

# King County Conservation Futures Advisory Committee

## MINUTES

**Tuesday, March 24, 2020**

4:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Teleconference

1. Welcome – Terry Lavender

Terry welcomed the group, and discussed ground rules for working by teleconference.

2. Approval of Minutes of February 25, 2020 Meeting

The minutes of the February 25, 2020 meeting were approved as distributed electronically in February.

3. Approval of Annual Project Progress Report

The Annual Project Progress Report was approved as distributed electronically in March.

4. Field Trip Logistics

Ingrid discussed field trip sign-ups, assignment of lead roles, and next steps.

5. Initial Review of Applications for 2021 CFT & Parks Levy Funding

The Committee identified questions to ask applicants prior to project review meetings, as follows.

### SPONSORED BY CITIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

#### **Covington, Jenkins Creek Park Expansion**

Questions for applicant:

1. What does the dedication of the "CFT covenant" on the existing city park accomplish? Will it change the use of that property?
2. What is the 'limited term' timeframe the seller is willing to wait in the proposed letter? Does that timeframe work for when funds would be available? If you can't get all the money what would work?
3. What are relocation costs of \$150k for? Why needed?

#### **Des Moines, Massey Creek Phase 1 (Property Acquisition)**

Questions for applicant:

1. What is the access like? Can the public actually get to the property?
2. If only this property is acquired can you still achieve meaningful restoration?
3. Are landowner(s) willing sellers?
4. What types of grants may provide match? Timing of those grants?
5. Consequences of partial funding?

#### **Des Moines, Midway Park Expansion Phase 2**

Questions for applicant:

1. Have you heard anything back from the second landowner?
2. Costs:
  - a. CFT funding request on first page was not filled in. Budget is confusing because they divide it into two requests. Total is \$1,664,000?

- b. Relocation of \$12,500 for multi-family seems low, is this realistic or will more \$ be needed?
- 3. What does “Low opportunity clusters” mean?
- 4. What is the zoning on the parcels - “Residential Suburban Estate” or “Pacific Ridge Residential”?
- 5. Will the light rail route to the east just be the rail corridor, or will there be a station there or nearby?
- 6. What is the status of the homeowners of the two parcels? What is the status of finding them a new location?
- 7. What was the experience working with the homeowners of the northern parcels? This will give info about how the response will be when buying the southern parcels.
- 8. What is project readiness? Can this be phased?

**Forterra (Federal Way), Kilworth Environmental Education Preserve (Camp Kilworth)**

Questions for applicant:

- 1. Match waiver
  - a. Please make a stronger case for a match waiver - I don’t see the request for match waiver supported in any part of the application or letters of support.
  - b. How do we know that the YMCA is going to provide the programming they are suggesting, and then linking underserved populations/youth to use this site in perpetuity?
  - c. Can you provide a letter of support/partnership from the YMCA?
- 2. Timing/Phasing
  - a. What is the timing on the YMCA having the money to complete the purchase?
  - b. If a match waiver is granted, does that affect the timing and mean the project could be completed sooner - e.g. within the next year or so - and make it a good bond funding candidate?
  - c. Is this the only request we will get for this project and will this fully allow a purchase?
  - d. Is it phaseable - \$1M each year or other?
- 3. Clarification on approach
  - a. How will the property be divided between CFT and portions with structures? How do they plan to pay for the portions with structures?
  - b. Clarity on the structure of the project- who would hold the underlying fee and easement?
- 4. When we saw this application before, the City was the applicant. Are they taking any role this time?
- 5. Community Engagement:
  - a. What other engagement strategies has Forterra done? Have they reached out to local grassroots organizations that are culturally diverse?
  - b. What are you doing to be intentional in your engagement process with diverse organizations in Federal Way and SeaTac?
- 6. Why is there such a high cost for staff and admin costs? (\$75k)?
- 7. Will usage of site be restricted to just YMCA/members? Will it be open for public use at certain times?

**Forterra (Kenmore), Arrowhead**

Questions for applicant:

- 1. Why is there such a big difference between the estimated cost to purchase and the Assessor’s land value on the table on page 5?

2. How does grant funding sources change the partnership structure to protect the property?
3. If a phased funding approach is used how long of a term can this be? What is the minimum needed for phase 1?

