

## OSN Steering Committee Meeting January 7, 2009

### Minutes

Present: Lorna Deckert, Brooke DuBois, Adam Fyall, Sharon Grant, Dick Jaquish, Bill King, Mike Lilga, Len Pavelka, Tom Page, Rick White, Scott Woodward, Debbie Berkowitz

- 1) Welcome to Lorna Deckert from Benton City and Dick Jaquish from FFOF.
- 2) How we make decisions as a group. One issue is level of buy-in for this group – so the government bodies know. A basic one-page charter could be useful to spell out how we function and make decisions. Need consensus; everybody needs to be willing to speak up. Try to address comments/dissents – so we have a common denominator. If we want community buy-in, we need to have consensus here. Voting would be problematical, don't know what constitutes a quorum. We should poll people on every decision; so nobody can say I didn't support this. We can range from: wholeheartedly agree, to I have serious concerns but can live with the decision, to I can't live with this. Fist to 5 - levels from 1 to 5 – 5 is wholeheartedly agree, 3 is middling, 2 or 1 means have concerns that need to be addressed, 0 means I can't live with this. This takes a lot of time; can discuss things in smaller groups in between meetings; we won't have that time. What if we have a couple of people who can't live with it – will need to go back and discuss the issue. If one person is holding out, do we say we have consensus except for one person. If the one person is representing a governmental agency, we'll need to deal with it. Is there an exception for a jurisdiction? Consensus is everybody, not everybody but one. The government representatives can help us work through this – we're counting on their guidance. Should we have a charter written up for next time? What else besides a consensus would be in a charter? What do we have now - mission, vision, draft action plan. This is a steering committee as opposed to being an official organization. The charter should describe the group the right way so it is known that government representatives are not speaking officially for their agency. The reps can help figure out issues, give guidance, help reach consensus. Next month, we could have a group effort to discuss the charter. It would be useful to have a bulleted list, what charter could include – for Feb. 4 meeting. Do we adopt a consensus model today and we'll tweak it next month to figure out how this will work? We went around the table and everybody supported this. Makeup of the present group might change; we might want to include people who haven't necessarily bought into the mission of the group. This would make a stronger product for the governmental entities. A minority report could be used when we can't reach a consensus. It would be helpful if each entity had somebody designated to show up. This could be part of the charter. We could send a formal letter to the entities in February, saying we're getting into planning mode and would like to have somebody designated from each jurisdiction to come to meetings and review drafts. Should we be requesting formal buyoff from jurisdictions or just acknowledgment that this Open Space Plan is out there. It would be helpful to have reviewers from each jurisdiction so there are no surprises with the final document. We need to know the level of buyoff we're trying to get from jurisdictions. Will they look at zoning codes? Will the counties look at Conservation Futures? Should this be in the charter? Going around the table for all issues is good.
- 3) To whom should the minutes be sent? Can we send them to our Boards and to other OSC groups? Should they be publicly available on a website? There's nothing secret about what we're doing, visibility is good. Would we send the minutes to the agency representatives? We're doing that now. Would the entities be responsible for passing them on? A couple of members of the OSC have requested that they get the minutes. **Debbie** will input the e-mail addresses that we received from the workshops and the survey and send an e-mail with a link to the website (Tapteal's website). **Debbie** will try to get out the minutes on Wed. night, will give everybody til Saturday to give her feedback, and then will get them or a link out to people who have indicated an interest. **Scott** will put the link to the minutes on the TGA website.
- 4) Survey – Debbie gave a powerpoint presentation of the survey results so far that were compiled by George and her. We have about 156 responses so far. This is a self-selected population, not a representative result. What do we want to do with this? A randomly selected group would include

about 600 to 800 people in the bi-county area, given a 100% response factor (more random people would be needed to make up for those that didn't respond). A survey like this could give us info about additional areas that people are interested in preserving. If we don't have to have this by the February dates, maybe we could get this out to more people. Which other groups can we get this out to? Or should we try to develop a representative sampling? It would need to be more concise. Do the cities have the means to send a survey to a representative sampling? No. Alternatively, we could make phone calls – take a phone book and call every 10<sup>th</sup> person in the phone book. This is very costly when a company is hired to do this (by public health); also, with advent of cell phones, representative sampling is difficult. We could just use this as indicators of what people who want open spaces are interested in – a means to cast a net for ideas, names. Megan did put this out in the Chamber of Commerce newsletter and other business outreaches. We might want the survey to stay on-line til the end of February, so we can get feedback from the February workshops. There's probably nothing in-between what we have so far versus doing a randomized survey. We should try to get more data the same way we've been doing and not try to get a randomized survey – too expensive and/or time intensive. Richland sends out a randomized survey in June, could possibly include 2 or 3 questions. **Debbie** will ask Oneza if Kennewick can do this [Kennewick doesn't do a citizen survey]. Pasco does it every other year and this is an off-year.

