



DATE _____

ADVOCACY ISSUE NOMINATION FORM

Name: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Organization: _____ WALT Member? Yes No

Issue Title: _____

1) Summary: Describe the issue.

2) Position: Describe the recommended course of action for the Washington Association of Land Trusts (WALT).

3) Level of Engagement: Based on the “Levels of Engagement” table from WALT’s Endorsement Policy (included as Appendix A), choose a level that would best characterize WALT’s involvement. Choose one.

- Priority - Level 1 Engagement:* WALT leads the effort
- Level 2 Engagement:* WALT supports another group that takes a leadership role
- Level 3 Engagement:* WALT takes a position but plays a very limited advocacy role
- Level 4 Engagement:* WALT will refrain from taking position on issue

4) Activities Required: Please select all the activities that would be required for success after an endorsement. Select all that apply.

- Developing and negotiating policy
- Stakeholder outreach and coalition building
- Engaging WALT members in grassroots advocacy campaigns
- Implementing a legislative strategy (direct lobbying, testimony, etc.)
- Take a public position (sign on letter, letter of support, endorsement, etc.)
- Other: _____



5) Mission: How does taking a position support our core work – supporting the ability of Washington land trusts to conserve land and water across the state’s diverse landscapes? Please address:

- Is the issue within the current set of advocacy priorities?
- Does the issue directly advance or threaten land trust conservation efforts?
- Does the issue advance or threaten public partnerships?
- Does the issue affect a variety of land trusts? Are the impacts statewide or regional?

6) Involvement: What role have land trusts played in shaping the proposal? Have land trusts been in agreement?

7) Reputation: What are the reputational consequences of taking a position? In your answer consider the legislative history, known support or opposition from core WALT partners, etc.



8) Other Comments?



Appendix A.

Advocacy Endorsement Policy

This document outlines guidelines and processes for developing positions on state and federal policies, programs, ballot initiatives, and other issues which make up the Association's advocacy platform. It provides direction and establishes protocols for considering a position on issues with varying degrees of importance or risk.

Evaluation Process:

A position sought by a Board Member, staff or external partner(s) should be brought to the Advocacy Committee ("the Committee") in writing using the attached Advocacy Nomination Form. The Committee will then meet and review the issue to:

- 1) Determine level of Board review and approval required (Green, Yellow, or Red).
- 2) Recommend a position (Support, Oppose, Neutral); and
- 3) Determine the level of engagement (Priority, Level 2, 3 or 4 Engagement).

The Committee's analysis, discussion and decisions will be recorded in meeting minutes and filed by the Executive Director for later reference. Implementation of the policy platform is at the Executive Director's discretion.

Criteria to Determine Level of Board Review

- **Green light:** For issues that meet the requirements for Level 2, 3 or 4 Engagement, the Committee may vote to determine the Association's position, requiring support of 80% of those present at a meeting where there is a quorum. The Committee must recommend a position to the full board for approval of Priority Engagement. The issue may:
 - Be included in the work or strategic plan
 - Be core to the Association's mission
 - Impact a diverse group of land trust members
 - Have been proposed by land trust members or staff
 - Affect a current advocacy priority
 - Not adversely impact land trust members
- **Yellow light:** The Committee must recommend a position to the full board, based on the Criteria for Board Review and the Levels of Support, for a decision. The issue may:
 - Be important to the Association's mission
 - Be outside of the current work or strategic plan
 - Impact only some land trust members
 - Elicit strong differences of opinion



- **Red light:** The Association will refrain from taking a position. The issue may:
 - Be highly controversial
 - Be risky to the Association’s reputation
 - Not directly impact land trusts
 - The Association's position would adversely impact some land trusts

Criteria to Determine Level of Engagement

	Examples	Executive Director vs. Board Engagement	Level of Board Review
<p><u>Priority – Level 1 Engagement</u> The Association leads the effort. The issue may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Core to mission Identified in the work or strategic plan ● Shaped by the Association or its members ● Of significant impact to a diversity of member land trusts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● WWRP eligibility for land trusts ● Section 6 and Forest Legacy program improvements ● Growing funding for community forestry/working forests ● NRCS funding/farmland funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ED will spend a significant portion of time advocating and mobilizing members. ● The Association designs and executes strategy. ED is point person for Board and external partners, and delegates to Board and partners as needed. ● Examples of how to express support: Full suite of possibilities, based on campaign plan. Could include Testimony, letters of support, coalition building, and partner and elected outreach. ● ED brings any concerns to advocacy co- chairs, advocacy committee and/or full Board as time allows and need dictates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If the Advocacy Committee determines that the issue meets the “green” or “yellow” level of review, the Committee recommends a position and level of engagement to the Board for review & final decision.
<p><u>Level 2 Engagement</u> The Association supports another group which plays a leadership role. The issue may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Important or core to mission ● Outside of work or strategic plan ● Primarily shaped by another group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State and federal funding programs (include list of all programs that fund land trust work). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WWRP, Floodplains by design, LWCF, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ED or a subgroup of Board members may spend time supporting, but it will not be a significant amount of the ED’s time. ● ED determines capacity for engagement but does not play a substantial role in designing or executing campaign 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If the Advocacy Committee determines that the issue meets the “green” level of review, the Advocacy Committee determines WALT’s level of engagement and position. ● If the Advocacy Committee determines that the issue meets the

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beneficial only to a portion of land trust members 		<p>strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board members may play greater role, if they choose to. Examples of how to express support: Testimony or sign-in in support; Share support in meetings as it makes sense; Join a group sign-on letter. 	<p>“yellow” level of review, the decision on WALT’s level of engagement and position is referred to the WALT Board.</p>
<p><u>Level 3 Engagement</u> The Association takes a position on an issue but plays a very limited advocacy role. The issue may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts land trusts, but not directly. Outside of work or strategic plan Primarily shaped by another group. A new topic area or unusual format/forum with no precedent or analogous example Eliciting strong differences of opinions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the ED will spend very limited time on this issue, the Association must have a position that the ED and members can communicate when necessary. ED plays limited role. Board members may play greater role, if they choose to. Examples of how to express support: Sign-in in support; Share support in meetings as it makes sense and as others request 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the Advocacy Committee determines that the issue meets the “green” level of review, the Advocacy Committee determines WALT’s level of engagement and position. If the Advocacy Committee determines that the issue meets the “yellow” level of review, the decision on WALT’s level of engagement and position is referred to the WALT Board.
<p><u>Level 4 Engagement</u> The Association refrains from taking a position on the issue. The issue may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside of the mission Outside of work or strategic plan A new topic area or unusual format/forum with no precedent or analogous example Eliciting strong differences of opinions Does not directly impact land trusts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth Athletic Fields (YAF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ED, if approached, may state that the Association has declined to take a position or become involved in the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Advocacy Committee determines that the issue meets the “red” level of review and the Association does not take a position.