### **GROW, Save Ballard P-Patch, Seattle Dept of Neighborhoods (Seattle), Ballard P-Patch**

Questions for applicant:

1. Why isn't City of Seattle an active funding partner here? (e.g. Dept of Neighborhoods; Seattle Parks (who is a P-Patch partner in Hillman City); an amount in excess of the \$50,000 line item listed in grant as match?)
2. Can we find out the demographics that P-Patch provides services to? (Ethnicity, age, etc.) And do we know whether they live in the surrounding area or from across the city?
3. Will this meet the 15% limit on non-vegetative impervious surfaces with the size of that parking lot (the portion within the footprint you plan to acquire)?
4. Do other members of the public get access to this parcel as well, if preserved, or only those who rent and use P-Patches?
5. Who will own title to the land and provide maintenance, clean up, security, and ongoing, permanent use of the land as a community garden?
6. What's the City's role here?
7. Does GROW meet the requirements for NGO applicants (historic preservation corp or non-profit nature conservancy corp or assoc)?

### **Historic Seattle PDA + Seattle Parks (Seattle), Turner-Koepf House and Garden**

Questions for applicant:

1. Valuation questions:
  - a. How can the Assessor place no value on the house?
  - b. How can the project cost be less than the assessed value?
  - c. What price was it listed for and offered by Seattle Historic (why didn't they get it first time)? Is this competitive for developers?
2. Public use of the site:
  - a. Will the public have regular access to the yard?
  - b. Will there be an access fee for the public to see and use this property?
  - c. What does the statement "The house and garden will be available to and affordable to the public" mean?
3. Page 3--Unmet needs paragraph. Seems to be a typo for median family income, as "70.3%" makes no sense.
4. Supplemental Form #2 (NGO Applicants is left blank)--if Historic Seattle is a historic preservation corp, why don't they meet the eligible NGO definition? Is it because they are not non-profit?
5. What is the plan for community engagement and involvement?
6. In addition to Beacon Hill Council, have you engaged other groups? Can you provide another support letter?
7. What will the selection process and RFP look like for the architect? Will there be intentionality in involving the community who will be served by this area? Will planning be equitable?

### **Kent, McSorley Creek Wetland Additional Parcels**

Questions for applicant:

1. The city proposes a big vision for this site. Please explain in detail about how that will roll out.
2. Is this really feasible for public use? What public use is happening on the existing nearby properties that have the same character (i.e. all wetland) - what makes these different and more usable to the public?

3. What is landowner willingness?
4. What was the per acre sale price of last year's McSorley purchase?
5. If there is still \$20K money left, why isn't the ask \$348K instead of \$368K?
6. What community engagement have you done, and can you provide another letter of support?  
(note: a 2<sup>nd</sup> letter received 3/25/2020)
7. Are there homeless populations at the site? If so, how does the city address that?
8. What does the term "non-conforming wetland activities" mean?

### **Kirkland, Denny Creek 141st St Parcel**

Questions for applicant:

1. The map is hard to see. Helpful to have a more close-up aerial of the site.
2. Is this city-owned stormwater system that is discharging on this parcel, or from a nearby development? Why is it discharging there - was it legal? Was it permitted or allowed under an easement?
3. What is a 10 year, 24-hour event? How much of the 0.23 acre will be the 1M\$ infrastructure being installed?
4. This seems primarily like more of a stormwater priority than as park or open space...is that true? Why isn't Kirkland Public Works buying this themselves when it's primarily a stormwater issue? Wouldn't WaterWorks or some other grant source that is tied more to stormwater, etc. more appropriate?
5. Is this proposing natural/vegetative stormwater treatment, or to build some kind of capital project for stormwater infiltration?
6. Has the appraisal process started?