- 5) February Workshops discussion. Location is Richland and Kennewick. **Bill and Rick** will find a representative from each city (elected official?) to give the welcome address.
  - a) Proposal from Sharon and Mike: People will break into groups of geographical interest: Ridge to River Trail; Sacagawea Trail and Park; West /West Richland/Benton City/Horn Rapids/McBee Grade; Pasco/Franklin County/Ringold/White Bluffs; Kennewick (Zintel Canyon to Jump-Off Joe, Thompson Hill, Southridge, and State Patrol). There will be time for people to be involved in one group only. A second group will meet briefly for a brief in-service about that area. The hope is that people will get involved in working in that first group. It will be important to be sensitive to the fact that private property will be involved and that we're talking about dealing with willing sellers.
  - b) What is the purpose of workshop #2? The first workshops gave a planner something to work with in terms of interest. The second set of meetings needs to inform our planning efforts. The purpose of Scott's introductory remarks is to tell them what the public has already told us. Now we've tried to assemble the input into 5 or 6 areas of activities. Scott shows the areas on a map with some trails. We need to get the bigger picture of what we can do in these areas and who's interested in these areas. Can we get groups together in the longterm to work on these issues? Open it up and see who starts talking – they might be the leaders. How will what we're asking people to do in this meeting move along the planning process? One thought as to the purpose of this meeting - give feedback as to what we heard; have public help in prioritizing. What were priority results from workshops and surveys? We need to integrate these results. We have a sense of priority from the first workshops. Go back to the question of the purpose of the public meetings – to inform our planning, give us a basis to plan. Use the second round of meetings to refine the feedback – did we get what you said? Prioritize within each geographic group. Get feedback on the concepts. Need to come back and make sure all the pieces fit together. This is an opportunity to inform and educate people. Or not. We're asking people to help inform our planning process. Step one was to gather information. Step 2 is to create draft plan. Step 3 is to get feedback on the draft plan. The draft plan could be a series of bulleted items, give them a skeleton, get feedback. We're trying to facilitate getting back input. There is no plan here. Early February might be too early to do these meetings. We need to get the cities and counties more involved; need to get more responses to the survey; need to come up with a draft plan. Then we pull people back in to get feedback. Let's float some ideas and get input before we write the plan. We tried to look at an example. Kennewick Hills. Scott has looked at the input, put it on a map, and come up with specific trail segments. We want to intensify level of excitement about the plan – the maps add a visual perspective. Going through the maps, how do we get what we need to do the plan? What do you, the public, suggest to make these maps become real? The public might not be able to help with that, it would take some expertise to get there. We have more of that knowledge. We want people to react to our ideas and get more data – did we get it? Is there a basis for the 5 areas that Scott proposed here? Are these from the input from the public? What's the focus? What is the intention of these 5 areas? Scott came up with them by geographically grouping them; they are a

