

## OSN Steering Committee Meeting June 3, 2009

### Minutes

Present: Skip Claeson, Lorna Deckert, Brooke Dubois, Adam Fyall, Sharon Grant, Bill King, George Last, Mike Lilga, F. Oneza, Doug Strong, Tom Page, Rick White, Scott Woodward, Debbie Berkowitz

1. Sue's budget has been cut. She'll probably come in August or September.
2. Columbia Park West master plan consultants interviewed a number of people. Sharon was interviewed for RROSN. They reached out to the user groups. The first public meeting is June 17. Should it be kept more natural or more developed? Sharon spoke on the side of keeping it more natural.
3. Buy-in letter. Scott had written a letter to the various jurisdictions, requesting a formal representative for the jurisdictional advisory board. Pasco had questions about the organizational strategy of the executive and steering committees. The Pasco Council is appreciative of the committee's efforts and goals. Mayor Joyce Olsen agreed to be an informal representative until some of the organizational issues are resolved. Richland mayor asked for volunteers – Rita Mazur and Sandra Kent volunteered depending on time of day, Rita for day, Sandra for evening. Lorna indicated that Benton City wants a more formalized statement of the group goals, though they are in favor in general. We do have a mission statement and action/goals; Scott sent a hardcopy to Mayor Carnahan. Lorna will get a copy to the council and will bring it up for the Council's agenda in 2 weeks. Benton County is about where Pasco is – Commissioner Beaver is interested in participating. The Board of Commissioners needs to know better what they're committing to. Adam will discuss this further with the Commissioners. Scott has been trying to reach Franklin County. For Kennewick, Bob Hammond has the question set up for discussion at a workshop on June 23. Scott will meet with Bob prior to that; Adam would like to join that meeting. We haven't heard from West Richland. This is a process that will take a while (it took TGA 4 to 5 years to build a relationship).
4. Formal structure. Tom rewrote the bylaws and sent them out for review and comment. Brooke made comments. It's been recommended that we have no members. Board members, jurisdictional members – and that's it. Tom rejected the consensus model because it's too slow; everything that requires a motion or vote requires a 60% vote. He thought that would insure sufficient dialogue among the Board members to bring issues out on the table and considered. Sharon suggested asking Sue about how broader based groups have handled this. **Tom** will talk to Sue and will get back to the group. Mike asked if the jurisdictions would participate under bylaws such as this. Adam pointed out that each jurisdiction has its own responsibility for its issues; this group won't be setting policy for the jurisdictions. The jurisdictions will be represented on the Board of Directors. The jurisdictional advisory committee will be the higher group that gives direction directly from the Councils. We're not a policy organization, we're an advocacy organization. The jurisdictions will be able to get involved with some things and not with others. A lot of the other plans we've been looking include a statement, that the jurisdictional entities will be respected. Some jurisdictional reps will want to abstain from voting on some issues. Abstentions count as a "no." Scott suggested adopting as much as we can today. Brooke moved that we endorse the Bylaws as presented. The question will be asked of Sue about the issue of voting with a super majority or consensus. Once that issue is resolved, we will vote to adopt the Bylaws.
5. Committee #1. Tom and Len cut and pasted from the other City plans. Oneza discussed the process that Kennewick just went through because Kennewick had a request from property owners to use open space land for wineries. They set up an advisory committee and looked at the intent of OS zoning. OS in Kennewick includes NOS and DOS. The committee came up with a draft code. We need to select the level of detail so the jurisdictions can find the plan acceptable. The plans from other cities are written at several different levels of approach and detail. What might be accomplished is that we develop a file that has different levels of detail. Different communities have different slopes - the planners could find it within their documents. The regulatory side will