### **Lake Forest Park, LFP Lake Front Property Acquisition**

Questions for applicant:

1. Public access/use:
  - a. How much use does Lyon Creek Waterfront get? Do Burke Gilman users actually visit there? How far it is from the nearest access point and it is well-signed to invite users there?
  - b. Will there be parking on site or along the public road frontage?
2. CFT/non-CFT portions of property:
  - a. What are you planning to do with the rest of the property – why would it not be eligible for CFT?
  - b. How did you select the portion of the property for CFT investment - most of the property is excluded? Is that 1559 s.f. portion on the eastern side also included? Seems like an odd and somewhat arbitrary footprint for CFT.
  - c. Could you please consider a way to make CFT a more meaningful and central part of the site's vision rather than, perhaps, a convenient funding source you are using to cobble together the total amount and apply to just the edges of the property?
3. Funding
  - a. How exactly will the \$2.5 million from the Parks Levy be secured?
  - b. How is a value of \$1.9 million for the CFT portion supported? We will need a detailed appraisal analysis to determine the actual value of that portion.
  - c. Why was the purchase price 60% higher than assessed value?
  - d. What is the timing of the buy-and-hold contract, by which you need the CFT dollars in hand to complete the acquisition?

### **Mercer Island, Mercer Island I-90 Boat Launch Addition**

Questions for applicant:

1. Questions from the map:
  - a. Could you explain the parcel configuration and shorelands designation?
  - b. Does is “concrete fnd” mean concrete foundation?
  - c. The legend doesn’t specify – red is target parcel and yellow is future potential target?
2. Would this meet the 15% non-vegetative, impervious surface limits?
3. Can you clarify – the boat launch is a use for the land next door and is not proposed for the site, correct?

**Renton, May Creek Fawcett ROFR**

Questions for applicant:

1. How does this relate to the Fawcett parcel that was previously purchased?
2. Does the City of Renton plan to make this educational/interpretive opportunity to incorporate the Salish people besides the Colman settlers?

**SeaTac, Des Moines Creek Park Expansion**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please explain how this relates to last year’s application and award.
2. Please help us understand the map:
  - a. Is the “passive recreation” parcel the target parcel?
  - b. Where are the lands that were proposed to be funded with last year’s award?
  - c. What will happen with the “future funding targets”? Will those be a future CFT application?
3. Related to funding request:
  - a. Please explain the budget more clearly.
  - b. Is the \$1M match you cite matching last year’s award, or is it actually new money to match this year’s request?
  - c. Why is the request for CFT money greater than 50% of the total ask? (Match is \$1mil; CFT ask is \$1.6 mil.)
4. Is there appraisal in process?
5. Will you be waiting until 9 acres are secured before doing design? How far toward that total acreage will you be counting last year’s award and this proposed award?
6. Will part of the existing park be taken for the highway?
7. What is the current zoning of the proposed property?

**Seattle, East Duwamish Greenbelt: Brick Pits**

Questions for applicant:

1. Funding:
  - a. If valuation was \$3.8M in 2018 dollars, do you estimate that actual price will be higher in 2020/2021 at time of purchase?
  - b. Why isn’t Seattle asking for enough funding to acquire the property now?
  - c. Does the city have the ability to purchase the property now, in advance of future CFT applications (if the total cost is more like \$3M+ but you only apply for \$1M now)?
  - d. Why is the city not interested in pursuing a partial CFT award if not granted the match waiver? Is this not an important priority for the city even without a match waiver?
2. What is the plan for managing the homeless encampments on the site?
3. Is this primarily for the preservation of environmental resources on site – or do you see potential for public use as well?

**Seattle, East Duwamish Greenbelt: South Chicago Street**

Questions for applicant:

1. No questions

### **Seattle, Lakeridge Park Addition**

Question for applicant:

1. How much do you think this amount will get you? It appears to us that this amount will only get 1 of the 4 listed parcels.

### **Shoreline, Rotary Park Acquisition I**

Questions for applicant:

1. Willing seller or not?
2. Valuation:
  - a. Can you explain how appraised price of land and improvements is \$416,000, but purchase price is estimated at \$1.25M?
  - b. Why is there \$65k in relocation costs?
  - c. How did the recent rezone impact the costs of the project?
3. The parcel contains a house that will be demolished when appropriate. When will it be appropriate? What is this based on?
4. Park use – here & nearby:
  - a. Does the adjacent Seattle City Light property function as a park? Is it open to the public?
  - b. What is planned for the two parcels between the target parcel and Rotary Park – are those future targets?
  - c. Did the land we funded last year address the need for park space near the new light rail station? Why is this needed as well?

