



PIERCE COUNTY

Conservation Futures & Open Space Citizens' Advisory Board

July 6, 2023
CAB Meeting Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Thomas Ginsburg, Chair, at 6:06 p.m. virtually via Zoom webinar. A quorum was present.

ROLL CALL:

CAB Members Present: Kadie Anderson, Sarah Chun, Thomas Ginsburg, Lyndsay Gordon, Brett Larabee, Jerome O'Leary, Susan Paganelli, Carol Paschal, Tony Paulson, Patty Villa

Staff Present: Chris Chaput, Cheryl Saltzman

MFA Consultant: Claire Moerder

CAB Members Absent: Ryan Hebert (excused), Ethan Newton (excused), Heather Shadko, (excused)

MEETING MINUTES:

Motion: To adopt the February 9, 2023 meeting notes as written. The motion was moved (Paganelli), seconded (Villa) and passed unanimously.

Introductions

DISCUSSIONS

A. Conservation Futures Program Overview and Changes – Claire Moerder

Shared PPT slide to review program changes and the scoring form.

Revisions

- Major revisions to Chapter [2.97 PCC](#) in March 2023 regarding public access – limitations and restrictions allowed to preserve conservation values incompatible with public access
- Future uses – CAB to evaluate compatibility with conservation values and requirements; limitations on improvements – only those directly related to maintaining conservation values allowed

Additions

- Floodplains are now separate from Streams/Rivers/Lakes
- Public Access (up to 10 points based on public accessibility, and compatibility of such with the values being protected, hours, public access to property must be clearly outlined and illustrated in a map of the property, days and allowable activities for public access are reasonable and clearly described, and any limitations or exclusions to public access to preserve the property's conservation futures priorities are reasonable and clearly outlined and described.
- Equity (location in underserved communities, assigned score using Pierce County Equity Index values)
 - We asked applicants to put their address into the Equity Index and give us the score. The overall equity ranks from very low to very high, so based on that, you could potentially assign points just straight from that score. For instance, a very low equity score could receive five points because it is a highly

underserved area. There is a lot of other information available in the tool, so it could be a more detailed evaluation, you can look at it on the map, and evaluate it for access to open space, air quality, things like that. It's an open scoring question that we would love to have some discussion on and get your input. *

- Carbon Sequestration
 - The TAC members that work on sustainability person, and Jess Stone, went through each application and made sure that not only did they answer the question right and use the tool correctly, but also what they put in the application was what we saw in the ground.
- Bonus points for projects of regional significance and a minimum of 500 acres

Questions/Comments

Susan: Is it a range for each category on the conservation values for primary, secondary, tertiary?

Thomas: Yes.

Jerome: A couple of the properties we looked at last year had future plans for development with given municipalities that we were working with, but those weren't 100% funded, some were conceptual, they weren't on a certain timeline. How is that evaluated in this system? Take the property out in Gig Harbor, there were some grandiose plans, the Narrows one, I remember a lot of discussion about a variety of things that sounded great, but when we got deep into the discussion, they had no funding or timeline for it. When I look at a project like that, I thought this is fantastic, this would be perfect, but we do our part, and they have no responsibility to do theirs. I wondered how that, when we score, if that kind of thing comes up, is that evaluated? I can't remember any discussion on that.

Thomas: The thing with Narrows West, they came in with 3, they came in with shorelines that connected to a park next door as primary, and active rec and passive rec. I evaluated it on those values – do those plans fit within those values? That's the nice thing about in perpetuity, the project gets funded, and then they can take as long as they want to find that funding to make those other projects come to fruition.

Jerome: I look at it as pie in the sky, they don't have any plan to get it done. I wonder what are we giving to the community beside perpetuity of undeveloped land?

Thomas: It's up to your discussion. That's why there is the range.

Patty: It's an individual decision. Like when we were walking through there and we saw all the beautiful huckleberries, and someone said oh, we're going to clear all that out.

