



November 16, 2022

Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Aaron Bert, Chair, at 6:05 p.m. via Zoom Webinar and in person at the ESB in University Place. A quorum was present. Chair notes that this is an open meeting and is being recorded.

ROLL CALL:

CAB Members present: Dean Absher, Derek Barry, Aaron Bert, Robert Buck, Dean Burke, Angela Gallardo, Caleb Heimlich, Kendra Nguyen, Tom Utterback, Shannon Zimmerly

Staff members present: Roxanne Miles, Tiffany Odell, Brianne Blackburn, Cheryl Saltzman

CAB Member(s) absent: None

Others: None

MINUTES APPROVAL: Chair called for a motion to approve the September 21, 2022, minutes. Board members unanimously approved.

Motion (D. Absher) to approve minutes as presented, and seconded (R. Buck). Minutes adopted.

NEW MEMBER WELCOME: Chair welcomed new Board member Shannon Zimmerly.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Roxanne Miles

- 1. 2024-2025 Budget Calendar** – Roxanne shared a review of schedule for upcoming budget preparation and that we will be looking to CAB for feedback as we move forward. Budget items include IT Strategic Plan, Capital Facilities Plan (CFP), Capital Grants, Training Plan, Extra Hire salaries, Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA's) as well as additional budget needs and the dates that they are required.

Comments/Questions

Aaron: The process and implementation of a budget is a pain, but it sounds like you have a well-versed process that you are putting forth.

Roxanne: The system had been underinvested in for a very long time, so there's still a lot of competing interest. Even though we have captured a majority of the need in our 10-year plan, it still means certain sites are waiting 8-10 years, which feels like a lifetime to those who are anxious for the projects, and then we have things that aren't going to wait due to failing condition or council priorities. It is a lot to bring all issues to the table at once for consideration.

Angela asked a question about REET slowing, and Roxanne said that Park Impact Fees are paid related to permitting and new development, so the more building that happens, the more that fund grows. That is a large source of funds and there's still plenty of building happening. While REET is slowing down considerably, we brought in more REET than what was anticipated this biennium early on, so we expect it to achieve budget, not slowing to drop below budget. We will likely need to set a more conservative target for 2024-2025.

2. **Draft 2023 CAB Work Plan** – Very organic document but it gives a sense of what is coming up. January – May will be budget heavy. September will be an update of what the Executive agrees to advance, with Council's decision in November.
3. **Lakewood Community Center Update** – We've mentioned the building is beyond its lifecycle. The building had the gutters from the roof running through the walls and out the bottom of the structure. That system failed and the water then ran through the walls into the interior beams, which forced the beams to expand. Now the floor in the south wing is sloping and can't be occupied. We've patched the roof and the rest of the structure is fine, and specialized rec is able to continue to program the available rooms in the building. The envelope is minimally a \$4M improvement. The hydroponic HVAC system is outdated and inefficient. That's a \$3-4M fix. Anything in terms of occupancy and refurbishing that wing to do something long-term is about another \$3M – so anticipating \$12M+ to do the basics, but still cheaper than constructing a new building.

At this point, we have not had this project in the CFP. The building is in the City of Lakewood but is a County facility. We're trying to get partners together to figure out all our funding options. There's a walkthrough with some of the Executive staff from the County and the Lakewood City Manager planned to know whether we're going to continue to invest in this facility. If we don't invest in the center, we have to figure out what to do with the countywide specialized recreation program stationed there. It is also the only gym in our system. We are likely going to request state funds for design, but we still must figure out how to get the full amount for construction.

Questions/Comments

Aaron: I know you mentioned divestiture is on the table from that facility as a whole. Does Lakewood not have the capacity to implement their own community center in that location, or is there an opportunity for a partnership between the two entities?

Roxanne: That is TBD. When Lakewood became a city 15 years ago, there were questions about the quality of the facility then, and it did not transfer to them. It's an ideal location and central to the County for county-wide interests. Lakewood had a senior center in LCC and they also had to close their library, so they have citizen interests to partner. They do have a Y, but it's at maximum capacity.

