

OSN Steering Committee Meeting July 1, 2009

Minutes

Present: Lorna Deckert, Brooke Dubois, Tim Fife, Sharon Grant, Bill King, George Last, Mike Lilga, Jarrod McPherson, F. Oneza, Tom Page, Len Pavelka, Doug Strong, Steve Wisness, Rick White, Scott Woodward, Debbie Berkowitz

1. Tim Fife and Jarrod McPherson are here from Franklin County and Steve Wisness from IMAC.
2. TGA applied for and received a small grant from Con Agra to publish and print the plan.
3. Buy-in updates (Scott). Lorna read a letter from Lloyd Carnahan, Mayor of Benton City. Benton City endorsed the RROSN regional planning process and is willing to assign a councilperson (Lorna) to serve as a member on the Jurisdictional Advisory Council (JAC). Benton City will also provide planning expertise and access for the RROSN through the city planning department. Jarrod met with Commissioner Peck of Franklin County. He would like to make some changes to the letter. Jarrod, Tim, and Scott will work on the language issues. West Richland also endorsed the process. The City of Kennewick will have a discussion between the mayor and city manager and then will meet with Scott next week to discuss the buy-in. Scott will put the letters in the appendix of the plan.
4. Structure adoption (Tom). The jurisdictions have asked whom they are talking to, the steering committee, or board of directors or? Tom, Brooke, Mike, and Scott have been working on this. We hope to create a Land Trust with a BoD and executive committee, which is its own 501(c)3. We need to be a formalized entity. Tom proposed that we establish a "Development Group", charged with two items - providing guidance to get the report through to completion and addressing comments; and moving forward with steps to incorporate as a 501(c)3 to become a land trust. The group will be a working group, taking roles in writing and editing. They would be meeting between the monthly meetings of the steering committee and bringing the information/proposals to the steering committee. Tom, Scott, Mike, Brooke, Len, Sharon (maybe), Debbie will form this development group. This will be a separate mailing list.
5. Tom talked to Sue Abbott on June 8 about the bylaws with regard the decision making process. The Steering Committee had made a decision to use consensus. The bylaws were written to use a 60% super-majority vote on decisions. Nonprofit law has a provision to allow a director to register a dissent. Sue indicated she didn't have much experience with governance of a nonprofit. She said to remember that the bylaws are not for the steering committee, but for a future organization that we intend to create. RROSN needs to make our own decisions as to how we do business. She doesn't think we really operate by consensus now anyway. Tom wasn't sure what she meant by this concept. She pointed out that we can change the rules if something doesn't work for us. Mike thought we have been working by consensus. Sharon mentioned a group that works by consensus; it takes longer, but everybody gets behind it enough that they can support it. Sharon thinks that a modified consensus plan can work, even if it we don't do it here. Tom indicated that in corporate law, if a director attending a meeting doesn't object or dissent, s/he is assumed to have agreed with the action. Mike thinks consensus is not a good model for working on land deals. Steve has experience with a group using consensus; it doesn't work very well, a lot doesn't get done. We had adopted the bylaws except for the 60% super-majority, pending the outcome of the phone call. Today we need to decide whether to adopt the bylaws with the 60% super-majority. Tim indicated that in his experience somebody always dissents, so consensus doesn't work. We went around the table and everybody agreed (with 2 or 3 abstentions) that we approve the bylaws as written.
6. First draft of the plan according to Mike. Mike has sent us a very rough draft of the document. He collected the input from various people and put it in the places that he thought it belonged. Mike passed out a TOC with boxes checked where we have pretty good input and with boxes not checked indicating holes or areas that Mike hasn't had time to look through. Chapter 1, the introduction is pretty well covered. We have a definition of OS to discuss today. Chapter 2, the importance of OS, is critical. We need more text for opportunities for improving our quality of