This brings to mind this question that we're not doing site visits. Did the TAC get to do site visits?

Chris: The TAC did do the site visits.

Patty: So we can trust they had in person experiences at these locations. When we go to judge quality, the hard part is for me is having been to these other locations over all these years and visiting them, I can view for myself, I know what it looks like, I know the sites and sounds nearby, I know the quality. We're talking about the quality of the resource and degree to which these characteristics apply, and we are doing it via video and photos, that makes it difficult. This is my protest moment. I don't think it's a very good way for us to have to evaluate site unseen, just having someone make a really good pitch, and someone else doesn't make a really good pitch? We're basing our decisions on the pictures they present us and the person that is making the pitch, basically. That is my protest, I just want to mention it.

Jerome: I think it's a great comment.

Lyndsay: Is there any opportunity to have engagement with the TAC without sponsors in the room? I know we're largely separated for most things. We get their recommendations but being able to do an interactive Q&A with them based on their impressions, because there were some pretty big, recommended restrictions or concerns with the properties last time. When you do site visits you can see it pretty easily yourself when you are there, but if you haven't been there, not to pick on Narrows, but it did have concerns raised by the TAC that I know from work experience was valid, was the active recreation could be at risk because it's a contaminated property and there were comments in there, but having seen what they were looking at helped to evaluate that level of risk and compare it. If there's any opportunity to build in some conversation with TAC as opposed to relying on written comments, that might help to offset.

Chris: Are you asking for this year or into the future?

Lyndsay: I don't know if we have time this year.

Chris: That was going to be my comment. We can look at that for future years, but this year we are on a very tight timeline.

Patty: Hopefully in future years we'll go back to doing site visits and not have to do that.

Jerome: I would like to echo the importance of the actual site visits for topography, shoreline issues, all sorts of things. It is hard to get all of that in a picture.

*Equity Index Questions/Comments

Lyndsay: As of right now, this is not prescored?

Claire: It is not prescored right now, but could be as simple as using the Equity Index tool if that's what's decided on.

Jerome: Thomas, if I remember that tool that they showed us in one of the discussions last year, a few of us identified some problematic issues with that map based on that version. I don't know if it has been enhanced or modified, but it wasn't accurate.

Claire: I remember when we were first looking at it there were a couple of issues, for instance where the blocks fell on the map weren't lining up with the equity index score was, so we did work with the team that is working with the developers, and I know they've made some updates. We can look back in minutes and see. Do you remember off the top of your head?

Jerome: I just remember there were some developed areas in downtown Tacoma and North End that were reflecting something different than what they were. I think a few of us identified some issues.

Brett: Did the applicants provide any narrative or information? Do they submit their own equity score, like we believe it's this and this is why, to give us some context on which to evaluate?

Claire and Chris: There were some, a range.

Brett: Are they required to?

Chris: It is a question, and we would hope they would answer all the questions.

Patty: This is a new piece, so these guys are often times repeat applicants, so this might be something new and they weren't prepared to do it, or sometimes they do it on the run.

Tony: Also they are repeat applicants and they know they don't have to go after every point.

Jerome: Was this also addressing some of the smaller municipalities that didn't have the resources.

Patty: Hopefully that is part of what they are counting as underserved. I know I instigated this. The small towns not having the resources to apply, and honestly I don't know how this equity index is functional.

Jerome: It doesn't seem to correlate.

Patty: It seems more like is this a low-income community, like for kids on free- or reduced lunch. I don't know, I haven't examined it.

Sarah: What is it based on, do you know?

Claire shared the Equity Index tool to discuss.

Jerome: Is that our resource, though, Claire?

Lyndsay: Is it using the Department of Health Health Disparities index?

Chris: It pulls in different information to create the entire Equity Index.

Jerome: I think some of the initial conversation was shallow in departments with people that don't have the resources in to put the man-hours into the application.

