

## OSN Steering Committee Meeting March 3, 2010

### Minutes

**Present:** George Last, Sharon Grant, Scott Woodward Mike Lilga, Mike Shuttleworth, Valerie Smith, Brook Dubois, Rick White, Doug Strong, Skip Claeson, Tom Page, Len Pavelka, Bill King

**Introductory Remarks:** Scott stated that Debbie Berkowitz (OSN Secretary) would not be here so George Last would be taking the meeting notes. Scott also noted that Ferdouse Oneza was leaving her job with the City of Kennewick. Mike Shuttleworth introduced Valerie Smith (also with Benton County) who may attend when he is unable. We then went through a round of introductions.

1. **RROSN News:** Sharon Grant noted that Friends of Badger is building a new trail – volunteer signup is online.
  - a. **Southridge and other developing developments:** Scott stated that the Thompson Hill appeal, sent to the Kennewick board had not yet been settled, but that another board meeting was planned for March 10, 2010 at City Hall. Scott also indicated that the City is looking at the Southridge Plan and potential flaws in that plan. This could allow contractors to proceed per planning documents prior to the 2005 Southridge Plan. Scott also stated that he met with the main developer (Miranda Group?) of the Southridge Development. Scott said the developer indicated that they were not sure what “Open Space” is. Scott described Kennewick’s definition and our RROSN definition – discussion ensued. Scott said he felt the discussion was very positive and that the developer is considering not developing a portion of the residential areas defined in the current Southridge Development, but instead to leave it for open recreation and perhaps a trail system. Scott also described the Ridgeline Road area and perhaps some connecting trails through that area.
  - a. **Request for letter of support for Amon Basin:** Scott requested a letter of support from the RROSN, to support acquisition of land from the Springwater Development. The Amon Basin is a major central connector to many existing and proposed trails. Tapteal is looking for an Urban Wildlife grant from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). Letter of support are very important to demonstrate public support – this can make the difference when competing with other projects. Scott said they are about a month and a half away from closing the deal. There apparently was a flaw in their survey, but that has since been settled. They have an agreed on price and a willing seller, and they have partnered with the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife so will not need matching funds. Doug Strong indicated that the City of Richland is considering support. The Staff will need to voice their support and then send that to the planning commission – which has some new members.

***Motion:** Tom Page moved that the RROSN Development Group craft such a letter and send it to Tapteal. Skip and Sharon both seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.*

Tom will draft a letter for the development group to review and approve.

2. **JC (March 5) meeting update:** The next JC meeting is this Friday.
  - a. **Conserve vs. Preserve:** Tom described the group’s efforts in researching the definitions of these terms, with their resulting recommended definition, highlighted in the box. The rest of the document is background. The plan is to send this document to Commissioner Peck, who raised the question at the first JC meeting. There was lots of discussion. Rick White and Len expressed concern that this document may not appease the Commissioner. They are concerned that Commissioner Peck is and will remain sensitive to the term “Preserve or Preservation” as it implies (at least in his mind) that land use will be restricted. Len suggested that we just drop those terms and just use “conserve”. Brooke pointed out that we already have “Preserves” out there and that we are not going to change those names. The concern is that in passing conversation the term “preserve” may cause confusion. Instead perhaps we should use “restricted use preservation” or something similar to match Commissioner Peck’s explanation/impression of the term “preserve”. Rick suggested adding a sentence to the definition that the terms “preserve” or “conserve” do not mean limited use (like the A.L.E Reserve). Doug Strong thought we might need to add a qualifier to the term to define the type of preservation – e.g. “limited” or “restricted”. Len suggested running the

definition document past Joyce Olson to get her feedback on it. Mike Lilga suggested adding examples of the sites around here, like Badger Mountain Preserve. Doug and Rick both mentioned adding a statement that we do not have the authority to restrict land use. Scott summarized – that the proposal would be to add two statements to the Preserve/Conserve Definition. Tom started drafting a statement that captured both thoughts. The group iterated on the statement and we ended up with “RROSN has no authority to establish land use restrictions. That authority resides with land owners and local jurisdictions and agencies”. [Tom said he would add that statement to the definition so that it could be provided to the JC at Friday’s meeting.](#)

