

**ISLAND COUNTY CONSERVATION FUTURES
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

Date: April 26, 2017
To: Board of Island County Commissioners
From: Todd Peterson, Chair, Conservation Futures Citizens Advisory Board
Subject: 2017 Conservation Futures Program Grant Recommendations

On April 5th, 2017 the Conservation Futures Fund Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) conducted a properly noticed public meeting in Coupeville, Washington to evaluate the Conservation Futures Fund (CFF) program applications for 2017.

The following CAB members participated:

- Susan Bennett
- Terica Ginther
- Linda Kast Meehan
- Dave Parent
- Todd Peterson
- Dick Toft
- Kathryn Wells

The CAB elected Todd Peterson as Chair and Linda Kast Meehan as Vice Chair.

The following citizens provided statements in support of specific CFF projects:

Kate Snider, John Palka, Michael Soule and Karen Bishop.

Island County staff supporting CFF evaluation and the CAB were Don Mason (GSA) and Dawn Pucci (Planning).

Four applicant representatives made project presentations to the CAB.

The purpose of the CFF program is to preserve and protect lands of public conservation importance through a variety of means, except eminent domain. These lands include shorelines, wildlife habitat, wetlands, farm, agricultural and timber lands that are under pressure from increasing urban development pursuant to Island County Code (ICC)

3.22.010 – ICC 3.22.050, Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 84.34.020, RCW 84.34.210 and RCW 84.34.220.

Island County manages the Conservation Futures program. Within the program the County, a city or town, a park district, a municipal corporation such as a port district, a nonprofit historic preservation corporation, or nonprofit nature conservancy corporation or association may seek funds to secure a fee simple or any lesser interest, development right, conservation easement, covenant or other contractual right necessary to protect, preserve, maintain, improve, restore, limit the future use of, or otherwise conserve selected natural habitat, shoreline, and open space, farm, agricultural and timber land.

Conclusions and Findings

Pursuant to ICC 3.22.060, the following attached documents define how the CAB recommendations meet fund allocation and selection criteria:

- April 5th, 2017 CAB public meeting summary/minutes
- CAB scoring on each project.

Project Ranking and Scoring

After reviewing project descriptions provide by County staff, conducting site visits, and holding a public meeting to hear applicants' presentations and public comments, individual members of the CAB scored each of the proposed projects in relation to prescribed evaluation criteria. Based on combined totals, including prescoring by the county Commissioners and staff, the four projects were ranked in the following order:

1. Barnum Point County Park – Final Acquisition: Funding request - \$400,000.
Score 928.75
2. Pearson Shoreline Acquisition: Funding request - \$415,000.
Score 791
3. Whidbey Institute Conservation Easement: Funding request - \$200,000
Score 677
4. Penn Cove Farm: Funding request - \$95,000
Score 587

2017 CFF Funding

Funding requests for 2017 total \$1,110,000. Conservation Futures funds available in 2017 total \$950,000. In some cases, however, funds from succeeding years may be allocated in the current year.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

Barnum Point County Park – Final Acquisition

Project Sponsor: Island County

CFF funds requested: \$400,000

Project Summary

In partnership with the Whidbey Camano Land Trust, Island County proposes to complete the expansion of Barnum Point County Park on Camano Island. Conservation Futures funding will provide the local match required for the acquisition from the Barnum family of the West Tract, including the park's only low-bank waterfront and its 17 acres of private tidelands. Conservation Futures funding will also enable the transfer of the Land Trust's neighboring 35-acre Core Tract to the County. Completion of the Barnum Point project will expand the County park from 27 to 129 acres.

Matching funds: Whidbey Camano Land Trust will donate \$790,000 in land value. In addition the Land Trust will contribute at least \$150,000 to the County as a management fund for use at Barnum Point County Park. According to the project application, the Land Trust expects federal and state grant funds, land-value and private donations to total more than \$4,400,000 representing more than a 900% matching contribution to Conservation Futures funds. The Land Trust has completed six grant applications totaling more than \$7.1 million for the overall Barnum Point County Park expansion.

Public Support and Consistency with Local Plans

According to the Land Trust's application, this project has documented support from:

- Stanwood High School students who raised and donated \$10,000 to "Save the Point"
- Friends of Camano Island Parks (FOCIP)
- Washington Recreation and Conservation Office
- Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Washington Water Trails Association
- Pilchuck and Whidbey Audubon
- More than 620 private donors who contributed to acquiring Phase 1 of the project (East Tract).

The proposed final acquisition of Barnum Point is consistent with the Parks and Recreation and Natural Resources elements of the Island County Comprehensive Plan:

- provision of beach access and low-impact outdoor recreation
- protection of natural lands, fish and wildlife habitat, wetlands, groundwater resources, aquifer recharge areas and steep slopes.

The proposed final acquisition is also consistent with the Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) 6 (Whidbey and Camano Islands) Multi-species Salmon Recovery Plan. Barnum Point is identified in the plan as a high priority for nearshore habitat protection.