### **Snoqualmie, Snoqualmie Riverfront Reach Acquisitions**

Questions for applicant:

1. None identified.

### **SPONSORED BY KING COUNTY**

*The following question has been inserted into every project where the applicant seeks PL as match to CFT:*

*Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.*

### **KC - WRIA 7, Carnation Marsh**

Questions for applicant:

1. No specific questions on this project.
2. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT: Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.*

### **KC - WRIA 7, Griffin Creek Natural Area**

Questions for applicant:

1. Are you accounting for the \$72,878 unspent Park Levy funds in your ask?
2. Why the need for an additional \$25k for staff and admin costs if this is already almost a done deal with the owner?
3. What are your plans for the pasture that you are purchasing?

4. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 7, Little Si Natural Area Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. Are you accounting for the \$18,349 unspent Park Levy funds from last year's award?
2. Why \$50k in relocation costs?
3. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 7, Mitchell Hill Forest Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. We were a bit confused by the map. Can you confirm:
  - a. The yellow square is 10 acres that is *not* to be included in the CFT footprint. Is that part of the adjacent parcel, and is owned by Seattle Schools too?
  - b. The red outlined parcels (excluding the yellow square) are they the land that is to be subject to the easement?
2. Phasing:
  - a. Can we break out the parcel values for purposes of phasing purchases?
  - b. Or phase across multiple years of awards?
  - c. What timeframe is workable?
3. What is the leftover balance after closing on the Roads parcel?
4. What happens if you don't get PL part of request?
5. What would the easement allow and what would it restrict?
6. Valuation:
  - a. Why is the easement so expensive?
  - b. What is the value remaining after the easement is purchased?
  - c. Was the appraisal already completed and reviewed?
  - d. Was there timber value that was part of the appraisal?
7. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 7, Raging River Natural Area**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please clearly separate out the amounts needed into two phases, identifying when each needs to be funded. What we think we see is:
  - a. \$2,260,000 in funding is needed to complete Phase I and allow purchase of the parcels from TPL.
    - i. Is that needed this year or could that be delayed until next year?
  - b. \$2,000,000 is requested for the easement on the newly added parcel (portion of 9011 – to protect in easement)?
    - i. When is that needed?
    - ii. Also, have you appraised the \$2M value of 9011, is that a solid number?
2. Funding availability:
  - a. Please account for the first award of \$200,000.
  - b. When will you know more about RCO funding contributing to purchase?
3. Is the owner still planning to donate the active mine parcel? When?

4. How do these parcels provide opportunities to create trail connections that link the county's regional trail system to Fall City? Show on a map
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 7, Upper Preston in Raging River**

Questions for applicant:

1. Does the timber on the property contribute to the total valuation of the parcel?
2. Is there legal access to these parcels? If not, will these really cost much at all?
3. Is there a way for the public to access these properties on trails from WADNR land?
4. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Cougar Mountain Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. What, specifically, is the amount of funding requested being targeted for this year?
  - a. How much is needed for DeLeo Wall?
  - b. How much would go to the other parcels?
2. Are any of the other parcels ready to be bought this year, or can some of that request be phased until next year?
3. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Eastrail - Renton Extension**

Questions for applicant:

1. Is this property Lake Washington waterfront?
2. Is there a plan to construct a trail through Renton that connects to the southern terminus?
3. BNSF engagement:
  - a. Funding is being requested before any agreement with BNSF has been reached. Can you engage BNSF to let us know by end of April what the situation is and if there is really an opportunity that can't be delayed?
  - b. Is there one party in KC negotiating with BNSF on Eastrail and Lake to Sound?
  - c. Is that an unused right-of-way for BNSF?
  - d. Do we know what BNSF thinks the railroad is worth – how much do we trust this number?
4. Phasing or partially funding the award:
  - a. What if partial funding were provided (a token amount of CFT + PL)?
  - b. If we fully funded just your CFT request and gave you \$0 PL for now, is there an interim funding source to use short-term for the match if you actually can make the purchase....then come back after you have a deal in a year or two and request the Parks Levy amount? The PL can then reimburse your interim funding source.
  - c. Is there any ability to tap into Parks Levy regional trail capital funds earmarked for Eastrail as part or all of the match?
  - d. If we are unable to fully fund, will Renton contribute to make up the difference? Will Renton only contribute funds if the acquisition is over \$3 million?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Eastrail - Woodinville Bottleneck**

Questions for applicant:

