

RROSN Steering Committee Meeting May 6, 2009

Minutes

Present: Brooke Dubois, Adam Fyall, Sharon Grant, Bill King, George Last, Mike Lilga, F. Oneza, Len Pavelka, Tom Page, Scott Woodward, Debbie Berkowitz

1. Chamber of Commerce would like to sit on the steering committee.
2. Scott spoke at the Home Builders Association. They were disappointed they hadn't been included before this. However, Scott had tried to make contact with them since November to get their input without success. We are in the process of structuring the organization, HBA will be welcome at the table. Their other comment is that there's plenty of open space and we don't need more. They want to include the water, golf courses, cemeteries. They want to look at the amount of open space per person. We're still in the process of defining open space. How is it calculated by cities?
3. Buy-in letter. A greeting letter and an accomplishment list went out 3 weeks ago – to each Commissioner and to each City Manager and/or Mayor (13 letters went out). The buy-in letter and updated flyer went out on May 4, requesting responses by May 25. The jurisdictions had to fill in the gaps, including their choice of representative on the jurisdictional advisory council. The jurisdictions were asked to buy in to the planning process and to let us have access to the planning departments of all the entities (for maps, discussions). They were asked to respond on their own letterheads and sign off on it. Scott gave them his phone number. **Scott** will ask the staff members on our steering committee to follow up.
4. Organizational development. What kind of non-profit do we want to be? Mike passed out a file on the different types of nonprofits, most are not applicable to us. The two main choices are 501(c)3 and 501(c)4. 501(c)3 allows other funding sources, 501(c)4 doesn't. 501(c)3 can be either a public charity or a foundation; foundations have a single major funding source, with money to distribute to other charities. The committee recommended 501(c)3 public charity and we agreed.
5. Organizational development. Bylaws. Tom and Brooke looked at examples of bylaws for 501(c)3s. They developed a draft set of bylaws which they passed out. Do we have members, or not? If we have members, are they voting or non-voting, what do they vote on, what is their role, what do they get out of being members, what do we get out of their being members. How many members of the Board of Directors – the larger the number, the harder to get a quorum. Committees are steering, jurisdictional. The steering committee would most likely become the Board of Directors – we'd have to adjust the membership of this, decide who should be represented. The bylaws include an attendance requirement. The Health Alliance has a 5-member Board (by virtue of their jobs, including CEOs of the hospitals) that controls the finances and policy. They also have a Community Council that advises the Board and the executive director – it includes anybody who has an interest and asks to be a part of this (the Alliance also invites people to be on it). Everybody on the Community Council belongs to a group; they haven't had the situation of an individual that isn't a member of the group. All of the subcommittees that meet monthly report to the Community Council on a bimonthly basis; this group gives feedback to the subcommittees, also if an issue comes up they suggest creation of another subcommittee. The Board members are members of the Community Council, but don't come; they send reps. We would have an active Board. We can say to the subcommittees – we need your feedback on this subject by this date. For the bylaws, we need to know whether or not this is a membership organization. We decided it's not. We would have committee members instead, similar to the Community Council of the Health Alliance. We want to include different perspectives. We could say committee members serve at the pleasure of the Board of Directors. Lack of attendance could be grounds for dismissal. If an organization wants to be a member of the committee, they appoint a rep who comes to the meeting. We debated whether to allow an organization to have a proxy if the rep can't come; we decided not to. The bylaws allow for a Board of Directors out of which come an executive committee which includes the president of the corporation (chairman of the Board) and an executive director. The officers of the corporation constitute the executive

