

**COUNTY EXECUTIVE'S ADVISORY GROUP ON LAND CONSERVATION**

**MEETING #2 SUMMARY**

Approved on October 6, 2016

**Date of Meeting: September 29, 2016**

<b>Advisory Group Members attending:</b>					
Jesús Aguirre	x	Jeremy James	x	Michael Orbino	✓
Lylianna Allala	x	Greg Johnson	✓	Alanna Peterson	✓
Marc Berejka	✓	Martha Kongsgaard	✓	Larry Phillips	✓
Michael Brown	x	Leann Krainick	✓	De'Sean Quinn	✓
Leda Chahim (alternate)	✓	Paul Kundtz	✓	Steve Shestag	✓
Tom Dean	✓	Terry Lavender	✓	Vandana Slatter	x
Tamara "TJ" DiCaprio	x	Hank Margeson	✓	Mike Stevens	x
Patti Dill	✓	Mo McBroom (alternate)	✓	Nate Veranth	✓
Gene Duvernoy	x	James McNeal	✓	Steve Whitney	x
Jon Hoekstra	✓	Louise Miller	✓	Christopher Williams (alt.)	x
<b>King County Staff and support team members attending:</b>					
Christie True	✓	Bob Burns	✓	Michael Murphy	✓
Katy Terry	✓	Ingrid Lundin	✓	Karen Reed	✓
Joan Lee	✓				

**Welcome and Introductions.** Advisory Group Co-Chair De'Sean Quinn convened the meeting at 4:35 PM. Facilitator Karen Reed led a round of introductions of members and other attendees. Mr. Quinn's opening remarks commended members for their discussion and participation at the first meeting.

**Advisory Group Business.** Ms. Reed covered several items of business.

- **Roster.** The advisory group now has 28 members. Updated roster will be provided again next week.
- **Schedule.** Updates to schedule: Wednesday 12/14 meeting is staying on calendar; Adding Thursday 1/19/2017, 4:30-7, location TBD.
- **Public Records Act.** Reminder to the group to complete the Public Records Act video and certification form if they have not already done so.

**Meeting 1 Summary.** One correction to Meeting 1 attendance (Jeremy James absent). As amended, Members present voted unanimously to approve Meeting #1 Summary.

**Advisory Group Charter.** Ms. Reed reviewed the changes made to the Advisory Group Charter after discussion at Meeting 1. It includes an updated mission statement; subcommittee 14 maximum members; 2 minutes for public comment. Members present voted unanimously to approve the revised Charter.

**Advisory Group Mission Statement.** Ms. Reed reviewed mission statement revisions as part of the new charter draft. Members present voted unanimously to approve the revised Mission Statement.

**Public Health Panel.** (Presenters: Pooja Tandon, Asst. Prof. of Pediatrics at UW, and pediatrician at Seattle Children's; Howie Frumkin, Dean and Prof. of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, UW School of Public Health; Kyle Yasuda, Clinical Professor of Pediatrics at UW, and Medical Officer at Public Health–Seattle & King County) Ms. Reed introduced Pooja Tandon as the first presenter on the health panel. Howie Frumkin joined the panel during introductions. Kyle Yasuda, health panel moderator, provided a brief introduction to the health panel purpose, mentioning:

- the importance of evidence based decision making;
- a suggestion to consider the health benefits of nature and open space in both rural and urban settings;
- offering the idea that this topic is at the cutting edge of decision making about what is valuable for kids' and families' health

Ms. Tandon gave a Powerpoint presentation on health impacts of nature on children (powerpoint available online). In addition to information contained in the powerpoint slides, Ms. Tandon noted a few additional points:

- Landscape changes affect where time playing occurs
- Changes to lifestyles can occur with increased access to nature
- Getting children outdoors is important for health, well-being, social justice

Mr. Frumkin gave a Powerpoint presentation on health impacts of nature more generally on adults (powerpoint available online). In addition to information contained in the powerpoint slides, Mr. Frumkin noted:

- Nature can prevent and treat disease
- In all of human history, it is only in the briefest of recent times that we have been relatively insulated from nature.
- The lower obesity effects of activity in green settings (versus non-green settings) are not fully explained by the physical activity – there is additional benefit that occurs from the setting itself.
- There is a remarkable body of evidence (not unanimous) that nature is good for health
- We don't have all the answers about dose of nature contact necessary for benefits
- Benefits operate more strongly on poorer people than wealthy. The equigenic effect of nature contact is an important social justice opportunity
- Key to consider what are high *human* value lands: select land so people can get to it
- Culture of metrics: what gets measured gets done

Mr. Yasuda and Ms. Reed facilitated a question and answer session following the presentation. Questions/comments that emerged included:

- How does one define a "green" vs. a "non-green" neighborhood? Mr. Frumkin explained that there are measurements of tree canopy and google street views that are used.
- What types of accountability metrics could be used? Mr. Frumkin suggested considering the change in health outcomes against expected outcomes with additional access to open space.
- How to measure children's health benefits? Ms. Tandon suggested in an urban park one could evaluate measures of social cohesion, neighbor relationships.