have to happen at the jurisdictions. The big picture/vision can happen with RROSN. We can put together a wish list. There are recommendations that we can make, e.g., about how to build on slopes. We don't want to put things in a plan that people will say no. The wish list would spur people to think about it and then we can discuss. We tried to combine statements in plans to fill in parts of the TOC. Brooke asked Sue how to define OS – she said that is difficult because the State has never defined OS. IRS definition may be different (e.g., doesn't include golf courses). Brooke found the only definition in WA State statute in the OS Taxation Act. Brooke looked at the various jurisdictional definitions and gave us a handout. There is a wide range of definitions. It was hard to distinguish between definitions and policies. This group needs to come up with a definition. The RCO publication Brooke distributed had information on OS definitions – they also cited court cases. The Committee should go back and write a proposed definition. Len has written a proposed Chap. 2; Scott is looking at it. Tom created an appendix of funding options. The definition of OS is probably one of the most important tasks of this group. We also need to define the types of OS. Brooke handed out a definition from Salt Lake- it includes passive and low impact activities, doesn't include golf courses/cemeteries/school yards. Richland has struggled with this. Agriculture is another issue within OS. Pasco defines the area around the airport as OS – so Pasco can control what goes there. The term OS is too generic. Some citizens want OS natural, some want it developed. Does this committee want to focus on DOS or NOS or both. Our priority projects are around NOS except that it includes connectivity. Is the OS available to the public or not? In Scottsdale, hillsides were undeveloped but weren't accessible to the public because they were still privately owned. But they may be visually available, too. Public vs private. Accessible for recreational use? Some areas are restricted for habitat use. The rural way of life is also a consideration. The updating process – what would be recommended, how often? It's part of the process – look at the plan every 3 to 5 years and decide whether it needs to be reexamined. The health aspect needs to be included in all this – wellbeing, wellness, life enhancement, quality of life. We can borrow the language from some of the other cities' plans. A national business leader said that it's easier to recruit the folks you want to your community if you have OS. Economic value needs to be included. National Recreation and Parks Association – Robert Crompton – does research on economic value. Homebuilders charge more when the house is located adjacent to OS; and assessors assess at a greater value.

6. Committee #2. Mike passed out handouts. Mike wrote an introduction, the need for planning. A lot is taken from our proposal to the NPS and from the TCH article. Mike wrote a piece on the history of the planning process, some of the accomplishments. It's high level stuff. There's a summary on the questionnaire and on the workshops. Mike included some of the appendices (first page of each). Mike suggested including all the data we collected – from workshops, questionnaire. We'll have a funding strategy appendix. Mike proposed revising the TOC – he gave us a handout. The TOC should be a road map to the document and gives a message. This TOC is based on Missoula's – it's a well written plan that tells a story. Item II, the need for more OS – call it the importance of OS. Our priorities were based on public input, what criteria are we looking for. We asked for criteria at the workshops. Plan implementation is the most challenging and most controversial. The cities/counties establish priorities. This could be taken as more public input into their processes. What are the opportunities for input – when are the counties/cities open to input for their land use plans? How do we tie in/supplement/complement the jurisdictions plans? How does this fit into the larger scheme? How do we change assignments based on the new TOC? What are future plans? Future plans include the jurisdictional plans as well as what the committee is doing. One of the key messages is to facilitate OS preservation across jurisdictions – chapter 4. The importance of OS is in Chap. 2. We're working from Comp Plans relating to parks, and land use plans, parks plans (acquisitions), capital projects plans. For example, Steptoe St. impacts Amon Basin. A potential balance needs to be struck. Parks Depts typically provide playfields, etc., not so much NOS. Cities are supposed to be accommodating growth under GMA. The counties need to be represented here because most of what we're talking about here needs to happen in the counties. **Mike** is willing to take the input from Committee #1 and start assembling the document. We'll see where the holes are.
7. Priority projects. Scott made a bunch of the changes we recommended last month. Scott has put together the workshop summaries and data. Scott included info on the outreach efforts which cover 4 items: public workshops, questionnaire, powerpoint tour, website information. **Scott** will

