

Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Committee Meeting

DRAFT AGENDA

January 21, 2009 ~ 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 noon
 Natural Resources Building (NRB) – Rm. 175A
 Capital Campus, Olympia

(Directions at http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/Maps&Directions/Map_to_NRB_rm175a.pdf)

Start	Minutes	Item	Topic	Who
8:30	20		Welcome, Introductions, Agenda review - RCO Staff change and transition	All Heath
8:50		Workgroup 1 recommendations		Pene/Heath/all
	30	Item # 1	April 29, '09 Landscape Planning Work Session Proposal ACTION: amend and approve implementation ID and delegate next steps	Heath / Pene
9:20	40	Item # 2	2009 Annual Lands Acquisition Forum Proposal ACTION: amend and approve implementation ID and delegate next steps	Pene / Heath
10:00	10		BREAK	
10:10	60	Item # 3 Item # 4	Coordination and Policy Recommendations ACTION: endorse, table or queue recommendations for further development	Pene / Heath
11:10	20		Workgroup 2 update and discussion regarding GIS-based land acquisition and data coordination.	Steve Hahn / Marc McCalmon
11:30	15		Updates from Workgroups 3, 4, 5, 6?	
11:45	15		Wrap up and next steps	
12:00			Adjourn*	
Total	210			
<i>If we finish early...</i>			<i>Brainstorm action items above and beyond statutory requirements and a process to prioritize those items for lands group action if time and resources permit.</i>	<i>all</i>

1-21-09

Lands Group Meeting minutes

Heath convened the meeting and introductions were made.

Workgroup 1 recommendations:

Item #1 - April 29th 2009 Landscape Planning Work Session Proposal

Moved to the end of the agenda

Item #2 - 2009 Annual Lands Acquisition Forum Proposal (Pene)

WG 1 was tasked with crafting the vision for the Forum. The proposal presented today is the result of that work (see handout). The proposal includes an every-other-year format, based on the legislative cycle and budget completion. The odd year forum would be focused on near term acquisitions and even year forums, focused on long term acquisitions, possibly as a two day workshop. The group discussed the proposal and had suggestions and comments to help refine the proposal.

Group discussion points:

- Both forums would benefit from GIS data, interactive mapping would be helpful
- Going around to the front part of WWRP process would help strategize grant proposals
- Should also consider federal funding cycle
- Good plan on even/odd year forum,
- Could offer involvement of local governments via email and target groups with highest benefit rather than a blanket approach
- It would be good after there was progress do a report to stakeholders relating successes – good to garner other support, perhaps post appropriate information on acquisitions on website?
- Perhaps a sooner update would be better. The level of secrecy on acquisitions within state agencies is too high. i.e., in Okanogan County, only 30% of county is privately held, and much pressure is put on by state or feds to purchase more land. Ideal scenario is a question and answer situation. State agencies don't allow for interaction by or with the public.
- How do we do more effective outreach? Forums may be the tool. Not sure how that process feeds the biennial forecast before the decisions are made.
- Is there a mechanism to give feedback to the community? Acquisitions are done privately and the confidential purchasing strategy is to control cost.

Heath asked if there was consensus that this is a good plan to move forward and the group agreed that there was. We will need to vet this with absent agencies before we move forward with the plan for the first Forum

Items #3 & 4 Coordination and Policy Recommendations (see purple and white handouts)

The group reviewed the recommendations developed by Work Group 1 from the matrix comparing the processes used for acquisition and disposal by State Parks, Fish and Wildlife and Natural Resources.

It was suggested that the group walk through the recommendations and ask: "Is it ready to recommend, or does it need more work?"

Options for general land acquisition coordination

#1 (a) – There was a great deal of discussion from the technology committee (Wrk Grp 2) members, especially, regarding the mapping and data tracking. Discussion points included:

- Make sure we're not creating unrealistic expectations (Iceberg analogy). Balance needs and standards with a product that allows the group to move forward. A lot of work should go into identifying the questions needed to be answered to develop the technology.
- Might be good to **have IT present at all meetings** to keep expectations real and keep IT up to speed on needs etc.
- Use questions and input to develop a questionnaire or survey that will help define the end product. -
- We're certain to have budget constraints in current climate.
- Effort to populate a report is in its infancy.

Heath asked the IT group if they were requesting agencies for mapping information by questionnaire or survey. They indicated that they were using some sort of process to identify questions, process and needs.

A question was raised about WG 1 having interaction with the World Technology Initiative? (Bruce Lipke) They are doing a similar coordination thing.

Heath asked what would be the best starting point for defining questions to develop mapping program. They indicated that it will be a back and forth process – won't be able to ask and answer all the questions at one time. Forum will be part of the process.

The recommendation was made to incorporate IT planning into the Forum agenda.

BREAK

#1 (b) Discussion points:

- How much acquisition are we doing for recreation purposes?
- Trails lands seem to be left out.
- How does item (4) integrate with the local comprehensive plan?
- What is acquisition activity level for recreation vs conservation? What is the workload?
- The public perception does not differentiate between recreation and conservation land acquisition.
- Give a good alternative to public for alternate location for activity.

#1 (c)

The question was raised about including an IT person from DOT.

Natural Areas Preserve Coordination

All agencies use Natural Heritage Advisory Council and this is an obvious area for coordination. More coordination will be facilitated by the forum.

Options for prioritizing acquisition

- (1) Can be done at the annual forum
- (2) Also done at the forum
- (3) Long term goal
- (4) Prior consensus item, no discussion needed – who is going to make that connection
- (5) Agencies should pool and coordinate resources

We should include IT to list of resources in #5.

Options for improved public involvement and transparency

The comment was made to highlight early involvement of the local communities, broaden to include others – public and private entities.

Options for Federal acquisition funds

The comment was made that both recommendations were good ideas.

Options for acquisition implementation

Splendid ideas!

Transformational big ideas

The group suggested some additions to the list: look at opportunities for carbon offset

We should restate that the public does not differentiate between recreational and conservation land acquisitions. Sustainable access to recreational lands in an integral component to all the work that we do.

Update on April 29th Work session

There was some wariness expressed about the date being too close to the end of session. Timing is important.

The comment was made about the earlier, the better – push is on to restructure natural resource functions. Maybe a stronger focus for agencies so that the afternoon would be more focused on who will do the work. Back up the steps and get the questions to attendees prior to the forum,

Update on WG#3

Bill indicated that the group met once. Wondered what type of info were we looking for but that it should be kept to a pretty simple question.

The meeting was adjourned.