Thomas: We experimented with a different couple of metrics that we could try and use, but it totally came out next to our expectations. When we used income, Tacoma and a lot of the developed areas weren't coming out with that.

Susan: It didn't serve the purpose. It favored the communities we didn't intend.

Chris walked through the equity map.

Susan: So high means equity is low or the other way around?

Jerome: I don't know what it means either.

Chris: Very high = most served, very low = less served.

Susan: I'm looking at where I work on the Key Peninsula where we have no public transportation...

Chris: This piece you are looking at is the overall equity tool. If you look at each of these tabs, it changes, depending on which piece of the equity you are looking at. I was looking at the accessibility piece because it gives you information about parks and open space.

Patty: This is absolutely opposite service of what we were trying to accomplish. I'm not sure that this equity index serves the purpose of what we initially were seeking. I feel terrible saying that, because it's kind of late in the game, but if we're scoring this way, we are just giving back to the same people that are already getting, as far as the municipality with their resources versus the municipalities without. That maps shows those that don't have any services, etc. as being highly served versus these people that yes, they have lower income but exactly what I was talking about before, free and reduced lunch kind of numbers. The City of Tacoma has a lot of access to a lot of resources and has a lot of human services and a lot of human manpower that the small communities don't have. They don't have those resources, they can't put in a request for Conservation Futures projects because they don't have the manpower to fund it.

Jerome: If the median household income, how can the poverty rate only be 7%? With what Patty is saying, it doesn't make sense.

Brett: Can we go to the accessibility tab, open parks and open space?

Sarah: Maybe punching in a different address will tell us (*recording muffled*).

Patty: At the same time, we have the Growth Management Act telling everybody to do infill and build up and increase density. Therefore, by their very natures the larger cities are going to have more population with decreased access because those open spaces are building the housing we buy.

Jerome: By design.

Patty: This is frustrating.

Brett: Are there any options? This is part of the scoring system, it's going to be, so we have to score between 0-5.

Jerome: And this is for sure?

Chris: This was the tool that the County selected.

Jerome: But we don't have to base our scores on it.

Thomas: No, you can base it on your daily walks. A perfect example, Sumner, in 2019 they wanted to preserve an open space and open it to the community, and that community around there wasn't within a mile, and it would have a connector, so they put on those values, and it just points to the importance of the site visits. We saw that on the site visit, they were next to a railroad track and an industrial park and the nearest park was a mile and a half away.

Jerome: As a comparison, I live halfway between Orting and Sumner, it's relatively rural. Would you mind putting in that address and see in comparison what that would look like.

The address came up as highly served, which Jerome disagrees with. There's no services, no bus stops, nothing.

Jerome: Are we understanding this correctly? It seems just the opposite.

Chris: I called the equity office to figure out what was going on. I am just sharing the information that they shared with me.

Patty: I have a question about this, when we are scoring, it is not prescored, and I'm grateful that it's not if it's based on this. It says equity index on that sheet. We have to score according to the equity index, in my mind I'm going to do the opposite of this.

Brett: We don't have to score according to the equity index.

Patty: It said it on the form she shared.

Chris: We gave you the equity index as a tool, it is not the only tool in your toolbox to provide that score.

Jerome: Individual discretion?

Patty: In person visits are helpful for that.

Lyndsay: Are these blocks census blocks?

Thomas: Yes, that's the other major flaw, is that they are census blocks, not self-recognized communities.

(Cross talk – unable to decipher).

Susan: Out of curiosity, do we know what bumps up a block like that? When we know there's very few stores, very few doctors, it's a very rural area. Is there any idea what this is based on, income or property value?

Jerome: What's funny to me is the contrast between the McMillan area and the other area. Those are the two extremes, and there's no change. The High Cedars Golf Course has some of the nicest homes around there. I bet you couldn't buy a home in there for under $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million dollars.