Dean A.: With legislature coming into session, are you aware if the County has put in any requests specifically for additional funding? The deadline for that is almost here.

Roxanne: In terms of Capital, we do have it on our internal legislative agenda, but still want to make sure the partners are all in play before engaging fully. It's not a new bill, so it's not something that needs to be filed in advance as much as having a sponsor for the project. We were waiting to see who would remain or come into seats to have the conversation with them. One of the interesting things that Lakewood Community Center was in District 28 for a long-time and Lakewood had a good relationship with those legislators. In the redrawing of the districting lines, the center is now in the 29th District, along with Sprinker and other sites that those legislators are most familiar with.

People in those seats feel very disconnected to Lakewood. But bottom line, yes, this project is on the list to request capital funds for but we do need to decide on who the building will continue to serve and what we are building to educate the ask.

Dean A.: I know Frederickson and Cross Park and Sprinker was part of the 29th, and I know Steve Conway was very supportive of Parks in general, and he used to be Vice President Pro Tem of the Senate, so he had oomph for getting stuff for his district. You might want to reach out to him.

Roxanne: I think he'd be our best advocate.

4. PROS Plan Purpose and Development – Tiffany Odell and Brianne Blackburn

Tiffany shared a presentation for the PROS Plan and provided a summary of the chapters. We are required to update the PROS Plan every six years to remain eligible for RCO grant programs, which is the majority of our grant funding. The last plan was approved in February of 2020, and the update will be due no later than March, 2026. That means the content needs to be completed by Fall, 2025 to advance through the approval process.

Questions/Comments:

Tom U.: Looking at the juxtaposition of the Comprehensive Plan update and then the PROS Plan forthcoming, for community plans, do you involve community plan advisory committees in addition to this group when doing the PROS Plan updates?

Tiffany: Great question. We don't have our complete strategy in place yet, but we are updating the PROS plan on the heels of the comprehensive plan. We are waiting on clarity from the Planning and Public Works department – they are the lead on the Comprehensive Plan update - about what their public process will be, so that we can figure out how we can align with their process as well to make it as efficient as possible. We'll use the land use advisory commissions and talk with folks about the Parks and Rec element of the Comp Plan, so why not talk to them about the PROS Plan as well at the same time? So, yes, we absolutely will talk to those groups, but I don't know the timeline of that yet because we need to align with the Comp Plan efforts which finalizes right before the PROS plan does.

Dean A.: I just came off the Frederickson Land Use Advisory effort. They stagger the local community plans so it's every few years. Frederickson was just updated, and Parks was very much a part of that along with Transportation.

Roxanne asked Tiffany to explain funding capacity.

Tiffany: When we look at funding capacity in the PROS Plan, we look at a couple of different things.

- Financial model – Very conservative financial model that collects data on the revenues that we've brought in, and looks at the trends going 20 years back, and forecasts out 20 years. The financial model allows for fluctuations in the market.
- Revenue types – Every revenue source that the department brings in comes with its own rules around how we spend it – where things are going to go, when funding is coming in, what projects funding can be spent on, when money can go out, etc. Because of the

adoption of the increased Park Impact Fee, the 2020 PROS plan was the first that we could say was fiscally constrained. That means it was realistic and set to expected funds. We had a very clear picture of what we thought we could accomplish over the decade-long planning period based on that revenue model. We had enough revenue anticipated from the Park Impact Fee to leverage grants and other funds and give us the ability to make major capital investments in the Park system.

Tiffany reviewed the key findings of the 2020 PROS Plan Demands and Needs Assessment which highlights the needs in our park system. We will be determining what type of surveying we should do to update this section. We may only sample or oversample in the South and Central Regions where we are the main service provider and where most of the unincorporated residents live.