result of the spreadsheet, but not prioritized. Scott added trails based on the land contours. Example: Badger Ridges: a group is together and noted that this was an area of interest. Interest was expressed in getting a trail between these. Get prioritization from the group first. Talk about the challenges – public, private ownership, freeway in between; come up with alternate lines on the map. Do we already have enough information? We inform people - this is what exists; this is priority people have given us; these are challenges; this is what would need to be done. Here is our draft on this area, did we capture it? The public won't know the specifics about the challenges; we should bulletpoint the challenges and get feedback. We might need to get more information first. Len has a list of funding ideas. The information that Len put together on finance doesn't fit here; it's more for the plan. The outline makes sense. Planning in its simplest terms is what do we have, what do we want, and how do we get it. Go back to the group that helped identify what we have and what we want – go further. The maps can reflect what we want. We want linkages, dotted line can reflect what we don't have, what we want. Do we want to get prioritization of the dotted lines. Some will go away because they're too difficult or too expensive to do. Start with handful of high priority ones and then figure out what's doable. Is it enough of a task to ask for a priority for ridges. Prioritization shouldn't be done geographically. The point of doing this geographically is to assemble groups of people who are interested in an area and will be willing to work on the plan later on. But most people are from Richland – geographically won't necessarily work. The easiest way to lose volunteers is to ask for a volunteer and have nothing for them to do. This is the best time to get names of potential volunteers. We're trying to include people in the decision process; we're not informing, we're getting input. If the discussion lags, we can, e.g., bring up a specific challenge and ask people what suggestions they would have to get around the challenge. Put an asterisk next to the person who's doing the most talking. The easiest way to make connections is to use existing right-of-way, but probably not our goal. Would this plan be used to influence the Comp Plan, to amend the Comp Plan? The cities would have to go through their own processes to amend the Comp Plan, but would use this open space plan. It would be very important to get elected officials to come to the next workshop. We need to focus on what we want from this meeting. What do we have, what do we want, and how do we get it? It should be based on Scott's map areas. What questions should we ask that we don't have answers to yet. We want these things by these areas. What are expectations, e.g., is it a sod trail, barked trail, how wide is the trail, how do we get over roads? We need to verify that this is what people want. Should there be a meeting that just focuses on the cities and counties? We need a focused program for them. Scott spent the month of December going to Council and Commission meetings and updating them on what's been happening. In large group, get the input - did we get what we heard. Stay in geographical breakdowns – how do we get it. These geographical areas are connectivities. What other areas should be protected. Preservation was highest priority from surveys; trails were a strong second. Preservation and trails should both be emphasized. What connections in each area and what areas for preservation? The prioritization between preservation and trails - we need some feedback on this. Should trails be a separate workshop from the preservation of lands? We probably won't want to do another big public workshop. We can integrate the preservation and trails into a workshop. Preservation involves a lot of money, a policy or principle, maybe should be a steering committee item, not for the separate groups. Preservation and then connectivity, because that gives public buy-in. Is priority to get a narrow corridor between Badger and Candy or to preserve more of Badger? How will the break-out sessions work? Task will be to ask a few questions about preservation, connectivity, priorities. What data do we really want to get from the meeting? Geographic areas are good. Don't bullet just the trails, include the areas. The map structure – dotted lines disappear when you pull away the scale. Could try different colors. Maps do get people excited. People get into their group, briefly show what we have, ask for public input, what do you want in terms of connectivity, trails, vistas, open space. Ask for public input about the actions that need to be taken – how to overcome challenges. **Scott** presents what we have and what we want based on existing data. Get into groups. Ask them to validate what we want – you heard Scott, does this match with what you want? Validate or update priorities, trails vs preservation, connecting existing trails or new trails; new areas of preservation; prioritize sections, trails, what are your expectations about the land/trails; how do we get it, what are the challenges – what are you willing to do to help us get these areas (tax yourselves, make contributions, volunteer). These questions can be the closing

slide on the powerpoint presentation. Example: Trail from Badger to Candy – privately owned, crosses road – work with landowners to purchase land, or get conservation easement for trail corridors, how get across the road. All groups should hear the same thing. We don't have enough time to get into things like Conservation Futures for this workshop. **Mike and Sharon** will put together questions. **George and Debbie** will get survey data to Scott. **Scott** will put together maps and powerpoint presentation. For second part of meeting, might it be better to have a report from each group – creative ideas that came up. Is there someone who's willing to do the report from each group – try to get a volunteer to do this rather than facilitator. We have 5 groups; **Scott** will get one more easel. The 5 groups are light on Pasco and Franklin Counties. Bateman Island could be under Tapteal Greenway group. Then form another group on Pasco/Franklin Counties. **Scott** will pull something in on Pasco/Franklin counties. If we have enough people, we can double up. **Lorna** will do Benton City. **Mike** can do Tapteal Greenway. **Rick** can do Sacagawea Heritage Control. **Sharon** can do ridges. **Scott** will do SE Benton County. We'll need recorders/co-facilitators – **Tom, Debbie, Len, Bill, Oneza**. Handouts – workshop flyer (can use from last time). **Scott** will get info out to the media. **Mike** has the markers that don't bleed. **Scott** will make signs to post above the stations. **Debbie** will do refreshments. Locations - Richland City Council chambers on Feb. 5 and Benton County PUD (hwy 395) on Feb. 12. **Dave (please confirm), Barb (please confirm), and Janelle (please confirm)** will do check-in table. **Barb** will be photographer. **Sharon** will get the information to each city and county to get the information to their elected officials. Scott will send out maps and stations info.

**Note that Action Items are Bolded and Underlined and in red in the text.**