Susan: I'm looking at Wilkinson...it's a tiny municipality, basically a ghost town and the equity index is very high. The things that you mentioned that you are concerned about, the capacity of organizations to apply for these grants, is not reflected on this tool.

Patty: I guess we just won't generally be using this tool. This is what the County selected for us?

Sarah: Chris just said it's a tool that we can use.

Jerome: Would it be appropriate to make a comment in the minutes that we have concerns about this as a tool.

Tony: I thought some of the issue was that we were going to advocate resources for the small towns to help put in applications for grants to help, not including it in the scoring. I thought there was talk about how the County can help the small towns that don't have the resources.

Thomas: I think we ended up tabling the overall issue because we were messing around with different kinds of metrics that were as befuddling as the equity index.

Jerome: Thomas, I don't know if it's appropriate to make a motion to make sure that it's registered in the minutes that I have a serious concern with this as a matrix or tool for us to use.

Thomas: I believe all of our comments are included. I don't believe we need to make a motion. I'm hearing everyone is very uncomfortable using a tool that does not reflect our lived experience with what we term equity. It's using gross census data and while it may make sense to the folks who put together this data, it's not intuitive for us to use as a sole source scoring tool. We can use it as a reference to look at some of the metadata, and some of the definitions like livability and accessibility. For regional access or community access, you can see if the property is within an area that has reasonable access to neighborhood parks. Then, based on what we know as residents of Pierce County, go from that, and not necessarily use the data that is being presented.

Patty: When we are scoring, though, we generally get the presentation and then have to score unless it's changed. So we're not going to be able to go back into this and research?

Thomas: We do have the applications now.

Patty: So we can look at them now?

Chris: Yes, that's why I made sure you had access so that you could review.

Tony: I think from my perspective, I will pick a couple of these matrix, obviously parks and open space, some of you know that I've been visiting every park in Pierce County, there's a park right behind Costco, a neighborhood park, that is a half a mile from here, and a regional park, Chambers Creek.

Thomas: That is another thing, you have to go through and see their definitions based on the values that are being applied on in the applications.

Jerome: In this particular case, if you look at Orting, the color appears to be moderate, and there is a park in the center of Orting.

Patty: Three parks.

Jerome: And it extends for three blocks. That doesn't seem to reflect that relationship to the population. The trail runs through it. It makes me question everything about it.

(Cross-talk muffled discussion.)

Thomas: I truly appreciate you jogging our memories with the issues we discussed with it initially, and they obviously haven't been addressed in a tool to solely rely on for scoring.

Chris: We'll have more discussion on what are the types of things that you would like to see for that particular question in the future.

Thomas: Carol, you've been silent, do you have anything to add?

Carol: The Anderson Island Park District got several grants through this organization with no

employees by partnering with environmental organizations to help us through the process. It should not be impossible for small cities to get this done if there is a will to do it. We were actually almost censured because we got so many projects through.

Thomas: What about your thoughts specifically on scoring for equity?

Carol: I would like to see us look at low-income areas. They may have a small neighborhood park, but is it a quality park, does it get them into nature? I was looking at that map, some areas that you know are low income didn't seem to reflect that.

Lyndsay: I think once you include the sheer number of values of properties that they did on there, it makes it difficult, because not all of those equity things are going to be as connected because you access to a wilderness area and your income are not necessarily connected if you live in a very small town right outside of a wilderness area. From the definition of parks, that entire block is going to be great because they are next to a wilderness area, but whether or not they even own a car to be able to get in, or different things like that, it gets hard when you are trying to combine that many things – I saw internet access, access to libraries. They are all important, but when you put them all together it muddles the waters as far as what you are looking at. Additionally, not all of those factors are pertinent for what we want to do from the standpoint that we're not going to be building a library or changing internet access.

Patty: Or putting toys in a park, this is about preserving and conserving valuable lands and resources more than providing human services and that may sound crass, but that's exactly what we're here to do – protect and preserve natural resources and farmlands and open space and create parks.