Summary of CAB Recommendation:

In ranking the Barnum Point project as highest priority for 2017 Conservation Futures Funds, members of the citizens' advisory board cited the following:

- Acquisition of the West Tract will secure the investment made to date in the other two parcels of the 129-acre Barnum Point property
- The West Tract provides low-bank access to Barnum Point's shoreline and tidelands
- Acquisition of the West Tract will protect salmon access to Triangle Cove and Kristoferson Creek
- An Island County Park in this location will become a regional draw.

Pearson Shoreline Acquisition

Project Sponsor: Whidbey Camano Land Trust

CFF funds requested: \$415,000

Project Summary

The Whidbey Camano Land Trust proposes to acquire 54 acres of tidelands and forested uplands including more than one-half mile along Whidbey Island's southeast shoreline. The property will be permanently protected for public use, fish and wildlife habitat, open space and bluff stability. Acquisition will ensure public access for beach combing, fishing, birding and nature viewing. The property is located along the Cascadia Marine Trail, a Washington Water Trail and National Recreation Trail.

Acquisition for public use would make this property a favorable stopover point for kayakers and other non-motorized boaters.

Matching funds: The Land Trust has secured \$1 million from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service toward the purchase of the underlying land interest in the property. According to the proposal, Island County's state Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account grant application ranked near the top of the list for the purchase by the County of a conservation and public access easement. According to the Land Trust's CFF application, a total of \$1,839,875 of matching funds will be secured from a combination of federal and state grant sources. The CFF request represents 19% of the project's total cost.

Public Support and Consistency with Local Plans

According to the proposal, there is a long history on Whidbey Island of support for protecting the Pearson property from development. The Island County Water Resources Advisory Committee, the Washington Department of Natural Resources, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as well as the Washington Water Trails Association and Whidbey Audubon Society have all expressed support for the project.

Protection of the Pearson Shoreline property is consistent with the Natural Resources and Parks and Recreation elements of the Island County Comprehensive Plan. In addition the Pearson project will help implement the County's Salmon Recovery Plan. The Pearson shoreline has been identified as a very high priority for conservation of forage fish, eel grass and juvenile salmon. The Action Agenda of the Washington State Puget Sound Partnership identifies habitat protection and restoration as a region-wide strategic initiative. The agenda also emphasizes the importance of improving public access to Puget Sound. The Pearson Shoreline offers more than one-half mile of beach, 10 acres of tidelands and a scenic access trail.

Summary of CAB Recommendation:

The CAB ranked the Pearson Shoreline project second in priority for 2017 Conservation Futures funding. CAB members noted the outstanding value of one-half mile of shoreline with a well-developed walking trail for access. They also noted the importance of timely action with a 90-year-old owner interested in selling.

Whidbey Institute Conservation Easement

Project Sponsor: Whidbey Camano Land Trust

CFF funds requested: \$200,000

Project Summary

The Whidbey Camano Land Trust proposes to acquire a conservation easement on approximately 103 acres of land located on south Whidbey Island. The land is owned by the Whidbey Institute, a non-profit educational organization that maintains a conference center offering local, regional and international programs and workshops. Eighty acres or 79% of Whidbey Institute's property will remain in its existing natural state and allow public trail access. The remaining 23 acres, or 21%, of the Institute's property will be in designated "building envelopes" that encompass the conference center as well as the Whidbey Island Waldorf School. The conservation easement would protect wildlife habitat at the headwaters of two tributaries to Maxwellton Creek as well as additional forestland and wetlands. The easement will provide and expand, by approximately 2 miles, permanent public access to a network of nature trails

Matching funds: The Whidbey Institute proposes to donate land value of approximately \$125,000. The Institute recently purchased, at fair market value, a 30-acre in-holding parcel. With this application, the Institute commits to putting this property into the conservation easement. The difference between the independent market appraisal of the conservation easement, minus the Conservation Futures grant award of \$200,000, will be donated by the Institute as matching funds to the CFF grant.

Public Support and Consistency with Local Plans

Five citizens submitted written comments or spoke in favor of this proposal. Please see the addendum to the minutes of the CAB public meeting of April 5, 2017.

Summary of CAB Recommendation

CAB members noted the value of maintaining healthy and intact forestlands and wetlands at the headwaters of two tributaries to Maxwellton Creek. They acknowledged the importance of updating and strengthening the Whidbey Institute's conservation easement. They found benefit in public access to an expanded network of nature trails.

Penn Cove Farms Conservation Easement

Project Sponsor: Whidbey Camano Land Trust

CFF funds requested: \$95,000

Project Summary

The Whidbey Camano Land Trust proposes to acquire an agricultural conservation easement on Penn Cove Farms. The farm's 129 acres lie north of Penn Cove within Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. The conservation easement will extinguish up to 10 development rights from the property and ensure that the land remains available for agriculture in perpetuity. At least one development right will be retained for the owners' home. The farm is part of the original Eli Hathaway Donation Land Claim and is a part of Whidbey Island's historic rural landscape.

The farm's acreage is used primarily for forage cropland to support an on-site dairy heifer raising operation. The property also serves as headquarters for an additional 1,250 acres in the immediate area leased for forage production to support Penn Cove Farms' operation. Leased land includes the Fakkema Farm and Tull properties, both of which the Land Trust recently protected using Conservation Futures and Navy funds. The Land Trust will secure an easement for a north-south trail spanning the western boundary of Penn Cove Farms.

