

## OSN Steering Committee Meeting August 5, 2009

### Minutes

Present: Sue Abbott, Lorna Deckert, Brooke Dubois, Sharon Grant, Bill King, George Last, Mike Lilga, F. Oneza, Len Pavelka, Steve Wisness, Rick White, Scott Woodward, Debbie Berkowitz

1. The Health Alliance will bring “Workable Communities” here in the spring. E3WA has formed an education group to consolidate info about sustainability; they will have a display at Tumbleweeds. There is room on their table for other groups to put up displays; they would like help staffing the booth.
2. We received our official letter of acceptance from Kennewick. Tom Moak will be Kennewick’s representative on JAC.
3. In order to become a 501©3, we need to have a Board of Directors. The jurisdictions have also been asking for this. The DG has proposed a slate of officers for the Board. Scott asked three times if there are any other nominations. There were none. Scott requested that we approve the Board as proposed. Unanimously approved.
4. The DG has been meeting to write up different parts of the plan. We have sent out different parts of the plan to the steering committee for comments.
5. Brooke talked about the health section. We need to have a more original document than we started with. Sharon wrote up a section on quality of life that included some pieces about health. We have local info about how healthy living meshes with easy access to OS and trails. TPL came out with a document that’s more updated; it has a section on health. **Brooke and Tom** are working on this section.
6. Revised action plan. Scott sent out a couple of versions. In the first draft, we eliminated everything we’ve already done. But we need to know what we’ve already done. Therefore, the coding was changed to use #1 to recognize that these items have been accomplished. #2 is partially accomplished. #3 is the future. Len suggested that we’re not planning to have a final plan, we’ll be updating the plans. He suggested using the initial plan. Brooke suggested coding with a word. Sue suggested coding with a date. The numbers 1, 2, 3 came from a generalized idea of what was going to happen when; we should lose those numbers. She suggested we will have a final plan, but then we’ll be implementing it. Once we have a final plan, it should be more user-friendly and transparent so people can jump in to help. We might move on to policies and regulations, health and wellness, acquisitions, etc. The action plan should be flexible. George suggested “now, next, future” should be considered stages of planning: data gathering and promoting public interest (initiation and pre-planning) (what we already accomplished), preparation of plan (planning), adopting and implementation of plan (execution). Mike recommended that the original action plan should come in an appendix. Sue said the action plan is more how we do business, a strategic plan; it doesn’t necessarily need to go into our OS plan. Len suggested we can’t really put dates in since this is all a volunteer effort. He suggested assigning a phase rather than a date to these steps, indicating what will be included, what will be future efforts. We don’t know what dates some of these actions will happen, since we don’t control some of these things. Mike suggested that for the OS plan we don’t need dates. This will be an evolving document. George said this is a plan for a plan. Sue said we should put blocks of time on this if not a specific date; that’s how things get done. Mike said we need input as to what goes into the action plan. Len said to pick and choose elements of the action plan to put in the plan document. Oneza said we need a plan first to decide what needs to be in our action plan. She suggested that we do an OS plan first, then do the action plan. George/Steve’s three stages – we can use these in the action plan. Much of what we did under “Planning/Mapping” was phase 1, but it will also continue. This needs to be a matrix. We will toss out numbers, create phases, see if there’s a way to use dates to complement these items. George suggested - change the paragraph on “potential actions” into a paragraph on phases, keep the numbers, add some dates. Prioritize by dates – we’ve already done that by putting in numbers. Detailed comments for **Scott** to look at: Steve – P. 3 – coordinate with volunteer organizations and government agencies. Communications and