- Residents most want trails and walking paths, family activities, open space and water access
- Pierce County has lower rate of parks and trails per capita than similar communities
- South region housing is predicting most rapid increase
- Capacity increase is needed in Parkland, Spanaway, Midland, Frederickson, and South Hill
- Central has lowest rate of trail miles and open space, North region exceeds all other regions, and South region has lowest rate of park acres
- Pierce County provides fewer park acres and trail miles per capita than similar providers locally and nationally

Capital Improvement Action Plan – Longer range capital facilities plan

Fiscal Policy and Impact Fee Revenues – We have to spend 32% of Impact Fees on existing parks, 38% on new trails, and 30% on new parks. Fee collections have increased since adoption of the Impact Fees from \$1,315,305 to \$6,000,000.

Questions/Comments:

Aaron: Were those increases over that time period tied to inflation or did they put an escalator clause in there for it to increase, or is this just reflective of new growth in Pierce County?

Tiffany: It is all of the above. When the Impact Fee was adopted, they included a method for adjustment to the Impact Fee to be revisited annually to be based on the cost of construction and engineering, either a percentage up or down. The total amount collected is based on the number of residential units that were constructed. We collect an Impact Fee for every new residential housing unit in unincorporated Pierce County.

Impact Fees have to be used on building capacity in the Park system. We can't replace a playground with Impact Fees, we can only build a new one where one didn't exist. This is good but doesn't give us new resources to address our current aging system.

Capital Funding Sources – Three main Capital funding sources (all have specific rules)

- Impact Fees – must go towards building capacity in Parks system

- 2nd REET – must be spent on capital projects that are specified in Capital Facilities Plan (can't put staffing on REET)
- Parks Sales Tax – More flexible, can be used on capital, staffing, administration so we can make our own decision on how that's spent. We often use PST to fill operating gaps, so less on capital.
- We have a goal of bringing in about 20% of our capital revenues in grants, and 2 percent in donations. That's what our revenue model is based on. Of course, we have to make adjustments if we don't receive those contributions as planned.

6-Year Capital Facilities Plan – We review the following:

- Long Range Planning & Policy – Comp Plan, PROS Plan, Fiscal Policy
- System Preservation Needs – Capital Preservation, Mandates (ADA), Emergencies
- Capacity – Staffing, Revenue Projections, Revenue Spending Requirements
- Other Considerations – Grant Timing, Mandates, Directives, Partnerships, Etc.

General 2026 PROS Plan Update Timeline

- 2022 – Comprehensive Plan Update, PROS Plan Scoping, Hire Consultant, Identify Stakeholders, Inventory Data Collection Needs
- 2023 – Park Impact Fee Working Group, Public Engagement, Stakeholder Interviews, Countywide Parks & Trails Inventory, Demands and Needs Assessment, Revenue Model, Facility Preservation Analysis
- 2024 – Parks and Trails Prioritization Criteria, Grants and Funding Strategy, Finalize Comprehensive Plan Policies, Acquisition and Partnerships Plan, Programming Plan, Open Space Plan
- 2025 – Capital Projects, Strategic Plan, Draft Plan, Public Comment, Final Draft Plan, Adoption

Questions/Comments:

Aaron: In the past, when this has been updated and adopted, have you found any particular pinch points or items of controversy that you've had to work through? I'm just curious to know what aspects of controversy has been outside of the Impact Fee?

Tiffany: Impact Fee for sure. We have to revisit the Park Impact Fee Working Group so that is something to focus on. This year we are anticipating looking at the Comp Plan Policies that are coming out. There's consideration for closer linkage of trails to transportation planning, so looking at impacts from some studies going on now. Vision 2050, which is the Puget Sound Regional Counsel's long-range plan has policies related to a walkability level of service for urban parks which may have an impact on requirements in urban growth areas moving forward. Our parks are very difficult to walk to, essentially because Pierce County doesn't have a great walkable system. We have policy that currently defines us as a regional service provider and have had much less focus on providing local parks, so that could change our level of service if that moves forward. Those are some of the things we think could give us some new considerations. We want to identify some clear

trail prioritization criteria for the regional trails plan, so how to decide which trails come next to keep a regional, connected system moving forward.