1. The property is in Ag current use. Is it protected by FPP covenants?
2. Why are the parcels labeled WA Trust Bank highlighted? Are they significant to this acquisition?
3. Willing seller or not?
4. Could you explain what is the publicly owned land? We're not used to seeing it in white.
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Hollywood Hills Forest and Pasture**

Questions for applicant

1. This appears very early in the process. Could this be feasibility money only?
2. Can you come up with any other match and just get a CFT award without any PL at this point?
3. Why should the Committee view this as a compelling proposal - esp. with a potential \$11M price tag?
4. Why is it important to connect Gold Creek Park with the Tolt Pipeline Trail? Is this just for a handful of equestrian riders that live nearby?
5. Will maintenance of this site be a concern?
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Lake to Sound Trail, Segment D**

Questions for applicant

1. Why is the easement value the same as the fee value?
2. The request is for a match waiver but they are proposing \$775,000 in match. Is that only if the waiver is denied?
3. Applicant says likely success, but other Applications say BNSF is difficult to deal with. Explain.
4. Is there one party in KC negotiating with BNSF on Eastrail and Lake to Sound?
5. Is this a trail that would connect to the Eastrail/Coulon Park area (a separate proposal)?
6. Are there recommendations/support from more local community groups (in the immediate area)?
7. What is the plan to make sure the adjacent neighborhood to the north (that is a qualifying census tract) has direct access to this trail?
8. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT (in this case, it may only be an issue if match waiver is denied):* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, McGarvey Park Open Space Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. This project is requesting \$2.3 million but the total project costs are listed as greater than this. Why the difference and how should it be handled?
2. The habitat values described are for McGarvey Park. Do they apply to the proposed acquisition?
3. Are there remediation costs for the missile site?
4. Is the landowner willing to sell just the portion you are proposing to purchase (excluding the missile site)?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Middle Bear and Cottage Lake Creek**

Questions for applicant:

1. How will your existing \$1.7M be spent?
2. Have you actually engaged the landowners and started work on the targeted parcels?
3. For Roads parcels, you estimate \$100,000 and say they will negotiate a good price. The table in section 4 includes the assessed value for all the roads properties (\$750,000) and that entire amount is in the ask. How much of your ask is actually earmarked for the Roads parcels?
4. Can you walk us through the maps to orient us?
  - a. What does "Owner Interest 2019" mean?
  - b. And the orange parcels, were those approved at the last meeting or are they being proposed here?
  - c. Second map - what does the bluish/green border mean? Are they in a different area so they couldn't be on the first map? Coloring of parcel borders is confusing. Same for the next 2 maps.
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8, Skyway - West Hill Urban Greenspace**

Questions from the match waiver review group:

1. Where is DCHS in the process for messaging around this work?
2. Where will the affordable housing site be located instead?
3. Why isn't this site right for affordable housing? Why is it a better fit for an open space match waiver site?
4. Can you provide letters of support for your project?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT (this may only be an issue if match waiver is denied):* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 8/9, Soos Creek Park/Molasses Creek**

Questions for applicant:

1. Is the \$90,000 in funds already received from Parks Levy and CFT?
2. Can this project be phased with some parcels bought this round and some later?
3. Of the two parcels noted by Council: Is parcel #3323059034 the main target? Are you also considering #3423059062?
4. Can you explain the priority of the other parcels in the application?
5. Can you explain where the wetlands are on these parcels?
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **GENERAL QUESTION FOR JOSH KAHAN:**

Josh, you have a lot of big asks, incl. Bass Lake Complex (\$3.3M), Green/Newaukum Preservation (\$4.6M), Middle Soos Preservation (\$2.4M) and Boise Creek Preservation (\$1M) for a total of \$11.3M. This is a large percentage (~25%) of the total grant money we have available. The Committee will really want to know: what are really the highest priority...what can give?