- promotions – engage local businesses and residents (Steve) (add clubs). (George) Add a speakers' bureau. (George) Add a bullet to gather data about how much money our efforts are bringing in; what are the health benefits. (Steve) Develop trail brochures should be a high priority. (Sharon) Vancouver, WA put out a slick bulletin about their trails. (Sharon) Local businesses will help fund these ideas. **Scott** is working on this.
7. 501©3 progress – Brooke. Now that we have a Board, we can complete our Articles of Incorporation, then we can get our 501©3 – we all have to have read and understand what we said in our articles of incorporation. The Board will have to approve the Articles, the EIN, the 501©3, the conflicts of interest clause. The JAC will not be part of the 501©3. **Brooke** is working on this.
  8. General recommendations and recommendations on trails and OS. Recommendations on trails and OS was done by workshop topics and based on the info from the workshops. General recommendations (what we hope the jurisdictions will do) – The DG looked at it first and then Rick and Oneza gave their input. Rick and Oneza made major changes. Rick indicated there wasn't a change in what was prepared, they grouped like thoughts together and prioritized them, considering the audience (mainly the JAC and the elected officials). This will be presented to the jurisdictions and they would need to approve these policies. If we can get the big stuff done first in terms of priorities and the jurisdictions agree, the details come more easily. Bill suggested the most important thing this group can do is to come up with something that's inspirational enough to motivate the elected officials to accept the broad ideas. Once Rick and Oneza feel comfortable with this, we'll pass it along to the rest of the steering committee and then the jurisdictions. The sections are definition and inventory, communication, ownership, regional trails, access, funding, federal notification, best practices for development, RROSN status and update process, comprehensive plan and ordinance adjustment. Scott is very pleased with how this has worked - it has been a great teamwork process. Brooke is still questioning who the audience is for some parts of the document; some should be for RROSN. We need to make clear who is doing what, i.e., the jurisdictions or RROSN. Brooke gave Scott some suggested changes. **Scott** is working on this.
  9. Maps. They're getting close. Scott goes through JPEGs and then takes it to the GIS office. He's working with an intern there. One map has the Ice Age Floods Trail, Columbia Plateau Trail, and NW Discovery Water Trail as they track into the Tri-Cities. It would be useful to have our map available, too, so we can be on the regional trails maps that are being developed. The next phase will be to look at how the backdrop looks – how many roads, how get rid of irrigation circles, colors to use. Scott gave them a deadline of September, so he can bring it to our Sept. meeting – hopefully they'll be able to meet this. Len suggested some 11 x 17 maps. Scott suggested some 11 x 17 and some 8 x 11, depending on how large an area and how much detail. Brooke gave out the OS and trails inventories that she's put together. Richland has a project to widen the trail on Keene to the West Richland boundary; the trail continues in W. Richland for another 100 yards. Do we want to include the short loops in the parks or does it need to connect to something? We need to make a decision about that. If it only serves internally within the park, do we want to include it? There are a number of trails that are partially developed, but not formally recognized, e.g., Rattlesnake, McBee grade, Wallula gap, Hover peak. Wallula gap isn't a trail. These should be dedicated trails. Developed trails would be a better term. We should include the water trails, including the Greater Columbia Water Trail. We need to emphasize that this is a huge hub of regional trails. Brooke will include the Tapteal water trail on the Yakima River – it's in development. Do we want to include any parks <25 acres – if they're connected by trails. What will be available, ready-made, to put into a brochure. Sue recommended using the official name of the trail (informational and educational) – the info would be available on a website, so we wouldn't have to provide as much information. What are we doing with KID canals? It's part of our recommendations to include the canal right-of-ways for trails. We can't include them on our trail maps as trails until we get the ok from the KID. The irrigation districts have right of way on main canals, but only have easements on other parts of the land. The easements are owned by private property owners, so couldn't be part of the trail system. We can have discussions with the irrigation districts to ask how we can make the covered canals available, how we can help them get funding to cover the canals, etc. We are asking that **Benton and Franklin** counties work on this.

10. Plan Implementation. Debbie put together a list of available tools, based on the Missoula Plan. Bill pointed out it's helpful to have the information from WA state, rather than other states. **Debbie** will incorporate info from Las Vegas, Clark County, and Crested Butte's idea.
11. Introduction – Mike L. George said this needs to include how we're facilitating OS planning across jurisdictions. We want continuity. We should strengthen the idea about the opportunity to influence OS planning across jurisdictions. This is followed up in detail in the recommendations. Sue suggested we should talk about how OS is both publicly and privately owned. For the working lands – landscapes is the term that Sue recommended. Our list is mainly agricultural. In other areas, working landscapes includes things like landfills. Sue thought Mike did a very good job of pulling this all together. Oneza asked if we should have a description of the area at the beginning. We talk about the Mid-Columbia, but should we specify the counties and cities. We could have a map of the planning area on the cover. We're talking about the Columbia Basin. The Weather Service refers to this area as the Lower Columbia Basin. Oneza suggested that the agricultural land of commercial significance may not be included in OS. Bill suggested OS could be a function of the land use designation – agricultural, development (holding pattern). The words are used differently by different people; from a jurisdictional perspective, there's a distinction between OS and undeveloped land. The latter is not intended for OS. But there may be lands that are going to be developed that could be considered for OS. Natural Spaces – are these intentionally managed as OS? We might include the word, intentional. When we talk about protecting OS, we're usually talking about trying to protect land that's been designated for development. Len questioned the inclusion of cemeteries as OS – Debbie pointed out that they're good for birding. **Mike** is working on the introduction.
12. Request for plan updates. Mike L. Debbie sent out the tables Rick Simon put together about Floodplains and Hillside Regulations to the **jurisdictions**. She hasn't heard back. Oneza said she's working on it. Lorna will check with Benton City. **Len** will talk to West Richland to find out to whom to send it and send the info to Debbie. In Richland, P&R is doing a separate soft trail plan, since these weren't included in the Transportation Improvement Plan. What capital improvements will be impacting OS? We're interested in everything that's planned, not just what's funded, though we also would like to know their priorities and funding situations. The street/highway info is coordinated by B-F CoG; **Len** will help with this. BFCoG doesn't have info on parks or capital improvements. We need this info from the **jurisdictions**, what they currently have in their plans. They are working on their 6-yr TIP and CIP plans now and will update the info when the process is done in a couple of months.
13. Sue asked - Are we looking at some of the other recommendations that came out of workshops/questionnaire, not just the priority recommendations. All the ideas that came up are in the appendix. Recommendations include more than just locations/trails; they include more general ideas about how we're hoping to work together. The available tools should include the input from the workshops/questionnaire.
14. Sue asked if we wanted her to try to extend her involvement in our process. She could probably extend til the end of the CY. She actually didn't start until Jan., so it's possible that she could extend through Dec. We've taken on a huge project and we've come a long way from the beginning, we've gotten everybody around the table, talking to each other with a common language. We've gotten the partnerships started. We'd like Sue to extend her official involvement til the end of Dec.; she's willing to stay on our e-mail list past that.