Derek B: Do you collect Park Impact fees from commercial and industrial developments or just residential.

Tiffany: Park Impact fees are only collected from residential developments, but that includes apartment complexes, any type of residential housing unit. Real Estate Excise Tax comes from any real estate transaction, not just limited to residential.

Derek B: Is that a decision that was made with that work group, or was this a policy decision at the County level?

Tiffany: I believe it is state law. The growth management act allows us to collect a Park Impact Fee and it specifies that it is specifically linked to residential growth in the County because that drives the demand for capacity in the park system.

Derek B: You may want to look into that. I'll send some information.

5. Board Actions – Chair and Vice Chair Nominees

A. 2023 Position Renewals – Roxanne noted that we have four positions that are up for renewal in 2023; she reached out to make sure incumbents had time to determine if they still had interest in serving before going into officer nominations. We will have voting in January.

- Position 6 - In March, Kendra Nguyen will be terming off, and is not going to be renewing
- District 4 – In March, Aaron will be cycling out because he moved out of District 4, but would be interested in an at large if one comes open
- In May, Caleb's term is expiring so we'll need to know your intentions – *Caleb expressed interest in renewing his at-large seat.*
- District 3 - Dean Absher is interested in renewing his seat, need to verify with District Councilmember – *councilmember concurred with renewal without reopening seat.*

B. Park Impact Fee Working Group –

- Council asked Parks to reconvene the Park Impact Fee Working Group in 2023. The membership is believed to be the same group of industry leaders, however new representatives are needed. They want to look at the division of the funding in the fiscal policy and how it has been used to date.
- There is a seat for the Pierce County Parks Citizens Advisory Board Chair. Parks wanted to ensure the CAB knew of this before taking nominations for 2023 Chair/Vice Chair as this is a robust assignment that would go with the Chair position. If the Chair can't fulfill that assignment, but is the right person for Chair, we could talk about a delegation to the Park Impact Fee Working Group.

C. Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair – Chair asked for nominations or self-nominations for Board Chair.

After discussion with current incumbents, Tom Utterback expressed interest.

Thomas: I have a bit of experience with Park Impact Fees, administering them, dealing with updates, and having an enjoyable appeal process standing, getting grilled by my friends at Gordon Thomas Honeywell and prevailing. I only work part time, semi-retired, so I'm open to it if other Board members would like to have my experience on that particular working group. I have a bit of experience on meetings in general and parliamentary procedure, so I'm out there if there is any interest.

Aaron: I would like to put forth Tom Utterback as a nominee for Board Chair, seconded by Caleb Heimlich.

Aaron: Any nominations or self-nominations for Vice Board Chair:

Caleb: I've been honored to serve as the vice chair, and if no one else would like to do it, I'd be happy to do it again, but if someone else wants to, I'd be happy to let them step in.

Aaron: I would like to put forth Caleb Heimlich as a nominee for Board Vice Chair, seconded by Dean Absher.

We will take the formal vote in January.

Other Items:

Roxanne will be mailing out Fantasy Lights Tickets for Board Members.

Derek B: Is there any concern at Sprinker with cars being vandalized or gas tanks being siphoned or drilled out and drained? Is that being addressed, and are we letting patrons know?

Roxanne: Yes. We've added mobile security to police the area. We do have security scheduled to be in the parking lot during the walk and Ice Lights as that happens. The Sheriff's Office is down 45 officers, and violators seem to be aware of that. We do send notices to our guests and monitor the issues through incident reporting. We are looking at working with Sheriff's Office on future crime-prevention through design and getting some funding for lighting at other sites which similar issues. We track vandalism and encampment costs to monitor escalations and areas of emphasis.

7. Public Comments - None

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, January 18th at ESB, and via Zoom

Chair asked if there were any objections to adjourning at this time, and seeing none, the meeting was

adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED: The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.