Thomas: I think these historically redlined districts have been overlooked and don't have parks or access.

Patty: So do they have a property that we are looking for in this program? That's where other funds might come into play, especially with cities that have enough people to have a low- and high-income area. Those may need other financial resources that they can seek.

Susan: I think that is exactly why we have the equity part of it was capacity of townships, but also was if there is a nugget of space in one of these underserved areas that we could help conserve, the old way would have had us scoring it much lower because it's smaller and it's not in an area...

Patty: It's not the quality of (muffled)

Susan: Right, so this does allow us to do because of the equity issue to raise the score marginally for a property that might be one of these small nuggets in a space. For that particular reason, this may be informative.

Patty: I think about the PLU project.

Thomas: Did everyone feel heard? Kadie, do you have any thoughts?

Kadie: Not really, my only thought is I would be concerned if we only (text omitted due to coughing over speaker)...low income communities.

Patty: That's not what we're saying.

Kadie: I would be looking at access to open space.

Claire: I'm hearing we're trying to balance different priorities, serving underserved communities in the traditional sense the tool was designed for, preserving open space and access for people and also addressing municipalities with lower resources to participate in the program and this tool is maybe not set up to intuitively do that, so it's going to be a more complex discussion for each project. Does that feel like an accurate summary of where we're at.

Thomas: I think just getting a line item for equity in underserved communities is a step forward, and we can think of ourselves as the pathfinders that will work it out. We know now that the major tool that was presented to us is not adequate to address our needs, so we'll need to rely on our lived and collective experiences as residents as to what is actually equitable. In a different application this could be a great tool, but not for this application.

Jerome: Agreed.

Lyndsay: In the applications we have for my program, when we do equity we do have separated out, some criteria that are based on the immediate population, which uses a somewhat similar map and has the census block, but we also have something for organizational equity that favors small towns and smaller counties to give them a better chance to compete with King County, because we're state-wide. So they are competing with King and Pierce County and the City of Seattle.

Thomas: I remember you sharing something about that, would you share that with Chris so she can share it with the group.

Jerome: The good news is that it is only five points.

Susan: This is something we can look at beforehand and do our homework on and have an idea about some of the properties we're looking at.

Carol: Chris, could you go back to the point for we looked at the ability to select which piece we wanted to look at. Could that change the whole map?

Chris: It only changes on the index information, not on the map.

Carol: So you can't have an overall look. I guess you could look up the particular project anyway.

Jerome: I wonder what the definition of a block group is?

Lyndsay: It's the census block. And how those are defined, don't ask...

Patty: I worked with the census very briefly, and it was usually population number in a particular area.

Jerome: Do they tie it to zip codes?

Patty: I don't recall it.

Susan: Lower Key Peninsula is connected to Anderson Island and McNeil Island and there's no ferry, no boat route so they're tied together so that would make sense.

Brett: I had one more question, not on the scoring for the public access part, is that current public access or it's proposed future use public access.

Claire: Proposed, and needs to be established within a year of the award, I will double-check that.

Jerome: I have a question, you mentioned that there would be a clear description of the covenant that would be put on a given property. In Ag land, seasonal housing is a discussion right now for labor workers. I wonder is that something within the scope that is being considered if applicable?

Chris: Structures are allowed on the conservation property as long as they go with that conservation. Housing for farm workers, if the primary conservation is for agricultural use, those go hand in hand. What we'd have to look at is where they are putting that and how much of the area they are looking to conserve, to make sure we're considering the areas appropriately. We don't have anything like that in this round.

Jerome: I'd just like to throw it out there, so it doesn't get lost. Most of the easements I've read say one dwelling or two dwellings, and if the definition of dwelling doesn't have...it could be a problem.

Chris: I think those will be on a case-by-case basis.

Thomas: Did everyone get the email and is able to download?

Patty: I wasn't able to, but that's because I was using my phone.