### **KC - WRIA 9, Bass Lake Complex Acquisition Preservation**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please help break down priority for committee:
  - a. You have 9 parcels - but how many landowners (and possible transactions) does that represent?
  - b. How can this be phased?
  - c. Which are really ready to go, which can wait? What is the cost break-down for ready to go parcels?
2. TDR is paying some of the project costs. Can they provide match?
3. You have about \$150,000 in previous CFT and PL but not accounted for in the application. How will that funding you have in hand be used?
4. Are we to consider your red parcels as the targets, and yellow as the future scope? Your nomenclature is different than we usually see.
5. Text in 5D talks about parcel 9017 needing demo, but not on map nor on list in 4A?
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 9, Calhoun Pit**

Questions for applicant:

1. Help us understand the funding need:
  - a. Does the \$150,000 represent what you think will be King County's purchase of the easement?
  - b. Explain the source of funds and timing for Covington to secure funds to purchase the fee.
2. Please walk us through the map to help us understand the site layout and boundaries. (White is the outline of publicly owned parcels?).
3. What is the zoning? You state "R" in section 4.
4. Why is this parcel important? Explain the "gateway" function. Can't this be accomplished with existing park property?
5. Where are you with discussions with the landowner? Do you think they will actually sell this land for \$300,000?
6. Where do things stand with the landowner's development application with the city of Covington?

### **KC - WRIA 9, Green River/Newaukum Creek Preservation**

Questions for applicant:

1. How will you spend down the \$2.8+M already in project? Do you need more money now?
2. Please provide a way to scale this project. What is the minimum amount of funding you need now? What deals are actually ready to go? What can be delayed?
3. Any opportunity for other sources of match?
4. Please explain parcel 9009 which is an FPP property - it seems like you will remove it from Ag. I see a number of other partial acquisitions of AG land for conservation. Please explain.
5. I see notes in almost all the WRIA 9 applications that TDR program funds could support these acquisitions. What is the reality of that and how will we know where that can occur?
6. Are we to consider your red parcels as the targets, and yellow as the future scope? Your nomenclature is different than we usually see.
7. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 9, Middle Soos Creek Preservation**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please provide a way to scale this project. What is the minimum amount of funding you need now? What deals are actually ready to go? What can be delayed?
2. Can you find any other sources of match?
3. No parcel numbers were included on the map. Can you please update?
4. It is unclear why some of the parcels are priorities other than they are adjacent to existing public parcels. For example, the ones in the middle of the map. Would like to know what makes these targets.
5. Are we to consider your red parcels as the targets, and yellow as the future scope? Your nomenclature is different than we usually see.
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 9, North Green River Acquisition**

Questions for applicant:

1. Can you delineate wetlands on the map?
2. Is Parcel 9028 actually large enough to be developed?
3. The Bond information was not filled out. Can you give us a sense of urgency, readiness, and ability to scale? Is there any opportunity for that, especially for the property with the willing owner?
4. Provide more rationale to conserve the parcels. 9021 seems away from the river, and most of 9023 is not on river. Others in yellow actually seem closer to river/flood area, but aren't the current priorities.
5. Can you actually do anything about flooding issues if you aren't securing the yellow parcels?
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 9, South King County Forest**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please explain the land match. (Note – Ingrid will have a slide from Megan last year, which shows the land match parcels in relation to your targets).

### **KC - WRIA 9, Sweeney Pond**

Questions for applicant:

1. Should you also consider the parcel that includes most of Sweeney Pond, to the east? This is very valuable bird habitat.
2. What do you think the expected total value of the parcel is – and what are the structure values if you plan to buy them?

### **KC - WRIA 9, Tacoma Water Federal Way**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please delineate wetland on the map.
2. Is this project phaseable?
3. Can you discuss your community engagement to date, and planned? Any potential to get letters of support?
4. What is the water body to the north (in the neighborhood)? Any lake that we would know the name of?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT (this may only be an issue if match waiver is denied):* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain

if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 9, White Center Urban Greenspace**

Questions for applicant:

1. Questions about purpose:
  - a. This seems a bit early in the process – how does the housing development know they actually can't create sufficient connections to the park on the existing property?
  - b. Why are the triangular parcels necessary to add to the existing park if displacing homeowners is needed? There is already a very large park right next to the HUB project.
  - c. Is there a threat of sale or development of these parcels? They would need to have the houses on each of the parcels torn down.
  - d. Are there other parcels without houses to identify instead? Why displace these people from their homes?
2. Is the county in contact with the homeowners/renters who are living on these parcels? Do they want to sell?
3. Can this project be phased - only one parcel funded now?
4. Why is \$100,000 assigned to assessed value of each parcel? Is that accurate or was that an arbitrary amount?
5. Can you provide letters of support for your project?
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT (this may only be an issue if match waiver is denied):* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 10, Boise Creek Preservation**