Matching funds: Ninety-two percent of the funds for this project have been secured. This project scored first, out of 24, for a state Wildlife and Conservation Program Farmland Preservation grant. The Land Trust also applied for a federal Natural Resources and Conservation Service Agricultural Land Easement grant that will cover 50% of the easement cost. The Conservation Futures Fund request represents less than 10% of the total project cost. In summary, according to the application, Conservation Futures funds are amplified by state and federal farmland grants that are likely to be awarded.

Public Support and Consistency with Local Plans

According to the application, the Land Trust received seven letters of support for this proposal. These letters came from groups and individuals whose interest range from conservation of wildlife habitat to commercial agriculture. At the CAB's public meeting of April 5, 2017, the District Manager of the Whidbey Island Conservation District spoke in support of the Penn Cove Farms proposal.

This project is consistent with a number of local and regional plans including:

- Ebey’s Reserve General Management Plan – Land Protection Strategy. Penn Cove Farms is identified as a high priority for farm protection
- Ebey’s Reserve Long-range Interpretive Plan
- Island County Comprehensive Plan including policies dealing with Land Use, Natural Resources, Economic Development, Historic Preservation, and Parks and Recreation

Summary of CAB Recommendation:

CAB members found the Penn Cove Farm project worthy and expressed surprise at its low score. As one CAB member noted, “It looks like it fell victim to a scoring system that awards an inordinate number of points to shoreline access. We are comparing apples to oranges here and both have great value.” CAB members noted the importance of Penn Cove Farms’ enabling the continuing agricultural use of more than 1,000 acres of nearby farm land. The CAB also pointed out the importance of recognizing Penn Cove Farms for working with the Whidbey Island Conservation District to carry out environmentally sound farming practices.

The CAB recommends that the Commissioners modify the Whidbey Institute allocation to allow Penn Cove Farm to receive the funding it requires. CAB members believe there is low immediate risk that Whidbey Institute’s forestland and open space will be converted to other uses without the allocation of this year’s total request. CAB members ask that if necessary the Commissioners direct some of next year’s Conservation Futures funding to the Penn Cove Farm project. The Citizens’ Advisory Board is concerned by the low scores for this project submitted by county staff, pointing out that these scores unfairly put this project at a competitive disadvantage. CAB members also recommend that the Board of Island County Commissioners revise CFF scoring so that farms get as much consideration as waterfront property.

CONCLUSION

The Citizens’ Advisory Board members offer the following concluding observations, questions and recommendations:

CAB members endorsed the goal of receiving a wide variety of proposals. Step one is to communicate widely about Conservation Futures funding. As one CAB member noted, “We ought to do more to get applications.”

The CAB recommends reevaluating Criterion G: Financial Strategies. The rationale for this criterion is that a project that buys a conservation easement for less cost would

score higher than a project that buys a fee simple interest for more cost. This year's scoring didn't turn out that way because the bonus points were awarded to the fee simple purchases not the conservation easement.

A CAB member asked, "Do applicants know the commissioners' annual priorities, when submitting projects? How much transparency exists in the priorities/bonus points realm? What guides the Commissioners in their annual priorities and when are they set? It seems they could easily skew the priorities and thus bonus points, to favor certain projects that appear on the horizon."

Expressing the sense of the Advisory Board, members noted: "The CAB was not informed ahead of time that 45 possible points would be pre-scored by the County DNR, negative 10 to zero by the County Planning Department...and up to 40 bonus points were pre-scored by the County General Services staff rather the County Commissioners or the CAB." It would be more appropriate for the County staff and Commissioners to apply their priorities after they received the project presentations and the CAB's recommendations. While it would be useful to know the Commissioners' annual priorities before project scoring, the CAB recommends that staff and Commissioner pre-scores be removed from the scoring sheets so that they do not partially predetermine the results of the project evaluations.

In summary, why have an advisory board if priorities to an important degree are predetermined by the Commissioners and County staff?

CONSERVATION FUTURES FUND
CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING – 5 APRIL 2017
MINUTES

Minutes taken by Don Mason, CFF Program Coordinator, Island County GSA

On Wednesday, April 5th, 2017, at 6PM, the Island County Conservation Futures Fund (CFF) Citizens' Advisory Board (CAB) met in a public meeting to discuss 2017 proposed acquisition project applications, to hear staff and applicant presentations about these projects, and to take public comments regarding these projects.

The public meeting was advertised by a press release to local media sources. The meeting was recorded on digital recording media.