- Are metrics on open space and health valid and important to grant agencies/funders? Mr. Paul Kuntz noted that Trust for Public Land and The Nature Conservancy both use research to help fundraise, and institutions understand it well. Mr. Frumkin noted that governments rarely calculate full benefits.
- What is recommended nature exposure time? Ms. Tandon: For children, at least 60 minutes a day outdoors; positive results from nature-based preschools; data still emerging and outcomes are not yet measured. Access to green space in play yards and near schools important.
- Are there examples of how nature can prevent and treat health conditions? Mr. Frumkin: Prevention is important and has been measured in terms of obesity, heart disease, myopia. Treatment effects have been measured in recovery from procedures, ADHD.
- Regarding metrics, could we look at increasing the ratio of green to built environment, and see reduced costs of public services? Mr. Frumkin: It may be about how much the land is used. Making vacant lots more attractive “green spaces” did show reductions in local crime rates in Philadelphia.
- Is there data about passive vs. active green space and the difference in health outcomes? Ms. Tandon: The presence of a ball field or playground or loose natural building materials lead to longer play. Parks with more individualized programming for families have better outcomes. Studies haven’t really compared the benefits of green spaces vs. playfields relative to one another. Children need both structured and unstructured play to build skills.
- What about non-human-focused benefits – land preservation for nature? Mr. Frumkin: Balance of protecting ecosystem function and *also* finding ways on the same land to advance human health and well-being.
- Discussion question #1 was asked: *“Based on what you’ve heard today, does improving public health benefits seem a compelling reason to preserve/provide green spaces in cities/urban areas? Why or why not?”* Responses were positive. Comment that it is extremely hard to save green spaces in urban areas. This supports equity and open space access in urban areas. Providing local recreation opportunity, staycations.
- Discussion question #3 was asked: *“Is it useful to identify “primary” and “secondary” benefits/values addressed by various acquisitions—e.g., are the primary benefits of rural acquisitions environmental and secondarily to support health (or vice versa with respect to urban acquisitions)?”* Members observed: can we describe benefits as more of a broad spectrum of benefits to better identify the complexity of what these lands provide? Those complex benefits are considered by jurisdictions when preserving open space.

The group took a break at 5:55 pm until 6:10 pm.

**Short presentation on homework from Meeting #1.** Ms. Reed emphasized that there were not key themes around which comments centered – there were a very wide range of comments and feedback. There were more questions than concerns. She encouraged the group to read the responses from members, included in the meeting packets.

**Presentation on Conservation Vision and Values.** Ingrid Lundin provided a presentation (available online) about the definition, benefits, threats, vision, and acreage proposed in each conservation category. Questions/comments that emerged:

- Consider alternative term for “passive recreation”

#### *Natural lands*

- Add: Economic benefits

#### *Forests*

- Add: fire risk reduction benefits
- How close are we to being ‘done’ – e.g. in FPD with 200,000 acres protected, 25,000 or so highlighted for protection. The “non-King County lead” category was noted as lands on which state or federal lead in the FPD may be needed, not included in funding proposal.
- Finishing the job: add that we promote carbon sequestration/complete the wall against sprawl

#### *Farmland*

- Can historic barns be part of discussion? Noted it was in original work plan.
- Farmland threats are real. How to bring in the voice of farmers. King County Local Food Initiative was recent work to example agricultural issues.
- Need to balance environmental goals in APDs (e.g. inundation in restoration areas can lead to upstream impacts)
- Suggestion to present to Flood Control District Advisory Board
- How do we bring home to people the benefits of farmland and forest land to make it tangible to people?

#### *Rivers*

- Benefits: include protecting infrastructure

#### *Trails*

- Benefits: add economic development, add climate change by improving mobility connections
- Threats: add adequate operating funds to maintain and keep trails safe

#### *General discussion points:*

- City priorities might be identified in comprehensive plans
- Consider re-shaping discussion of proposal to lead from the vantage point of benefits achieved, rather than leading with land categories
- Expand upon the health benefits achieved
- Affordability and equity are important in climate change discussion
- We need to do outreach to grassroots groups pursuing similar agendas
- The values expressed are arguably subjective conclusions by the County: we can strengthen this by showing demonstrated need/value expressed through public input/polling. Others may have different beliefs about values.

**Survey.** Question emerged about a survey. Ms. Reed noted that will be discussed in Meetings 3 and 4.

**Closing Comments.** Mr. Quinn thanked group for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 7:00 pm.