Questions for applicant:

1. Can you break down the parcel values – what will the requested funding get you? Can you break down the values and propose phasing?
2. What is the risk or restoration delay if only the three vacant parcels are bought at this time?
3. There are existing funds of \$497,000 - how will these be spent down and will any be available?
4. Can any parcels have dwellings carved off and acquire only portions without dwellings?
5. Explain map nomenclature. Are red the target parcels, and yellow the long-term scope? How about “in negotiation” - those aren't actually listed on the app?
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 10, Foothills Trail, McPherson Acquisition**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please explain why this really needs to be bought. This seems like a “nice to have” not “need to have.”
2. Is this an inholding in public ownership? It's hard to tell - can a different color (another shade of green?) be used to outline the existing public lands?
3. Can the house be carved off and just the vacant land purchased, instead of purchase of entire parcel, and demo?
4. Is landowner willing?
5. Is there any regional trail funding that can serve as match?

6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - WRIA 10, Little Lake Forest**

Questions for applicant:

1. Costs:
  - a. What is the \$1 m estimate based on? A full 2 years of Forterra ownership? How much can it be reduced if fully funded this year?
  - b. What do the \$150,000 and \$70,000 payments to Forterra represent?
  - c. How many months of interest are expected to be charged?
2. Why was a buy-and-hold needed here?
3. The app sounds like house is gone but it is not and will need demo. Can any other parcel (north) that is only forest be looked at instead?
4. Does this resolve the issue with limited public access to Little Lake Forest?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **GENERAL QUESTION FOR DAVID KIMMETT:**

David, you have a lot of large asks for projects on Vashon/Maury Island, including Frog Holler (\$7M), Manzanita Natural Area (\$320K), Maury Island Additions (\$850K) and Neill Point (\$3.3M) for a total of \$11.5M...approximately 25% of the total amount of grant money we have available. And this doesn't even include Greg's projects, which total about \$6.4M. What are the real priorities and what can wait?

### **KC - Vashon, Frog Holler Forest Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. Valuations:
  - a. Shouldn't the value of a Camp Sealth easement be a fraction of its fee value?
  - b. Why is the value of Scarsella assumed to be 50-60% higher than assessed value?
  - c. Costs on page 4 look like fee purchase, so is that the "worse case" cost, because easements is also checked and mentioned on page 1. Presumably easements would be less?
  - d. If Camp Sealth is ready, and the Assessor's value is \$2.75 Million, the EASEMENT will be less, yes? How much less?
2. Scaling/phasing:
  - a. This is a multi-year phaseable project, yes?
  - b. The request for over a third of the available Park Levy money is not possible. How can you scale or sequence this project over multiple years this project or bring other match?
3. Are any of these potential bond-funded properties? Section 7 was not filled out.
4. What would easement on Camp Sealth allow? Prohibit logging, subdivision, & development?
5. Feedback on maps:
  - a. I'm confused about the hash marks on the map.
  - b. It looks like the Nashi property (#9026) already has an easement? (Is that related to this application?)
  - c. It's helpful on the maps if the green overlaid on the forest is easier to see somehow.
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - Vashon, Manzanita Natural Area Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. Shouldn't easement value be a fraction of fee value?
2. Since this property is already in public ownership, can it wait another year? Is there a way to hold in the interim?
3. What are the other red outlined properties on the map?
4. Why would the County want to leave \$6,000 on the table (costs on page 4 make it look like fee title would be \$306,000, and they are proposing \$300,000 for an easement. That doesn't make too much sense to me, as a taxpayer.) To not pay the fee title to own the property? Can the County still "manage" the property without fee title? What are the advantages of not owning, so County doesn't have to "maintain"? What if owner doesn't maintain either? Hassle?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - Vashon, Maury Island Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. Please provide history of all previous appraisals of this property.
2. The application says the purchase could be phased. Give us an example of what that would look like.
3. \$130K over appraised value? Perhaps Mr. LaSalle would like to throw in the trail easement on his other property (not included in this application) as part of the deal?
4. Without that trail easement as a guaranteed part of the deal, how can we ensure we get that in the long run and actually secure the public access that this is supposed to achieve?
5. Bond funding potential? Section 7 not filled out.
6. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - Vashon, Neill Point Natural Area Additions**