Attendance:

CAB members that attended were:

Todd Peterson
Susan Bennett
Dick Toft
Terica Ginther
Dave Parent
Katheryn Wells
Linda Kast Meehan

Island County Staff that attended were:

Don Mason, IC GSA, CFF Program Coordinator
Dawn Pucci, IC DNR, Environmental Health Specialist

Applicants Organizations' representatives that attended were:

Pat Powell, Executive Director, WCLT
Ryan Elting, Conservation Director, WCLT
Danielle Bishop, WCLT
Ida Gianopoulos, WCLT
Steve Marx, Assistant Director, IC Public Works

The Barnum Point County Park proposed project is now sponsored by Island County. This project was originally submitted by WCLT

Public present:

Maddie Rose, North Whidbey
Holly Harlon, Langley WA
Kate Snider, Seattle WA
John Palka, Langley WA
Doug Snider, Seattle WA
Michael Soule, Langley WA
Steve Hillborn, Oak Harbor WA
Karen Bishop, Coupeville WA

Election of CAB officers:

The CAB members who attended elected Todd Peterson as Chair of the 2017 CAB and Linda Kast Meehan as Vice-Chair.

Approval of the Agenda:

Don Mason presented a Draft Agenda (attached) for the public meeting which the CAB unanimously approved.

Program Presentation:

Don Mason presented training on the CFF Program Procedures, Purpose and Function of the CAB and the Acquisition Project Selection Criteria.

Presentation process:

The CAB decided to proceed with presentations, reports and comments grouped by project. For each project:

1. Applicants delivered a power-point presentation about the project,
2. Staff presented information on staff review of the project,
3. Public Comment was taken, and
4. The CAB asked questions of applicants, staff and/or the public for clarification.

The proposed projects were presented by the project applicants in the following order:

1. Whidbey Institute Conservation Easement – Pat Powell
 - Kate Snider spoke in favor of this project
 - John Palka spoke in favor of this project and provided a written copy of his remarks (attached)
 - Michael Soule spoke in favor of this project
 - Francis Wood provided an email (attached) in favor of this project
 - Britt Conn provided an email (attached) in favor of this project
2. Penn Cove Farm Conservation Easement – Danielle Bishop
 - Karen Bishop spoke in favor of this project
3. Pearson Shoreline Acquisition – Ida Gianopoulos
4. Barnum Point County Park – Final Acquisition - Ryan Elting

CAB discussions, project scoring and recommendation to the County Commissioners (BOCC):

The CAB discussed each of the projects and individually scored the 2017 acquisition projects by using the Acquisition Project Selection Criteria. The project rank, determined by these scorings, are:

1. Barnum Point County Park
2. Pearson Shoreline Acquisition
3. Whidbey Institute Conservation Easement
4. Penn Cove Farm Conservation Easement

The Cab instructed the Program Administrator to place in the minutes that the CAB is concerned about low pre-scores provided by IC DNR

The CAB designated the Chair, Todd Peterson, to prepare the 2017 recommendation to the BOCC and to present the recommendation at a future Commissioners' public meeting.

Island County Conservation Futures Program
Citizens' Advisory Board Public Meeting
Wednesday, April 5, 2017 - 6 PM - County Commissioners' Hearing Room

Public Attending

Name	City of Residence
Michelle Rose	Unincorp D.C. (N. Whidbey)
Holly Harlan	Langley, WA
Kate Snider	Seattle WA
John Palka	Langley
<i>[Signature]</i>	Langley 
DOUS SNIDER	SEATTLE WA
MICHAEL SOWLE	Langley
Steve Hilborn	Oak Harbor

Island County Conservation Futures Program
Citizens' Advisory Board Public Meeting
Wednesday, April 5, 2017 – 6 PM – County Commissioners' Hearing Room

Public wishing to make comment on a project

Name	Project
Kate Snider	Whidbey Institute
John Palka	Whidbey Institute
MICHAEL SOULE	Whidbey "
Kaven Bishop	Penn Cove

Don Mason

From: Frances Wood [wood@whidbey.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Don Mason
Subject: Conservation Easement

ATTN: Don Mason
PO Box 5000
Coupeville, WA 98236-5000

Dear Sir:

I write you to support the establishment of a conservation easement on the Whidbey Institute property in Clinton.

This extended woodland area provides not only quality habitat for many species of birds and mammals, but also provides valuable protection to the waterways in and near it.

I have hiked the trails many times and found species of birds, including the pileated woodpecker, Pacific wren and great horned owl that need extended wooded areas for their survival.

This wooded area provides connectivity and enhancement of other protected lands and should be protected.

Please vote in favor of this designation.

Sincerely,

Frances Wood

Don Mason

From: Britt Conn [britteconn@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 7:16 AM
To: Don Mason
Subject: Whidbey Institute's Conservation Easement - Please support

Dear Island County Commissioners and CFF Citizens Advisory Board,

My husband, Eric Conn and I are writing to ask you support the Whidbey Institute's request for a conservation easement. We live in the same watershed as the Whidbey Institute, just down the hill in the Maxwellton Valley. Our young son attends the Whidbey Island Waldorf School and we all appreciate the rich outdoor environment that the Whidbey Institute and surrounding community has stewarded for over seven years.

By granting this conservation easement, our island's citizens and visitors from off-island would have an additional 2 miles of public access to explore and develop a deeper appreciation for the wild, natural beauty that surrounds us on Whidbey Island. Additionally, this easement would help protect the wetland at the head of two creeks into perpetuity. These critical areas are home to myriad species of beneficial insects, native flora, salmonids, and more. These species cannot protect themselves, we must do it for them and make choices now that protect their sensitive habitats into the future.

