



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?



ADVOCACY ENDORSEMENT POLICY

This document outlines guidelines and processes for developing positions on state and federal policies, funding programs, ballot initiatives, and other issues which make up Washington Association of Land Trust's ("Association") state legislative advocacy platform and Advocacy Committee work plan. It provides direction and establishes protocols for considering a position on issues with varying degrees of importance to land trusts, level of capacity required, or reputational risk.

Evaluation Process:

If a staff or director of Association member organizations ("Members") or an external partner wishes the Association to take a position on an issue or support the development of a specific policy, the request should be brought to the Advocacy Committee ("Committee") via staff in writing using the Association's Advocacy Nomination Form. The Committee will then meet and review the issue to:

- 1) **Determine a position** (Move forward in support, move forward in opposition, take no position, seek more information, etc.) and recommended course of action. The course of action should involve consideration of whether the issue should be included in the Association's annual advocacy platform, and the extent to which the issue or required activities should be delegated to staff or natural resource affinity groups ("Affinity Groups") for implementation.
- 2) **Classify the issue**, if moving forward, based on a combination of factors such as potential impact to Members, level of support among Committee members, level of capacity required, and/or reputational risk (Green Light, Yellow Light, or Red Light). See Table 1 for guidelines on classifying an issue.
- 3) **Seek review and approval** from the Association's Board of Directors ("Board") and/or Members, as required herein. See Table 1 for a description of the level of approval and notice required based on the classification.

The Committee's analysis, discussion and decisions will be recorded in meeting minutes and filed by the Executive Director for later reference. In bringing a nomination to the Committee, staff may provide a preliminary recommended course of action and classification to the Committee members to help streamline decision-making and inform deliberations. Prioritization of any recommended course of action by the Committee in the annual work plan is at the Board's discretion.

Table 1. Classification and Review

Classification Categories	The Issue May:	Possible Examples
<p align="center">GREEN LIGHT</p> <p><i>General Description:</i> Issues that are core to the collective mission of land conservation, strongly impact a diversity of Members, elicit clear agreement among Committee members, involve less organizational resources and/or have limited reputational risks.</p> <p><i>Review and Approval:</i> The Committee may move forward independently with a “green light” issue, but the Board should be notified of the decision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be part of a previous work plan and/or fall within an established advocacy priority area • Impact a diverse group of land trust members • Have been proposed by multiple land trust stakeholders • Be supported by many key partner organizations • Not adversely impact land trust members • Involve short-term engagement in a supporting role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWRP Eligibility for land trusts • Funding for key federal land conservation programs (ACEP-ALE, Forest Legacy, etc.) • Funding for key state land conservation programs (WWRP, ESRP, PSAR, Floodplains, etc.) • State or Federal Community forest funding • Federal easement tax incentives • LWCF allocations and funding levels
<p align="center">YELLOW LIGHT</p> <p><i>General Description:</i> Issues that have more regional or disparate impact to Members, reveal differences of opinion among Committee members, involve longer term policy engagement, and/or have unknown reputational consequences.</p> <p><i>Review and Approval:</i> If the Committee recommends moving forward with a “yellow light” issue, this must be referred to the Board for review and approval. Members should be notified of the Board’s decision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a connection to the Association's mission • Be outside of the current work or strategic plan • Impact only some land trust members • Elicit differences of opinion among Committee members • Have reputational impacts that are unclear or unknown. • Involve sustained, moderate engagement in a supporting role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment in lieu of Taxes (PILT) • Clean Water State Revolving Fund Eligibility (CWSRF) • Shore-Friendly program funding • Washington Invasive Species Council re-authorization • Youth Athletic Fields (YAF) • B & O Tax on state restoration grants • Conservation Future Tax policy
<p align="center">RED LIGHT</p> <p><i>General Description:</i> Issues that have little direct impact to Members, provoke internal disagreement among Committee members, involve long-term leadership commitments, and/or have clear negative reputational consequences.</p> <p><i>Review and Approval:</i> If the Committee recommends moving forward on a “red light” issue, this must be referred both to the Board and Members for review and approval.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be a highly politicized issue at the state or federal level • Elicit strong differences of opinion among Committee members. • Be opposed by a core partner of the Association. • Not directly impact land trusts on-the-ground work • The Association's position and work could adversely impact some Members • Involve heavy, long-term engagement in a leadership role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation or ballot initiatives involving carbon pricing. • Net Ecological Gain • Changes to the Forest Practices Act • Federal wilderness designation • State tax assessment of eased properties • Trust Land Transfer