- committee. The executive director may be an ex officio member of the executive committee. The Community Representation Committee would be a permanent standing committee, as would be the Jurisdictional Committee, and the Executive Committee. There will probably be a lot of other ad hoc committees. The officers would be elected by the Board of Directors at the annual meeting. Board members are elected to a specific position; if you're appointed to fill in a vacant position, you just stay for the remainder of the term. The officers would come from the Board. **Tom** will send the bylaws out to everybody; comments should be sent back to him. In "Purposes", we need to make it clear that we have the ability to buy lands – that is already included in 1.1d, as a broad statement.
6. Organizational development. Executive committee. The executive committee includes a chairperson; it should be small enough to allow the Executive Committee to meet easily. This would give Scott more help. The Executive Committee would look at the bylaws in May and present a proposal to the BoD. We don't really need this yet since we're all working on different parts of this anyway. The land trust issue doesn't have to be decided yet; at this point the bylaws must not preclude us from becoming a land trust or from aligning ourselves with another land trust.
 7. Table of Contents. Len presented a draft TOC. We would like to rely on jurisdictions for their municipal code and ordinances that are relevant to the discussion. We need to cut and paste some of this information. We're missing "the plan" – what we're implementing. The plan is the overall framework for what we're trying to accomplish. We should include future actions. What is the end-state that we want to get to? We need to have some info about criteria. Our action plan is in our appendix – we probably want to move that into the main chapters. How much detail do we want to include? Chapter 1 could include highlights of our action plan. In the Missoula plan, the plan is Chapter 1. Missoula has been building to their plan for 20 yrs; it's mature. But we're not there yet. We're trying to present a new plan that will be open to criticism. We want to say – why are we doing this. What are we going to have, not just what we have. Where do we want to go? The photos of South Richland in 1960 and 2009 say a lot. We'll focus on documents already created – how do we incorporate these into the TOC? Here are the areas we think should be preserved – which are already preserved, which are we looking at? Chapter 2 is background information on OS – it should be introductory material, fits with statutory definition of open space. We can put stuff in the way it's organized now and then move it around. The appendices are documents already created in this committee and should be included there. Parts of the appendices will probably be included in the discussion chapters.
 8. Other plan evaluations. Clark, Jefferson, Pierce, and Whatcom Counties (WA). These were too expansive in terms of the details of their plans for our purposes. Burlington VT has interesting things even though things don't quite fit geographically. Missoula MT is similar in many instances to our area. Monmouth County wasn't recommended. Monroe County PA didn't really fit; the state has mandated a lot of growing greener ideas. Southern Nevada (Las Vegas) had similarities – ridges, expansive, federal holdings – it was grass roots from the beginning and had several communities involved; they had TPL support. Spokane Valley had little of interest. Spokane County was interesting for Conservation Futures. Sun Valley, Idaho, didn't have a lot to work with. Boulder, CO has a long history and is mature; they didn't have a lot of detail. So, Burlington, Missoula, and Southern Nevada made our list. The Boise foothills section had interesting material to offer on slopes, etc., so that part made our list. Scott took the plans electronically and went through with highlighters and comments; to fit into the chapters of our TOC. We will cut and paste some of this generic information.
 9. Questionnaire Summary. George handed out a questionnaire summary. We may have gone into a little more detail than we need. We need to bullet the information. It's important that we include radio and television advertisements, City and TRAC reader boards that were used for publicity. We might want to have sidebars. Key information could be in a graph form. We asked the public, we heard from the public, and here are the 4 or 5 things that are the focus of our plan. Part of this should go in the public outreach discussion; we need to decide where this fits in the TOC. The most valuable part is the findings. But the process was important, too, to validate the information. The survey went through the Chamber of Commerce newsletter. The Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau put out information – **George** will ask Kris Watkins what was distributed.

10. Public Workshop Summary. Scott handed out a workshop summary. The process of the Workshops should also be summarized. The discussion should include information about the maps. **Len** will forward that information to Scott. Question #2 included more suggestions for open space not just trails. The other factors should be included in question #4 so that it's known what was considered unimportant.
11. Priority Project summary. Scott passed out a list of priority projects. It would be useful to have a map of these projects. The support was for preservation of open space and trails, it's not a contest between them – add a list of the other categories.
12. Committee action items for May. We need to include what we have in our cities/counties. Using the 3 ½ plans from other locations (see #8), what would we like to have – e.g., statutory definitions from the other plan(s) – which would we like to see included in our plans. Is this raw data or do we pull it together. Right now, we'd like to have definitions in the documents cut and pasted into our document – we can make a recommendation. What's the appropriate ratio of OS per capita (developed, natural – what's typically included)? Our community might have more because that's what is desired by our population and our natural features warrant it – the first committee would look at this. We'll have the choices we looked at and a recommendation as to what we liked best. Our different jurisdictions have different definitions of OS – our approach might come up with something that all the jurisdictions could use. **Committee #1 – Brooke (chair), Bill, Oneza (city regs and ordinances, definitions), Tom, Len, Debbie, Sharon, Rick, Merle, Barb, Jarrod, Mike S. Committee #2 – Lorna (chair), Mike L, George, (Bill - inventory), Oneza (inventory), Steve, Adam, Doug, Colin, Janelle, Scott.**