The Whidbey Institute has proven itself as a leader in land stewardship for over 40 years. We urge you to support this conservation easement, and ensure protection of the critical areas within this easement to be appreciated and enjoyed for generations to come.

Sincerely,
Britt Conn
3464 Quade Road
Clinton, WA 98236

My name is John Palka. I was a professor of biology at the University of Washington for almost 35 years, have been a resident of Whidbey Island for almost 20 years, and have served on the boards of, and financially supported, a number of local organizations including the Marine Resources Committee, the Friends of Freeland, Whidbey Watershed Stewards, and both of those before you today, the Whidbey Institute and the Whidbey-Camano Land Trust.

I would like to make six principal points in strong support of the request for Conservation Futures funding for a conservation easement on the property of the Whidbey Institute:

- a) The conservation of *substantial properties that are functioning in an ecologically integrated way* is of high importance for Island County. Not only does it align with the state's Growth Management Act, it is also a significant draw for people who come to settle here and thereby support the local economy.
- b) The approximately one hundred acres for which a conservation easement is being sought represent a contiguous area of significant size. *The forests on the land are in excellent health, as are the wetlands and the meadows that provide habitat diversification, and the border areas that are known to be attractive to both mammals and birds.*
- c) The property is an *integral part of the Maxwellton Valley Watershed*, one of the most important watersheds on the island and an *active spawning area for salmonids*. It abuts several other well-preserved properties and together with them provides important protection to the watershed, especially its headwaters.
- d) The land already has a *fine trail network that is open to the public*. Under the conservation plan, this trail system will be enhanced and extended, providing an outstanding public resource.
- e) As a professor, I see extraordinary potential in this site for *public environmental education*. One of the trails has already been developed as a nature trail, with a guide booklet that is one of the best I have ever seen anywhere. I have personally talked with Whidbey Institute staff about doing more in this direction.
- f) And finally, from a historical/cultural point of view, the land is a Finnish farmstead dating to the turn of the 19th/20th centuries. Its fields have been preserved as meadows, and some of its original structures still stand and are well taken care of. The Whidbey Institute has cultivated warm connections with descendants of the original Finnish owners. This is a *well-preserved gem in Island County's rich cultural history*.

For all these reasons, I urge you to approve the Conservation Futures funds that are being requested to safeguard the lands of the Whidbey Institute for the future.

In terms of habitat protection, the Institute has a long, 40 year history of caring for the forest and the meadows. The meadows will remain open if they are kept from overgrowing by the adjacent forest. This maintains habitat diversity beyond what would be there in the absence of human care.

John Falke

* RCVN AFTER PUBLIC COMMENT



ISLAND COUNTY PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PHONE: (360) 679-7339 ■ from Camano (360) 629-4522, Ext. 7339 ■ from S. Whidbey (360) 321-5111, Ext. 7339
FAX: (360) 679-7306 ■ 1 NE 6th Street, P. O. Box 5000, Coupeville, WA 98239-5000
Internet Home Page: <https://www.islandcountywa.gov>

TO: Board of Island County Commissioners
FROM: Nathan Howard, Long Range Planner *NSH*
DATE: April 4, 2017
SUBJECT: 2017 Conservation Futures Fund – Capacity Analysis

Summary

RCW 84.34.230 states that for Conservation Futures Fund proposals “the county must determine if the rights or interests in real property acquired with these funds would reduce the capacity of land suitable for development necessary to accommodate the allocated housing and employment growth, as adopted in the countywide planning policies.” If a project were to reduce the capacity, the applicable jurisdiction must “adopt reasonable measure to increase the capacity lost.”

Island County Planning and Community Development reviewed the 2017 Conservation Futures Fund proposal to determine if any of the projects reduced land capacity intended to accommodate projected housing and employment growth. **All of the projects were determined to have no impact on the capacity to accommodate the project housing and employment growth.** For a more detailed explanation, see each project summary below.

1. Acquisition – Barnum Point

Since the Barnum Point Acquisition project properties are not located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA), **it will not affect capacity to accommodate the projected housing and employment growth.** There are two existing dwelling units in the Barnum Point project area. An additional two dwelling units could be built if the subject properties were developed fully. This project would likely reduce the potential rural capacity on Camano Island by four dwelling units; however the rural area on Camano has over 900 dwelling units of excess housing capacity, so it would not require shifting additional rural housing to the adjacent UGA.

2. Acquisition – Pearson

Since the Pearson Shoreline Acquisition project properties are not located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA), **it will not affect capacity to accommodate the projected housing and employment growth.** At most, an additional nine dwelling units could be built if the subject properties were developed fully. This project would likely reduce the potential rural capacity on South Whidbey by at most nine dwelling units; however the rural area on South Whidbey has over 1,800 dwelling units of excess housing capacity, so it would not require shifting additional rural housing to the adjacent UGA.

3. Conservation Easement – Whidbey Institute

Since the Whidbey Institute Conservation Easement project properties are not located within an Urban Growth Area (UGA), **it will not affect capacity to accommodate the projected housing and employment growth.** The Whidbey Institute owns all of these properties, so they would not be available for future housing capacity, and this project will have no impact to the rural capacity, so it would not require shifting additional rural housing to the adjacent UGA.