send these documents to us. The maps and boundaries aren't here. The map process is time consuming and expensive so Scott wants us to be on the same page before he does it. What is the OS boundary? Benton-Franklin County of Governments has a bike map for Benton County that is more representational. Scott did the GIS maps. Those are options for formats. Do one map with just parks and trails, lose the geological features and the relief. We can create a series of maps. We can create separate maps for each city and each county. We want to make sure we have our proposed trails and community projects. The GIS format is most difficult – has to be done by hand. What scale will we have? 8 ½ x 11 or folded or plates? The scale will dictate the decision. One base map of Benton County, blowups of areas on the next pages. At the workshops we had 6 maps. We might want more level of detail on priority projects. We could eliminate some of the DOS pieces. We could show significant natural areas. If we can use the maps we've already done, that would be efficient. The GIS maps can go to a shadow mode. The maps provide a lot of data and information. What detail do we want? We might want maps on 3 different scales – trail corridors to even larger areas (eastern part of state and Oregon); 2 county area; series that highlight the areas we're focusing on. Can we use Google maps? Google sells subscriptions that give one access to their maps. The basic work is for the jurisdictions. Google maps are hard to do. No need to have visual inserts.

- Regional map. We're at the crossroads of a lot of regional trails. Eastern WA and NE OR (land and water trails).
- Overview of what we're proposing in the two counties – pretty general, shows how it all fits together. Schematic level.
- Two separate county maps.
- More detailed maps, similar to the Google maps that we had in the Powerpoint presentation. What is this scale? Priority projects – open spaces and trails. Use shading to indicate topography.
- Map of what we have now. Each jurisdiction has this now.

We should start with the regional maps and the county maps first and that might clarify what we need on the more detailed maps.

8. Questionnaire summaries. We incorporated the comments from everybody and pulled together the appendices – the questionnaire, powerpoint info, and open-ended responses.
9. Committee #1 decided we needed a writer to have a single voice. **Mike** has agreed to start that. **Brooke** will send Mike the results from committee #1 and he'll start compiling. Mike wants a coherent section, not the cut and paste we've done. We have an inventory of ideas and writings that we can use. Is there a plagiarism issue? We should massage the wording to be our own. **Mike** can e-mail to the committee chapter by chapter, preferably in Word.
10. Committee assignments for June: Who is doing which chapter? Committee #1 has a cut and paste document by category, put in the order of the old TOC. **Tom** will summarize the cut and paste information in his voice and send it to Mike. **Mike** will put it in his voice. Mike has done the Introduction. **George** will forward the e-mail on the questionnaire summary to Mike. **Scott** will forward the writeups on workshops and the excel data to Mike. Chapter 2 – **Brooke** will send the Chap. 2 that Len created on OS values and functions. **Tom** will pull info together on improving our quality of life and economic stability. **Sharon** will send her writing on improving the quality of life. Health should be included in quality of life. We should include photos interspersed throughout the document (sidebars). Chapter 3 – Brooke has put together inventories from most of the jurisdictions. **Lorna** will send Mike the Benton City inventory. **Brooke** will compile the jurisdictions policies from the Comp Plans to include in the appendices. Chapter 4 – will need more discussion. **Scott** will send Mike the Google maps used in workshops 3 and 4. Chapter 5 – Taking apart comp plans for jurisdictions and finding out what current efforts are. Current efforts should go under Chap. 3 for the jurisdictions; current efforts of this group go under Chap. 1. We're asking the **jurisdictions (Bill, Oneza, Rick, Lorna, Merle, Adam, Jarrod)** to send information to Mike on current and future efforts and capital projects, schedule for Comp Plan revisions, park plan revisions. What are the current threats – where does this go? Capital

projects on the jurisdictions lists that affect OS should go under Chap. 3. We need some information on maps where trails and OS should go. Chapter 5 – also management and maintenance of NOS. How do jurisdictions coordinate with each other and with citizen groups and with law enforcement to manage/maintain these areas? This will come later. Chapter 5 – **Scott** will cut and paste plan update process to Mike. Appendices – proposal, action plan, public meeting records, questionnaire records already discussed. **Brooke** will send the funding options document that Len wrote to Mike.