- life and economic stability; health benefits. OS values and functions are included in one section. A bunch of material is verbatim from other plans; Mike thinks we should use our own language. Chapter 3. The maps are in production now. A lot of the street details have been taken out, trying to include the important information, including contours. The main regional map has a pullaway of the entire region; includes the three main trails in our region. The last three sections in Chapter 3 could use input from the jurisdictions; we have some input from some, but not all. Len pointed out that for section 3.3 there's a big difference between projects that are funded and projects that are planned. Mike suggested that we would like to have both since future plans will have an impact on OS planning. Brooke suggested that funded actions are in Chap. 3; future needs are Chap. 4. We need the long-range plans in Chap. 3 so we can include the OSN future plans in Chap. 4. E.g., the proposed Duportail Bridge goes in Chap. 3 as an area that will impact OS. Chap. 4 would include a pedestrian walkway on the Duportail Bridge as a trail linkage. Chap. 4 section 1 includes recommendations for OS protection and trail linkages. This would be a conceptual chapter. Chap. 5 might include some details of a couple of projects. Do we want to recommend policy directions? The regulations would need to be left to the jurisdictions. The general policy directions could be proposed to the jurisdictions; we could draft a recommended/sample OS policy for the jurisdictions to look at. Each jurisdiction would modify according to their needs/desires/lawyers recommendations, etc. If another jurisdiction (e.g., Spokane) has sample language adopted in specific ordinances, we could include that in an appendix. Rick suggested the recommendations should be provided (e.g., no cut and fill on hillsides), since this could provide a resource for sample ordinances. This document could link to examples in other communities. Lorna said the city clerks do this whenever an issue comes up. However, links don't remain forever, so there's no point in having them in a printed document. So, we're talking about making policy recommendations. The cities/counties have policies for OS in their Comp Plans, but no definition. Brooke has pulled these together. There is no definition of OS in the GMA that the State uses. We could provide recommended language to incorporate at a local level. Tim suggested that for Franklin county OS means keeping the farms as agricultural lands. We can include a list of recommended language. But the jurisdictions will modify the language. Do we provide model language for the Comp Plan? What's the policy behind preparing this plan? This policy discussion will continue with the Development Group. Will the **jurisdictions** put together the last 3 bullets in Chap. 3? What are the steps needed to adopt/implement the plan in each **jurisdiction** (Chap. 5, Available Tools) – e.g., take policies from the OS Plan and put in local jurisdictions' Comp Plan (adopt by reference)? Chap. 3 has much of the information Mike's requesting from the jurisdictions (what Brooke pulled together) – could each **jurisdiction** clarify and put in a better format? Each **jurisdiction** will put their part in a Word document and modify as they see fit (Benton City and West Richland didn't have information in their Comp Plans.) Mike will put it all in the same format. Brooke put together a table of parks and OS inventory in the counties and each city that we had data for – she sent it to the jurisdictions this morning. Chap. 5 – we might want to discuss steps next time. A couple of the jurisdictions' plans have methods to prioritize future projects. We should include methods to prioritize future projects in our plan. This is called a priority array. The priority OS projects and trails were established at the public workshops and questionnaire. The process from here on is what we're talking about. In an ideal world, we'd have criteria, but in the real world, it won't necessarily work that way. Priority arrays are frequently geared around funding availability. We'll need to have knowledge of the different types of grants available. When we're talking property, a willing seller is needed as well. The Development Group will need to fill in Chap. 5.
7. OS definition. The OS definition came out of the Missoula and Burlington OS plans. Len, Tom, and Brooke have edited this. We need a formalized definition. George had questions – we don't talk about water as OS, just shorelines; he thinks this is good because we don't want to include the acreage of water as OS. We wouldn't develop or manage it. Franklin County is the only jurisdiction that includes rivers/lakes. An ORV park is a special use park. Other urban green spaces create a feeling of space. We are defining OS, but our focus will be on natural OS. We need to consider the big picture, the general audience in this document. Third sentence - ...benefit to citizens (add) and protection of the environment. The addition of "the environment" could add additional sources of funding. OS paragraph – get rid of the "undisturbed" shrub-steppe land since most shrub steppe is disturbed. The value of landscaping was suggested, but this should go

- into “Values and Functions” section in Chap. 2. Special geological features include erratics, Yakima Bluffs, Wallula Gap. Trails section – trails can follow irrigation canals and transmission line (utility) corridors, abandoned railroad lines and abandoned irrigation canals as well (existing or vacated rights of way). Functional value includes windbreaks (hedgerows probably don’t fit in our area). Functional value could include floodplains or floodways – we should use “floodways”. As a whole, this definition is the right idea. We will make editorial changes.
8. Assignments. Counties and Cities input already discussed, including steps each jurisdiction would have to take for this plan to work. Management and maintenance ideas will go through the Development Group. We need recommendations in place and get help from the jurisdictions to create language that works. **Scott** will go through the Action Plan, take out what we’ve already done, and add the new stuff. The health benefits part – Tom collected some material, he’ll generate something, pass it to Brooke, and then pass it to Mike. **Sharon** has been writing up a health part; she presented her outline and has writeups on most of the bullets. She will pass it along to Brooke and Tom who will see how it fits. The NPS has an initiative on the health benefits on OS, so does the National Recreation and Park Association; both have info on their websites. Doug is working on an OS plan; the hard trails are listed, they’re working on the soft trails. Brooke is working on a trails table that has location, surface, length. **Scott** will give Doug and Brooke info on the TGA soft trails. **Steve** will pull info together on Benton-Franklin soft trails. **Scott** will send Steve electronic copies of the maps we used in the workshops – that would give the locations of many of the trails (Rattlesnake Slope, McBee, Scootenay, White Bluffs, Ringold, Hover Peak). **Sharon** will get a contact from Rancho Reata to add their trails. Do we want a proposed trail mileage? That would be a different table. Not now. The recommendations will start with the Development Group. We can make policy recommendations for the Comp Plans. Are we dealing with recommendations, e.g., for land acquisition or for developing ridgeline building standards? It would be helpful to be able to say that the JAC has worked some item out as a proposed policy and could report back to their respective Councils. A resolution to support regional planning for OS in the Comp Plan would be important for each of the jurisdictions once we have a plan. We need a document from here that the jurisdictions could adopt. We need to be incorporated first. Each **jurisdiction** could check their Comp Plan to see if there’s a policy to support regional OS planning. In the next cycle of their Comp Plans, the jurisdictions could decide whether to incorporate the OS plan. This is referenced in our Action Plan. The Development Group will look at the action items which Scott will re-do. These will be brought forward to the JAC.
 9. George brought up that we haven’t been talking about promoting OS as an economic driver. That will come under Chap. 2, section 3. How do we promote the OS we have and that we’re going to have. Products? Part of updating the action plan is in Chap. 5. Can any of the grant be used for promotion. George proposed a section in the actions, not just in the values, possibly in the recommendations for OS Protection and Trail Linkages, recommendations for Promotion and economic development as a separate heading in the TOC.