Questions for applicant:

1. Shouldn't a sale of multiple contiguous parcels in common ownership be discounted from individual lot values?
2. What is the readiness/willingness of specific owners?
3. I'm not sure why these properties are targets, other than they are large and have willing sellers and/or are suddenly available.
4. What would the easement(s) provide and prohibit? Shouldn't easement value be a fraction of fee value?
5. Is there a way this project can be phased?
6. You have four Vashon forest applications. Is there any priority order among the four projects?
7. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

**General question for Greg Rabourn:** Greg Rabourn's projects seem to have higher levels of funding requested for staff and admin costs than others (\$30-\$40K on each project). How does he justify this? What are we paying for?

### **KC - Vashon, Vashon Creeks & Estuaries**

Questions for applicant:

1. What is the dollar amount needed for the 3 parcels you say are ready to go? Is it possible to phase or prioritize those?
2. A table we have with existing funds says there is \$638,630 remaining in this project. The application says only \$138,630 remains. How do you account for the other \$500,000? Is that all held for Talequah parcels?
3. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - Vashon, Vashon Marine Shoreline**

Questions for applicant:

1. Which parcels on the map have already been purchased? What were the prices?
2. A couple of the maps do not include parcel #s. Could you please update the maps to include them?
3. What is the cost to buy the parcels that have the buy and hold? They are not separately marked.
4. \$4+ million remains in this project from past awards (including some of the older smaller accounts that have been rescoped to this larger project). Detail how all of that will be spent in the next year and, therefore, require additional money this year.
5. Can you please prioritize the parcels and scale the ask?
6. CORBIN BEACH: Can you explain this parcel: is it actually one parcel that is bisected by the road? Or is it missing a parcel number on the western portion of the red parcel? The yellow parcel isn't listed on the list of target parcels, is it?
7. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - Vashon, Vashon Park District Surplus**

Questions for applicant:

1. Can the parcels marked as donation be land match for the other parcels?
2. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **KC - Vashon, Vashon Tax Title Properties**

Questions for applicant:

1. Are these just the tidelands and not upland?
2. Are there any "cons" to CFT purchasing just tidelands and not uplands, other than not being able to manage the upland uses?
3. Does DNR need to be involved re: tideland leases?
4. Do tideland purchases give the public beach access?
5. *Note to all applicants seeking PL as match for CFT:* Parks Levy match is extremely tight and will limit awards. Please be prepared to explain if you can work with CFT only and find other match, and/or how you can scale your project for a partial award.

### **GENERAL QUESTIONS FOR TED SULLIVAN:**

1. On all maps, "Cumulative CFT Farmland Targets" – can you explain that? Are some of those in current negotiations? Are they just future targets?
2. The remaining balance (in your current projects) and current ask add up to about a quarter million more than the stated need. Can you explain?

### **KC - Farm, Protecting Farmland Enumclaw/Upper Green River Farms**

Questions for applicant:

See general questions

**KC - Farm, Protecting Farmland - Snoqualmie and Vicinity Farms**

Questions for applicant:

1. See general questions
2. Can you explain how tree farms like Stringfellow and Carnation Tree Farm qualify as farmland?
3. How many points of contact has the team had with the farm owners? Where are they at in the process? Wanting to expand upon "staff have engaged two of the four farm owners."

**KC - Farm, Protecting Farmland - Vashon/Maury Farms**

Questions for applicant:

1. See general questions above
2. There are only 3 farms listed, but in section 3- ownership - says KC has 4 owners contacted already and more to engage?
3. (Side question: What approach is being taken at Nashi Orchards between farmland and parks?)

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

**King County Conservation Futures Advisory Committee**

**Tuesday, March 24, 2020**

Teleconference

**Attendance**

Ken Brunner	Conservation Futures Advisory Committee
Niesha Fort	“ “
Catherine Gockel	“ “
Molly Graham	“ “
Leah Grant	“ “
Mark R. Johnsen	“ “
Ken Konigsmark	“ “
Terry Lavender	“ “
Keith Livingston	“ “
Courtney Naumann	“ “
Cil Pierce	“ “
Andrew Schmid	“ “

Analyn Unpingco, King County DNRP  
Ingrid Lundin, King County DNRP  
Linda Holecek, King County DNRP