B. Overview of 2023 Applications, Chris Chaput

Chris reviewed the application schedule overview and the 2023-24 applications. CAB decided to add back in the July 20 date, so the schedule will be July 13 (four presentations and scoring); July 20 (three

presentations and scoring); July 27 (final ranking and discussion).

There are seven applications in this cycle, ranging from \$584,000 to \$2.7M, match range is 10-70%, total funding request - \$10,353,000 and total funds available - about \$8M.

Application Overview – overview of each project application including sponsor, receiving agency, size, values, request amount, match, and sponsor proposed terms.

- **Clover Creek Conservation and Recreation Area**

Questions/Comments

Tony: This was a sniper range?

Chris: It is a sniper range, it was shut down that day, but it will be continued as a sniper range.

Tony: With environmental, ranges of issues of lead are an issue.

Chris: They do have a lead management plan in their information. Those were questions that the TAC grilled them on. SWM (Surface Water Management) provided a letter of recommendation. Clover Creek is a 305 water quality, so they do not have a TMDL (total maximum daily load – how much crud is in your water) out, but they are in a strategic water initiative program so that they don't get kicked into a TMDL.

Jerome: That is a dues and membership based organization and my question is the public access issue to this, that would be a very dangerous thing if the public was allowed access while that is in operation. Has that been addressed?

Chris: It is in their application. And the public can access it for daily fees.

Jerome: But for my question, the public can't just go walking through?

Chris: It is separated.

- **Haley State Park Protection**

Questions/Comments

Patty: This property would be annexed into the State Park?

Chris: That is one of the potential future uses, but currently Great Peninsula Conservancy is the sponsor and receiving entity.

- **Island Blvd (DeMolay)**

Questions/Comments

Thomas: We should look at the meeting [minutes](#).

- **Little Minter Creek Forest and Farm**

Questions/Comments

Susan: I'm not familiar with the difference between the easement? If you could go into a little

more detail.

- Chris: The sponsoring agency wouldn't own the land underneath; they would just hold the development rights to that particular property. The property owner would still own the land but would have to meet the requirements of that conservation easement.

Susan: Basically like a covenant? It can't be changed.

Chris: Yes, it can't be subdivided.

Jerome: You said they would hold the development rights; in the past those have been extinguished. I just want to make sure because I'm not agreeing with that.

Chris: No, that's correct, they are extinguished.

Carol: Is the property to be sold to another farmer?

Chris: They are looking to sell the property to the park district up there, but that's only if they can come to an agreement on the sales price, which is why they are completing the conservation easement at the moment. If they can't come to an agreement with the parks district, they will sell it as agricultural farmland.

Carol: How much of the property is farmland?

Chris: About 75%.

Jerome: They did make a comment in there that there was to be no grazing in the wildlife area. Was that delineated?

Chris: You can see it on site, but the 150-foot buffer is currently grazed or mowed at the moment. What they are talking about is they would maintain the 150-foot buffer off of the creek and fence the area off from any livestock that goes out there.

Patty: What's this hatchery?

Chris: I don't know, that's a great question for sponsor.

Jerome: This is a year-round creek?

Chris: Yes, it was flowing pretty good when we were there.

- **Nelyaly Creek**

Questions/Comments

Chris: There was a little problem out there. The majority of the property is forested, but the current property owner decided that they were going to get ahead and do some trail building of their own. They have been notified that they need to cease and remove the mini equipment out there. It is fairly minor grading that has occurred, but it has occurred. The property has been maintained in good use until they decided to bring in the mini excavator. There are wetlands

associated with the creek onsite.

- **North Salmon Creek Heritage Site Phase 4**

Questions/Comments

Chris: There is a letter of support from the Puyallup tribe.

Jerome: How many development rights are associated with this piece?

Chris: I would have to go back and look.

Jerome: It's inside the UGA?

Chris: Yes, inside the UGA.

