

**Skagit Alternative Futures Project
Steering Committee Meeting Summary
Wednesday, April 7, 2010
Skagit County Administration Building, Mount Vernon, Washington**

Attendance

Members

Rebecca Bradley-Lowell, City of Mount Vernon	Jan Ellingson, Better Homes and Gardens Real Estate	Margaret Fleek, City of Burlington
Steve Hinton, Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, alternate for Larry Wasserman	Carolyn Kelly, Skagit Conservation District	Paul Kriegel, Private Forester
Ryan Larsen, City of Anacortes	Kevin Morse, The Nature Conservancy	Rebecca Ponzio, Puget Sound Partnership
Allen Rozema, Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland	Shirley Solomon, Skagit Watershed Council	Margaret Studer, Futurewise
Dr. Gary Tollefson, Skagit Valley College		

Other Participants:

Kirk Johnson, Skagit County	Josh Greenberg, Skagit County	Kendra Smith, Skagit County
Linda Christensen, Skagit County	Betsy Stevenson, Skagit County	John Lombard, University of Washington
Luke Rogers, University of Washington	John Bolte, Oregon State University	Lisa Dally Wilson, Dally Environmental
Mark Personius, Growth Management Consultant	Hart Hodges, Western Washington University	Stephen Stanley, Department of Ecology
Martha Bray, Skagit Land Trust	Ellie Rogers, Skagit Land Trust	Keith Folkerts, Kitsap County
Loren Cedar		

Handouts:

1. Agenda
2. November 4, 2009 Meeting Summary
3. Key Differences Among Scenarios – Preliminary
4. Project Schedule

The meeting began at 9:10 a.m.

Agenda Review and Brief Business

The Steering Committee reviewed and approved the November 4, 2009 meeting summary.

Welcome from Skagit County Commissioner Chair, Sharon Dillon

- Commissioner Dillon welcomed the Steering Committee, County staff, and guests on behalf of the Board of Skagit County Commissioners and thanked all for their commitment and time to the Alternative Futures project.
- This is a unique opportunity which will affect our grandchildren's future and we are fortunate to have this opportunity: "If you don't dream and don't have a vision and let life go as status quo, then nothing changes. I believe a group such as you can make a difference."
- The Board of County Commissioners is committed to put into place what needs to be done to move forward for Skagit County

Presentation of Skagit Model Prototype – John Bolte

- Below is the presentation on the Skagit Envision model prototype link that can be viewed from the meeting: http://skagit.granicus.com/ASX.php?view_id=2&clip_id=636.
- At the end of these meeting notes is an index identifying various parts of the presentation.

Discussion of Next Steps

- Kirk Johnson discussed what will happen at the May 5th Steering Committee meeting. It could take a full three hours to review model assumptions. [no May meeting was held; instead this was done at the June 2 Steering Committee meeting.]
- Margaret Fleek mentioned that the Skagit River is not shown as a floodway per the FEMA map. She was concerned that the model would not show this information.
- John Lombard mentioned that the May and/or June meeting should possibly longer than three hours to get the work completed.
- Shirley Solomon inquired about the Citizens Committee.
- Rebecca Ponzio asked for a clarification of how the process will flow from one committee to another, i.e., Steering Committee to Citizen Committee, to the Board of County Commissioner, to the Growth Management Steering Committee.
- Kirk described the process and mentioned that city mayors will have some involvement in selecting membership of the Citizens Committee and in shaping the project's recommendations.
- The Citizens Committee will consist of approximately 9-15 members .
- Gary Tollefson asked for clarification on what the Steering Committee will be doing at the May meeting. Would there be an opportunity in this process to amend the scenarios or are we looking at them as very distinctly different?
- Kirk responded that the intent of the initial four scenarios is to draw distinct differences. The Citizen Committee will work to develop a preferred vision and future that draws on all of the scenarios and includes new ideas as well.

- Keith Folkerts from Kitsap County, which has done alternative futures analysis before, spoke about the distinctions between development and ecological scenarios as bookends for comparison purposes.
- Shirley Solomon asked how the Steering Committees time will be allocated in relation to the Citizens Committee. She wondered if the Steering Committee stays in place as the Citizens group ramps up their work.
- Kirk said there would likely be a continuing role for the Steering Committee such as helping with Citizen Committee orientation or public engagement. Perhaps not all Steering Committee members will become involved depending on their interest(s).
- Shirley said floodplain and wetland restoration should be more fully addressed in the ecosystem scenario as described in the Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan. She also said the ecosystem scenario should remove people and development from the floodplain.
- Jan Ellingson talked about the challenges of moving people out of floodplain and other areas identified for restoration and finding comparable locations for them to live.
- John Bolte said the model will clearly include restoration activities when it is more fully developed.
- Kirk gave an overview of the supplemental grant proposal. Shirley Solomon, Margaret Studer and Jan Ellingson noted that they were interested in the public process.
- Jan Ellingson made a recommendation regarding the name of the “unplanned growth” future. She would like to keep the title as Development Future until we think of something better.
- Kirk spoke about changing the Alternative Futures name, possibly something more compelling.
- Next Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 5th at the usual location at Skagit Valley College. Possibly it will be a five hour meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Flip Chart Comments on Envision Model

Sheet #1

1. Refine what constitutes working forests.
2. Change name – from Development Future to Unmanaged Growth?
3. Restoration - wetlands, floodplains, other (integrate) as reflected in the Chinook Recovery Plan.
4. Floodway Mapping – missing for all futures in Sedro-Woolley. Map as area between levees.

Sheet #2

5. Ecosystem future
Functional Floodplain – “get people out & keep people out” [no further development in floodplain]
6. Discuss moving existing populations. Distinguish FEMA policy for floodplain restoration and floodway restoration
7. Determine whether how to incorporate restoration projects in Envision (or qualitatively or quantitatively after model is run).

Index to Recording of Envision Presentation

Segments 5 through 9, particularly 7 through 9, are especially worth reviewing. Please use the fast forward or advance functions (the little blue line at the bottom of the video image) to move around in the video to get to the indicated times.

	Time (Hrs; mins; secs)	Content
1.	0:00 – 2:50	Intro to model demonstration meeting – Kirk Johnson
2.	2:50 – 3:40	Overview of presentation – John Bolte
3.	3:40 – 11:00	Envision 101 – how Envision works
4.	11:00 – 21:30	Summary of Skagit model scenarios (policy basis)
5.	26:26 – 33:45	Skagit model: data sources, policy sets, evaluative metrics
6.	33:45 – 37:00	Skagit model: IDU coverage; data sets; level of detail at which model functions
7.	37:00 – 42:00	Puget Sound Nearshore project “flyover” – highlights Envision’s visualization capabilities
This “flyover” may be more clearly viewed at:		
<u>http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iW2I6pvhh64</u> (but there’s no narration)		
8.	44:00 – 55:00	Skagit model introduction and demonstration (running in Envision)*
9.	1:04:20 – 1:10:00	Demonstration of various indicator outputs