4. Conservation Easement – Penn Cove Farms

Since the Penn Cove Farms Conservation Easement project properties are not located within an Urban Growth Area, **it will not affect capacity to accommodate the projected housing and employment growth.** These properties are existing agricultural properties, so they would not likely be available for housing capacity over the next twenty years, and so it would not require shifting additional rural housing to the adjacent UGA.



ISLAND COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH

P.O. Box 5000
 Coupeville, WA 98239
 www.islandcountyeh.org

To: Conservation Futures Citizen Advisory Board
 From: Island County Department of Natural Resources
 Re: Conservation Futures Funding, 2017 Applications – DNR Scoring
 Date: March 29, 2017

Thank you for the opportunity to evaluate the 2017 applications for Conservation Futures Funding. This document details how the Island County Department of Natural Resources (IC DNR) staff evaluated the Habitat and Water Resources sections of the Conservation Values & Resources Criteria. The information in this memo is intended to provide technical guidance to the CFF Citizen's Advisory Board (CAB) on the habitat section of the CFF scoring. The following Island County Department of Natural Resources (IC DNR) staff evaluated and scored the 2017 Conservation Futures Funding Applications:

- Keith Higman, Director (ICPH & IC DNR)
- Jill Wood, Environmental Health Director
- Doug Kelly, Hydrogeologist
- Dawn Pucci, Lead Entity Program Coordinator

The IC DNR staff evaluated these proposed projects using the following criteria:

A. 1. Habitat

- a. Habitat projects are scored in three different categories, with a total of 30 points possible:
 - i. *Biological function and environmental benefits*, quality and importance of habitat type for specific species including salmonids. Possible score of 10.
 - ii. *Connectivity to and enhancement* of other protected lands and important water bodies. Possible score 10.
 - iii. *Site significance of habitat ecosystem*: locally, regionally, or statewide. Possible score 10.
- b. Working Farm are scored for habitat parameters differently from Habitat projects. There are 10 points possible for habitat parameters. Working farms are able to score an additional 24 points in section A.2. Working Farm & Agricultural based on soils, site significance and resource suitability. Those are not scored by IC DNR staff.

	Biological function	Connectivity	Site Significance
Habitat Projects			
Barnum	9	10	9
Pearson	7	8	8
Whidbey Institute	9	9	9
Farm /Forestry Projects			
Penn Cove Farm	3		

Department of Natural Resources
 PO Box 5000, Coupeville, WA 98239-5000 (504 Haller Street)
 From N. Whidbey 360.679.7350 From S. Whidbey 360.321.5111 x 7350
 From Camano Island 360.629.4522 x 7350 FAX 360.679.7390

A. 2. Water Resource Prescore

- a. Provides for protection of groundwater resources through aquifer recharge area protection. Groundwater susceptibility is currently mapped as Low, Medium or High susceptibility (as a part of the county's CAO). (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, high=5).
- b. Provides for protection of groundwater resources/ seawater intrusion risk (ICC 8.09.099). Groundwater susceptibility is currently mapped as Low, Medium or High susceptibility (as a part of the county's CAO). (Ratings are low=0, medium=1, high=3 and very high=5).
- c. Reduces impact of surface water discharge. (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, high=5).

	Aquifer recharge area protection (0-5)	Seawater intrusion risk (0-5)	Reduces impact of surface water discharge (0-5)	Total
Barnum	1.25	3	3	7.25
Pearson	3.5	0	4	7.5
Whidbey Institute	4	0	4	8
Penn Cove	1	0	1	2

H. Bonus Points Partial Prescore

Assures alignment with the Board of Island County Commissioners' goals set annually for the current grant cycle. The 2017 goals include: 1. Funding for projects that provide access to the shoreline for public use, 2. Funding for projects located within a critical watershed, and 3. Funding of projects that provide immediate public access. IC DNR provided a recommendation for a score based solely on the critical watershed component. The shoreline access and public access components were not taken into consideration in the following recommendations. IC DNR scored each project based on the watershed it is located within and the potential benefit to that watershed.

	Location within Critical Watershed
Barnum	10
Pearson	4
Whidbey Institute	8
Penn Cove	2

Total Habitat, Water Resources Analysis and Conclusion

CFF Proposal	Total Habitat & Water Resources Combined PreScore
Barnum	45.25
Pearson	35.5
Whidbey Institute	42
Penn Cove	7

Island County Conservation Futures Program
Barnum Property Project Evaluation Criteria

MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE

CRITERIA	EVALUATION ELEMENTS	HABITAT PROJECT	WORKING FARM PROJECT	WORKING FOREST PROJECT	
A. Conservation Values & Resources	1. HABITAT (Prescore / DNR) a. Biological function and environmental benefits, quality and importance of habitat type for specific species including salmonids. b. Connectivity to and enhancement of other protected lands and important water bodies. c. Site significance of habitat ecosystem: locally, regionally, or statewide.	9 (10 possible)	N/A	N/A	
		10 (10 possible)			
		9 (10 possible)			
	2. WATER RESOURCES (Prescore/ DNR) a. Provides for protection of groundwater resources through aquifer recharge area protection. Groundwater susceptibility is currently mapped as Low, Medium or High susceptibility (as part of the county's CAO). (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, and high=5) b. Provides for protection of groundwater resources / seawater intrusion risk (ICC 8.09.099). (Ratings are low=0, medium=1, high=3 and very high=5) c. Reduces impact of surface water discharge. (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, high=5)	7.25 (15 possible)	N/A	N/A	
		3. WORKING FARM & AGRICULTURAL a. Agricultural soils quality and condition. b. Resource suitability for current and long-term production, existing and future agricultural income. c. Site significance of agricultural resources locally, regionally, or statewide.		N/A	
				N/A	
			N/A		
	4. WORKING FOREST a. Timberland quality and condition. b. Resource suitability for current and long-term timber production, existing and future timber income. c. Site significance of timber resources: local, regional, or statewide.			N/A	
				N/A	
				N/A	

Island County Conservation Futures Program
Pearson Property Project Evaluation Criteria

MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE

CRITERIA	EVALUATION ELEMENTS	HABITAT PROJECT	WORKING FARM PROJECT	WORKING FOREST PROJECT
A. Conservation Values & Resources	2. HABITAT (Prescore / DNR) a. Biological function and environmental benefits, quality and importance of habitat type for specific species including salmonids. b. Connectivity to and enhancement of other protected lands and important water bodies. c. Site significance of habitat ecosystem: locally, regionally, or statewide.	7 (10 possible)	N/A	N/A
		8 (10 possible)		
		9 (10 possible)		
	3. WATER RESOURCES (Prescore/ DNR) a. Provides for protection of groundwater resources through aquifer recharge area protection. Groundwater susceptibility is currently mapped as Low, Medium or High susceptibility (as part of the county's CAO). (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, and high=5) b. Provides for protection of groundwater resources / seawater intrusion risk (ICC 8.09.099). (Ratings are low=0, medium=1, high=3 and very high=5) c. Reduces impact of surface water discharge. (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, high=5)	7.5 (15 possible)	N/A	N/A
	4. WORKING FARM & AGRICULTURAL a. Agricultural soils quality and condition. b. Resource suitability for current and long-term production, existing and future agricultural income. c. Site significance of agricultural resources locally, regionally, or statewide.		N/A	
			N/A	
			N/A	
	5. WORKING FOREST a. Timberland quality and condition. b. Resource suitability for current and long-term timber production, existing and future timber income. c. Site significance of timber resources: local, regional, or statewide.		N/A	
			N/A	
			N/A	

Island County Conservation Futures Program
Whidbey Institute Project Evaluation Criteria

MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE

CRITERIA	EVALUATION ELEMENTS	HABITAT PROJECT	WORKING FARM PROJECT	WORKING FOREST PROJECT
A. Conservation Values & Resources	3. HABITAT (Prescore / DNR)			
	a. Biological function and environmental benefits, quality and importance of habitat type for specific species including salmonids.	9 (10 possible)	N/A	N/A
	b. Connectivity to and enhancement of other protected lands and important water bodies.	8 (10 possible)		
	c. Site significance of habitat ecosystem: locally, regionally, or statewide.	9 (10 possible)		
	4. WATER RESOURCES (Prescore/ DNR)			
	a. Provides for protection of groundwater resources through aquifer recharge area protection. Groundwater susceptibility is currently mapped as Low, Medium or High susceptibility (as part of the county's CAO). (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, and high=5)	8 (15 possible)	N/A	N/A
b. Provides for protection of groundwater resources / seawater intrusion risk (ICC 8.09.099). (Ratings are low=0, medium=1, high=3 and very high=5)				
c. Reduces impact of surface water discharge. (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, high=5)				
5. WORKING FARM & AGRICULTURAL				
a. Agricultural soils quality and condition.		N/A		
b. Resource suitability for current and long-term production, existing and future agricultural income.		N/A		
c. Site significance of agricultural resources locally, regionally, or statewide.		N/A		
6. WORKING FOREST				
a. Timberland quality and condition.			N/A	
b. Resource suitability for current and long-term timber production, existing and future timber income.			N/A	
c. Site significance of timber resources: local, regional, or statewide.			N/A	

Island County Conservation Futures Program
Penn Cove Farm Project Evaluation Criteria

MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE

CRITERIA	EVALUATION ELEMENTS	HABITAT PROJECT	WORKING FARM PROJECT	WORKING FOREST PROJECT
A. Conservation Values & Resources	4. HABITAT (Prescore / DNR) a. Biological function and environmental benefits, quality and importance of habitat type for specific species including salmonids. b. Connectivity to and enhancement of other protected lands and important water bodies. c. Site significance of habitat ecosystem: locally, regionally, or statewide.	N/A	3 (10 possible)	N/A
		N/A		
		N/A		
	5. WATER RESOURCES (Prescore/ DNR) a. Provides for protection of groundwater resources through aquifer recharge area protection. Groundwater susceptibility is currently mapped as Low, Medium or High susceptibility (as part of the county's CAO). (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, and high=5) b. Provides for protection of groundwater resources / seawater intrusion risk (ICC 8.09.099). (Ratings are low=0, medium=1, high=3 and very high=5) c. Reduces impact of surface water discharge. (Ratings are low=1, medium=3, high=5)	N/A	2 (15 possible)	N/A
	6. WORKING FARM & AGRICULTURAL a. Agricultural soils quality and condition. b. Resource suitability for current and long-term production, existing and future agricultural income. c. Site significance of agricultural resources locally, regionally, or statewide.		(8 possible)	
			(8 possible)	
			(8 possible)	
7. WORKING FOREST a. Timberland quality and condition. b. Resource suitability for current and long-term timber production, existing and future timber income. c. Site significance of timber resources: local, regional, or statewide.			N/A	
			N/A	
			N/A	