Jerome: So we are inside the UGA and extinguishing development rights which is contrary to the Growth Management Act's foundation. This is the second piece in this that we've looked at (two for me). My concern is the same, when we talked to the City of Gig Harbor last go around, they mentioned that they were going to do something with the development rights issue, and I've been curious to know if they have.

Chris: That would be a great question when they come to present.

Lyndsay: Is it the City that applied? Great Conservancy applied, but the City will be the receiving agency.

- **Probst Property at Swan Creek**

Questions/Comments

Chris: They came in with two protected areas, not three.

Susan: Do you know if the house would stay?

Chris: The house would be demolished as soon as MetroParks took over if the project moves forward.

Patty: I know this is politically incorrect, but down by Swan Creek when they go to potentially demolish the home, do they have a plan to keep homeless tents from being erected on the area?

Chris: At the moment, it is gated and fenced. They have mentioned that they will maintain the access but block it off, but that is something that you can ask MetroParks when they come.

If you have any questions that you would like the sponsors to ponder and make sure that they bring back with them after the presentation, if you have them now, or you can email them to me, and I'll make sure they get them so that they are prepared.

Questions/Comments

Jerome: I would appreciate if you could ask what the City of Gig Harbor is doing with the

development rights, and how many are going to be extinguished, and if they are planning any offset with that, and if they've done any offset with the previous parcels. I won't be able to be here, so I'd appreciate if you'd find out.

Lyndsay: For the Great Peninsula Conservancy, the City of Gig Harbor is receiving one, are they the applying entity for all four, but not the receiving entity.

Chris: They are the receiving entity for three.

Lyndsay: Is there any concern that given that you have more projects than we have funding, if theirs are top ranked, I know this doesn't factor into scoring, but just for awareness, are they going to be able to actually do all four if all four are awarded to them?

Chris: That's a great question for them.

Jerome: To go along with that, I notice that match wasn't funded.

Chris: There are some unsecured match.

Jerome: That is just 10%, but doesn't say it's secured.

Chris: That is a scoring factor.

Thomas: Any additional questions or insights? Jerome, I'll make sure those questions are raised.

Brett: We score same day, right? Do they need to be in before the next presentation starts, or at the end of the day?

Chris: If you want to give them to me or email them to me at the end of the evening or the next day.

Thomas: She has a separate folder for scored documents, so if you are all scored at the end, you can just drop them in, or email them.

Brett: My question is the time that they are expected.

Chris: I would love to see them by the end of the night, but if they come in the next day, that's fine as well.

Susan: Do you have a sense of how a hybrid presentation will play? I'm just trying to make sure it's fair.

Chris: I've presented in a hybrid. It's actually easier to do it from a hybrid perspective, but that may just be me.

Tony: Is that at the ESB? I might come by, but the last time I had a hard time seeing the screen.

Cheryl: We've got the big screen, you can just move closer. It's not anywhere near staring at your computer, it's just a big room, and it's not a tv like this.

Tony: The resolution was not as good. I'll stay home.

Thomas: Is everyone here in this room able to make the presentations and scoring in this room, aside from Jerome?

Patty: What happens with that? Are they recorded?

Susan: What was the rule? Was it that you couldn't vote if you didn't do the site visit or if you weren't there for the presentation?

Lyndsay: I think it's if you weren't there for the presentation.

Thomas: I think you have to be in attendance at the meeting presentations to score. So if you aren't there, you won't be able to score, but your voice can still be heard in the final discussion of ranking. The scoring will tell you where we collectively thought as a group, but there's always horse trading, and believe me, the Council members will be horse trading.

Patty: If we are recording, they can still score, or are you saying no?

Thomas: Correct, they have to be there during the presentation to be able to score.

D. Other Business

Thomas: Is there any other business? I would like to say thank you, this is very well done.

Questions/Comments

MEETING CONTINUED: To time/date certain, July 13, 2023, 6:00 p.m.

Chair continued meeting at 7:48 p.m.