frank Jagodnik]
20. In ...grants, we are already entertaining these issues. [Scott Abdon]
21. So instead of mentioning particular problem areas...say maximizing leveraging other resources for health and wellness. [Mandy Cole]
22. Already some of these emphasized in the program. [Kathy Schutt]
23. Put “health and wellness” in the goal.
24. Don’t mention the age thing cause you could be talking about adults...children. [Mandy Cole]
25. I agree that socio-economic standing should be a priority in addressing these basic facilities. [Jim Hammett]
26. Thinking about urban areas or...[Gloria Shinn]

27. Thinking as a priority urban areas. SCORP should recognize that. [Jim Hammett]
28. Just as important in rural communities as well. [Mandy Cole]
29. That is what skate parks have become. Oregon skate park capital of the world. Become just like the basketball court. Etc. [Frank Jagodnik]
30. What is the solution in ... on the coast, what is there solution for lack of flat lands? [Doug White]
31. They don't want regional facilities because of the distance between the communities. [Terry Bergerson]
32. Land use problem because inside UGB is too expensive but outside is surround by EFU land. [Brian Carroll]
33. Rules do not restrict public park facilities on high-value farmland but as conditional use.

General Funding not tied to LWCF dollars

1. Resource Protection/Environmental Education

Goal statement –

1. Emphasis on resource management to protect resource [Doug Tindall]
2. Environmental to be a tool – strategy. [Mandy Cole]
3. Avoid degradation or consumptive uses. [Ann Rogers]
4. If you are going to invite people out to enjoy the resource, develop so to protect the resource while still providing recreation. [Scott Abdon]
5. Is there a need to emphasize resource protection over recreation? [Kathy Schutt]
6. Need to balance.
7. There is a sub theme. There is an educational component in education. Appropriate behavior. Public engagement issue. [Rick Bastash]
8. Can we use the term “sustainable recreation” as a way to encapsulate the need to balance protection and providing access for recreation. But to provide for the resource to be there for future generations. [John Barnes]
9. Carrying capacity guidelines – address use based on carrying capacities. [Terry Bergerson]
10. Keep “Sustainability” as theme that runs through the goals, objectives, and strategies. [Jim Hammett]
11. Carrying capacity for what outcome? [Kathy Schutt]
12. Marketing strategy – what happened in Hawaii, unbridled marketing could not handle volume and resource being thrashed in the outcome. Cannot just open the floodgates and let people come in – use marketing strategy to control. [Scott Abdon]
13. Marketing plans are a wonderful tool. Keep things appropriate to the

landscape. [Mandy Cole]

14. Do we want to reach out to private landowners to try and extend the intent of what we are doing there to those folks? In terms of resource management, enhancement, etc. [Steve Bosak]
15. Provide education that can be applied to private lands. [Kathy Schutt]
16. Or vice versa, private landowners could manage their lands in a way that could benefit the public lands as well. Educational opportunities. The other way also. [Rick Bastash]
17. Lessons between private and public. [Kate Schutt]

2. Recreational Funding/User Fees (Shortage of operational funding and the need to find other ways to fund operations and maintenance.)

1. Difficult for smaller community understanding the opportunities and alternatives available. Sharing information on fee schedules that have worked in other places. Should we provide this information through SCORP?
2. Assist with developing maintenance/management programs to help smaller communities use their budgets more efficiently. [Steve Dickenson]
3. Put a dollar figure on the public sector maintenance backlog. [Jim Hammet]
4. We will end up with the facilities in need of major rehabilitation. If there is a way for coming up with an estimate for what those repairs would cost we could do the math. [Terry Bergerson]
5. Difficulty that folks have is in competing for dollars. We may want to do more in talking about the benefits and virtues of these programs...i.e. health and welfare issues, getting delinquents off the streets and onto the courts, etc. If you give them other opportunities. Money would not have to be spent elsewhere. [Scott Abdon]
6. Coordinating programs to see what they can come up together. Promote partnerships. [Brian Carroll]
7. If you are going to compete for dollars, we need to do a better job of promoting the recreational programs in general. [Scott Abdon]
8. Public dialogue. [Rick Bastasch]
9. Feels like a partnership with the CDC is developing strategies ...don't have to walk alone. [Gloria Shinn]
10. Ancillary benefits should be pointed out. [Scott Abdon]
11. Can be public/private partnerships. [Brian Carroll]
12. The voting public should understand that public recreation is not fluff. [Mandy Cole]
13. OPRD is going to take a leadership role in looking at the issue of day use fees and looking at how other entities approach this... folks are looking to OPRD to make this a statewide process. [John Barnes]

3. Recreational Planning/Technical Assistance (Need for regional planning)

1. Is there some way to broaden this so that it is not just around planning but also around marketing, communications, etc.? The Oregon Wide Pass concept? It is bigger than is delineated here. [Mandy Cole]
2. Community assistance teams, regional investment board, depending on the same audiences. Begin by depending on existing regional planning structures. [Rick Bastash]
3. Working with these groups, recreation becomes a low priority. Leave the comment that you participate in these groups but that there needs to be a regional recreational focus. [Rick Bastash]
4. Perhaps there is a way that a couple of matrix diagrams could be set up. Across the top are all the issues we have selected to address. Down the side, existing documents, committees, councils, etc. that have an interest. Livability forum, watershed councils, ...community solutions team and others. There are a number of planning documents, statewide and regional worth exploring. [Scott Abdon]
5. You could then go across and down and find the documents that have a common thread. Don't think we have taken advantage of identifying. [Scott Abdon]
6. Could do other matrix on the issues that we've identified and move forward in SCORP but that there are other organizations that have the same issues and they are identified in other documents and show it in the SCORP that they could be found in other places. [Scott Abdon]
7. Put a form on the Internet to be filled in.
8. SCORP would not have to go on and on but at least capture where the things marry together, it would work. The reader would see that the issue makes sense. Need to be somewhat selective about what goes down that left column – worth highlighting

Action items: Post Goals, Objectives and Strategies on web site for review and revision	Person responsible: Terry Bergerson	Deadline:

20	Project Selection Criteria Framework	Terry Bergerson
Discussion:		
Material was passed out and instructions given to read over material and contact Terry Bergerson if there are concerns or comments.		
	Adjourn	Terry Bergerson