Additionally, following are observations/recommendations for consideration and were considered in scoring these project proposals:

Barnum Property

- The project would create connectivity between the Port Susan Marine Stewardship Area, already acquired parcels on the east side of the point and Triangle Cove, which is important for out-migrating salmonids and nearshore beach-building processes.
- The location of this project is important for salmon because of its close proximity to the Stillaguamish River and the two listed populations of Chinook salmon that are located there.
- This project will greatly increase the amount of public land as well as provide access to undeveloped, low bank waterfront

Pearson Property

- This a rare stretch of undeveloped beach and nearshore in the Saratoga region.
- There is connectivity to the Glendale watershed to the south.
- The removal of creosote will benefit water quality.
- It is not located within a critical watershed.
- The high energy of this site may make the site less desirable for juvenile salmonid rearing

Watershed Institute Project

- The location of this site at the head waters of Quade Creek and adjacent to the wetland complex associated with Maxwellton Creek make this an important site with its potential to benefit the water quality/quantity of both streams.
- The mature and well-maintained forests provide great habitat for many upland and aquatic species.
- Public access to the site is highly valued.
- The development threat to this property is very low.

Penn Cove Farm Project

- This project is located in an important watershed but it is uncertain if an easement on this farm would increase Best Management Practice implementation and protect water resources from intensive farming practices. If the easement was being applied to land downstream of the farm practices, the project would have provided assurances to long-term down-stream treatment of runoff between the farm and Penn Cove.
- The development threat to this property is low.
- Habitat for native upland or avian species is limited due to the intensive nature of the farming practices. There is little overstory cover, edge habitat or connectivity gained with this project. While IC DNR values productive, well-maintained farm land and agricultural practices, our scores are restricted to the habitat value and significance of the project due to ranking criteria structure.

ISLAND COUNTY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

P.O. Box 5000

Coupeville, WA 98239-5000



Phone: (360) 679-7378 FAX: 360 240-5551

TO: ISLAND COUNTY CONSERVATION FUTURES CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
FROM: DON MASON, PROGRAM COORDINATOR
RE: PRE-SCORE OF 2017 PROPOSED PROJECTS FOR COMMISSIONERS PRIORITY CRITERIA – BONUS POINTS

In resolution C-05-17, the Island County Commissioners (BOCC) set the Commissioners' priorities for Conservation Futures (CFF) projects. These priorities are reflected in the selection criteria bonus points and are:

1. Funding of projects that provide access to the shoreline for public use (20 maximum bonus points)
2. Funding of projects located within a critical watershed (10 maximum bonus points)
3. Funding of projects that provide immediate public access (10 maximum bonus points)

The priority with regards to location within a critical watershed is pre-scored by Island County Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and is detailed in the DNR pre-scoring document dated March 29, 2017.

Project	Whidbey Institute	Penn Cove Farms	Pearson Shoreline	Barnum Point
Pre-score	8	2	4	10

General Services, as the department that coordinates the Conservation Futures Program, pre-scored the other BOCC priorities as follows:

- Funding shoreline projects.

Project	Whidbey Institute	Penn Cove Farms	Pearson Shoreline	Barnum Point
Pre-score	0	0	20	20

Neither the Whidbey Institute project nor the Penn Cove Farm are located on a shoreline, while the Pearson project would provide public access to over a half mile of shoreline and the Barnum Point project would provide public access to over a mile of shoreline.

- Funding of projects that provide immediate public access:

Project	Whidbey Institute	Penn Cove Farms	Pearson Shoreline	Barnum Point
Pre-score	10	0	7.5	10

The Whidbey Institute and Barnum Point projects have current public access that is planned to continue uninterrupted and expanded as these projects are completed.

The Penn Cove project proposes a future trail easement to be developed at an unknown date. The future nature of this proposed easement is best accounted for in scoring criteria B. Appropriate Public Use and Enjoyment, but is not Immediate Public Access.

The Pearson Shoreline project has an existing road which will be used for public access to the shoreline from the road once the existing small parking area is improved and opened. The applicant states that this will occur within 6-8 months of closing. However, at the CAB's public meeting on the evening of April 5th, the applicant further expanded their explanation that upon closing, the public will have access to the beach from the water, but not from the trail until the parking is improved within 6-8 months. As this would be public access but not as complete as the Whidbey Institute and Barnum Point projects, the Pearson Shoreline project was scored at 7.5 points on this criteria.

All prescores were presented at the CAB's public meeting.