- b. Do you feel misled?** Scott asked if anyone thought that his presentation or discussion on the steering committee members or the JC were misleading. No one thought that any changes were needed.
3. **Chapter 3 review and discussion:** Brooke found a spelling error on Page 40 – complimentary vs. complementary. Mike led the discussion on Chapter 3 with some discussion on the open space definition. Brook suggested some reorganization and/or better referencing to the tables. Mike acknowledged that the current draft did not reflect the intended organization – but was just done to ease the production of the draft. Doug noted that the community park at Horn Rapids has been named “Hanford Legacy Park”. Brooke wanted to make sure that there were no established trails in Franklin County. No one could think of any. Discussion continued on additional comments regarding the trail inventory, and some misspellings (e.g. Ranch Reata Trails should be Rancho Reata Trails). Sharon thought that the 16-acre open space listed in Table 1 as Badger Mt. (no access), should be “Little Badger Mt.”. Doug was not so sure – [Doug and Sharon will check on this.](#)
4. **Chapter 4 review and discussion:** There was some minor discussion and comments passed on to Mike.
5. **Chapter 5 Trails/Open Space only review and discussion:** Scott stated that the JC meeting will focus only on the Trails and Open Space portion of Chapter 5 – Not on specific recommendations. Doug stated that the City of Richland is updating its master/comprehensive plan and will recommend incorporating aspects of the RROSN plan. Brook suggested that a statement like that be made at the JC meeting.
6. **Draft resolution for RROSN adoption discussion:** Scott introduced the draft resolution noting that it was intended to be a “soft-edge” resolution and that both Len and Rick had provided valuable input collected from the visions of the cities and counties – these were incorporated into the *Whereases*. Len questioned whether the title of the resolution shouldn’t be “in Recognition of support of work of” rather than “in Recognition of support for the adoption of”. Scott noted that this has to do with the timing – when will the resolution be given to the JC – before or after the plan is completed? There was some discussion by Rick and Scott on the process surrounding the JC – which was organized to support and recognize the need for regional planning. Mike Lilga went back through the intent of the resolution – to have the JC adopt the RROSN Plan – after it was completed. The JC is seeing the chapters and having the chance to comment on them as they are being drafted – the most important thing is to have a resolution after the plan is completed. Scott asked if we should not have a *Resolved* on the timeline in the plan? Brooke wished the *Whereases* were linked back to their origins in the City and County visions. Brooke also liked many of Sharon’s comments that had been sent out via email – and there was some further discussion of those comments. The discussion then came up that each jurisdiction would likely create their own versions of the resolution, rather than all jurisdictions using the same resolution. This would mean there would be seven different resolutions – each done to meet the standard and needs of the individual jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction would likely have its own *Whereases* but could work towards a common set of *Resolveds*. Questions remain: Who to send this to? – When does it go out? – What are we looking for in regards to accepting, adopting, using, or influencing regional open space planning? Further discussion – maybe change “adoption” to “accept” or “we support the goals and objectives for (e.g. Benton County) as appropriate” – in other words, adopt by reference. Scott tried to summarize as to how he would change the draft resolution – he would change the title to “for adoption of the plan”. The *Whereases* would be provided as suggestions. Skip suggested some additions to the *Whereases* particularly on the health aspects of open space. Scott said he would add a *Whereas* on the health benefits. Further discussion – the *Resolveds* came out of the RROSN Plan – we could boil these all down to one *Resolveds* – “to adopt the plan”. We should consider simplifying the *Whereases* also. It was suggested that we develop one resolution for the JC, and then each jurisdiction could create their own resolution from it. [Mike Shuttleworth volunteered to take a shot at the next draft of this resolution.](#)

**The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.**