



PIERCE COUNTY

Conservation Futures & Open Space Citizens' Advisory Board

February 3, 2022

Joint CAB/TAC Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Marcello Mancini, Chair, at 6:02 p.m. virtually via Zoom webinar. A quorum was present.

ROLL CALL:

CAB Members Present: Marcello Mancini, Thomas Ginsburg, Kadie Anderson, Lyndsay Gordon, Ryan Hebert, Brett Larabee, Carol Paschal, Jerome O'Leary, Susan Paganelli, Anthony Paulson, Susan Potter, Terry Reid, Heather Shadko, Patricia Villa, Sarah Chun

TAC Members Present: Niki Yonkow, Krystal Kyer, Jessica Stone, René Skaggs, Jake Pool, Desiree Radice, Katie Baker

Staff Present: Kimberly Freeman, Katherine Brooks, Cheryl Saltzman

CAB Members Absent: Terry Reid (excused), Ethan Newton

TAC Members Absent: Greg Volkhardt (excused)

Member of Public: Tracey Perkosky, Executive Director, Key Pen Parks

ELECTION OF CHAIR

& VICE CHAIR:

Katherine indicated that we need to hold our annual elections of Chair and Vice Chair. Marcello asked for nominations.

Motion: To renominate Marcello Mancini as the Chair
The motion was made (Potter), seconded (O'Leary) and passed unanimously.

Motion: To renominate Thomas Ginsburg as the Vice Chair
The motion was made (Mancini) seconded (Paschal) and passed unanimously.

WELCOME:

Chair Mancini: Thomas and I will remain in the positions we are in for 2022, thank you so much for your confidence and your vote.

MEETING MINUTES:

Motion: To adopt the December 2, 2021 meeting notes as written.
The motion was moved (Ginsburg), seconded (Potter) and passed unanimously.

UPDATE ON CONSERVATION FUTURES 2019/21 CYCLES AND OPPORTUNITY ACCOUNT

Katherine provided an overview of the 2019/2021 CF projects and the new Conservation Futures Opportunity Account (CFOA) application information sent out in the meeting materials via zoom screen share.

Kat shared that Council gave an extension for the 2019 projects until the end of June 2022. The two Kapowsin properties were withdrawn by sponsors. Two properties closed since our last meeting in December, they closed in late December, Rocky Creek Ellis, and South Prairie Creek.

The Narrows West property from the 2021 cycle informed us they are most likely not moving forward due to an unwilling seller.

Some of our 2021 sponsors have indicated they are eager to get going and move forward, such as LaBelle in Puyallup and North Creek Salmon Heritage Site in Gig Harbor.

Gig Harbor is also planning to submit another opportunity account application for another piece of property close to the first two NCSHS properties. When the application comes in, we'll schedule a CAB meeting for you to review.

Board Questions:

Q-S. Paganelli asked what happens with that Narrows West when seller no longer wants to sell?

A-Kat said there has been no official word that the deal is dead. If they give us formal notice or never pursue acquisition, the monies will float in the budget and get carried forward to next cycle for future project acquisitions.

CF CODE UPDATE

Kimberly Freeman presented information via zoom screen share.

Kimberly clarified that the nominations weren't carried out correctly, so they were moved on again as reflected in the motions above.

Kimberly informed the group that in addition to extending deadlines for 2019 projects to June 30, 2022 and the 2021 projects, and the incoming Opportunity Account, Council also requested an update to the Conservation Futures code by October 1, 2022. County codes for Conservation Future reside in Chapters 2.96 and 2.97. The code provides guidance on updates as: 2.96.080 Review of Selection Criteria. At least every five years after the effective date of this Chapter, the Board, Committee, and Council shall review and, if deemed in the public interest, amend this Chapter and the selection criteria in Chapter 2.97 PCC.

Our goal will be to update the code as quickly as possible and stay focused on changes that are essential as there simply is not enough time to re-write the code. We are going to have some CAB/TAC meetings in the next few weeks wherein we will review/discuss/verify simple code sections e.g., purpose of code, duties of CAB and TAC, Opportunity Account, etc. We are also working with a consultant to put together a survey to deal with more technical issues. We need to have all changes complete no later than July to get it delivered on time. Kimberly provided a draft timeline for code review and update.

Kat mentioned that this project requires SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act), so we will need to have everything in a consolidated manner so that we can get through SEPA for timely submission to Council.

Board Questions:

Q: Tony asked if we would provide paper copies to CAB/TAC so we don't have to find it on your website?

A: Kimberly confirmed that summary sheets will be provided ahead of first meeting. We will also be going over the brochure, the 27-year report on Conservation Futures. For each meeting we have, we'll break down those code sections and provide them ahead of the meeting. The more difficult parts of the code will be in the survey.

Q: Sue Potter asked if this was just standard because we haven't done it or is there something they are hoping to accomplish.

A: Kimberly said she doesn't think there is anything they want to accomplish, but it is a requirement every five years, and it's been nine, so they want it done.

Q: Tony asked about carbon sequestration that doesn't have a code number, who was asking for that?

A: Kimberly replied that Council adopted a Sustainability Plan last year and that plan called for looking at including carbon sequestration in Conservation Futures application scoring. The Planning Department is starting an update of the Comprehensive Plan that they expect to be complete by the end of next year for

adoption in early 2024, so they are looking for input on open space and conservation values and priorities across the county. The timing is perfect as this code update can help feed to that process.

Kat added that staff from Sustainable Resources have thoughts on how they might weave carbon sequestration into the code. We'll be relying on their staffing expertise to help prepare some briefing materials and options for you to review. Kat also mentioned that after the code update is complete it may require companion updates to the Conservation Futures Administrative Guidelines and 2023 application.

Marcello added that bylaw review can take a lot of time, but we need to stay focused on what's important and not get side-tracked.

Thomas added that staff and consultants are going to be putting a lot of time and effort into preparing materials, so please come to the meetings prepared, because we have limited time. Please come mindful and aware.

Jerome added that having clear direction at the start, including a reminder, and preparation is key, but having clear directions is important.

Q: Ryan asked if we would be using a shared track-change document.

A: Kimberly confirmed it wouldn't be a shared document.

Kimberly reminded TAC that we will be launching a meeting in the upcoming weeks.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Thomas discussed the importance of being good ambassadors and one of the most impactful things we can do to diversify the application pool is to do education and outreach within our communities. We've seen throughout the pandemic how important recreation and open space is to the communities that we live and serve.

Kat added that resulting modifications from the code update will require a series of trainings for future sponsors before we begin the application cycle in 2023.

Thomas said he'll recommend to prior sponsors to take the training.

Katherine commented that she and Kimberly talked to Conservation Futures counterparts in King County this week. Through a consortium of other counties that do Conservation Futures, they are floating a bill to clarify the taxing rate cap and what could be utilized for Conservation Futures dollars. There's a bill in the state legislature that would do that clarification.

Kimberly and Kat explained that the state RCWs allows CF to charge 6.25 cents per thousand dollars of assessed value, but the WACs require that to be subject to the taxing lid that is in place, so there is an inconsistency between what the RCWs say and the implementing rule or WAC says. King County consortium's proposed amendment would clarify that what the RCW says is correct, and not the WAC, which would mean counties could go all the way up to that 6.25 percent per \$1,000 of assessed value that the RCW allows with the vote of Council. Currently Pierce County is in the three percent range because of this lid. Some counties have chosen to go with the RCW and some are more conservative and going with the lid cap, which is what Pierce County does, but there's no consistency. They'd like it to be an even playing field with a consistent code.

MEETING ADJOURNED: The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.