

Jefferson Land Trust
 Conservation Futures Citizen Advisory Committee Question Responses
 April 2024

Humbleberry Farm:

1. Please explain why the matching fund total from Question 1d is different than the amount noted in Question 1c. Or is the difference the O & M request?

The response for 1d. should be consistent with 1c. and the budget table in 1a. The matching funds from the Navy REPI program are estimated at \$345,000 and the matching funds from the State Farmland Program are estimated at \$340,000. These are estimated figures because final costs are not determined until project due diligence is underway and appraisals are finalized.

Deerfoot Forest:

1. What is the time period over which the puma and bear sightings were made and how many of each are documented? Were any records kept regarding sightings along Center Road on either side of the Deerfoot forest property?

Jefferson Land Trust has not been tracking or recording the sightings of large mammal species crossing between the two Deerfoot Forest parcels since we began conversations with the Hubbard family in the last 6 months. The landowners have shared with us that there have been multiple sightings over the 50 years of living on site, as well as sign including cougar kill site and a bee hive destroyed by a bear.

2. Deerfoot Forest does not appear to meet the classic definition of refugium (singular) “an area of relatively unaltered climate that is inhabited by plants and animals during a period of continental climatic change (such as a glaciation) and remains as a center of relict forms from which a new dispersion and speciation may take place after climatic readjustment”. How does the JLT define refugium?

We should have utilized the term “refugium function” rather than “refugia” which refers to De Groot, Rudolf S., Matthew A. Wilson, and Roelof MJ Boumans. *A typology for the classification, description and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services*. Ecological economics: 41, no. 3 (2002): 393-408.

“Refugium function- By providing living space to wild plants and animals, both for resident and transient (migratory species), natural ecosystems are essential to the maintenance of the biological and genetic diversity on earth. Natural ecosystems can thus be seen as a ‘storehouse’ of genetic information. In this ‘genetic library’ the information of environmental adaptations acquired over 3.5 billion years of evolution is stored in the genetic material of millions of species and sub-species. To maintain the viability of this genetic library (through evolutionary processes), maintenance of natural ecosystems as habitats for wild plants and animals is essential.”

3. Since there is “no apparent surface water flow (on the property)” where is the property’s hydrologic connection to Donovan and Tarboo Creeks? (“the property appears to have hydrological connections as a section of the headwaters of both Donovan Creek and Tarboo Creek”)

From the hillshade maps, provided in the application packet. These maps show, at fairly fine detail, the contours and depressions of properties and Deerfoot Forest appears to be at the headwaters of both of these creeks.

4. The proposal references the Land Resilience Study the proposal’s response to questions 5 and 11. It’s unclear where the Deerfoot Forest property overlaps with the Habitat & Biodiversity Conservation Opportunities areas identified in the Land Resilience Study (see maps in email to follow this one) although it does appear it is within a Working Forest Opportunity Area. Please identify where the overlap occurs and what percentage of the Deerfoot Forest property is within one of the Biodiversity Conservation Opportunity Areas.

We were unaware that we were able to add additional maps to the application than the Site Location Map and the Project Boundary Map. However, the climate resiliency data has been updated in 2023 since it’s original assessment in 2020q which is what the committee member has screenshots of. Here is the most up to date data from Deerfoot Forest, showing that portions of the property have Habitat & Biodiversity Terrestrial Conservation Opportunities (dark green).

ArcGIS Web Map



5. What is JLT's working definition of wildlife corridor?

Wildlife corridors are greenbelts of native vegetation, connected by permanently protected properties, with minimal human interruptions that can provide cover, transit and sources of food for multiple species of wildlife.

6. What data does the JLT propose to gather to demonstrate the Deerfoot Forest is a linkage?

Our conservation easement monitoring does not typically involve quantitative data collection. Monitoring will help ensure the baseline conditions of the conservation values are sustained and/or enhanced over time. As the habitat conservation values are stewarded by the landowner, evidence of wildlife use can be documented in our annual monitoring visits, and over time that information may provide valuable insight into how local populations of resident and migratory wildlife are using it in the decades to come.

Jefferson Land Trust has also been increasingly working with the Olympic Cougar Project which collars and tracks many cougars present on the Olympic Peninsula. We will be able to use their data as it is shared with us to know which of our protected properties are used by collared cougars.

7. Has the JLT utilized the mapping or evaluation tools for linkages/corridors identified by Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group (<https://waconnected.org/applying-the-science/>) to evaluate if Deerfoot Forest is a wildlife corridor and if so its importance?

The Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Work Group connectivity data—amongst multiple other data sources from The Nature Conservancy, the Cascades to Coast Landscape Collaborative, and WA DNR and more—is incorporated into the analysis for Habitat & Biodiversity Terrestrial Conservation Opportunities, as shown in question #4 above.

Conservation Futures Fund Citizen Oversight Committee
 Sponsor Question Responses -- NWI
 April 2024

TARBOO WILDLIFE PRESERVE – WEST SLOPE FOREST ADDITION

1. *Would they accept funding if it included a condition requiring retention of up to 60% (or some similar reasonable percentage) of the existing timber on the 80 acres?*

YES. Retention of 60% of the trees is reasonable and consistent with NWI's management and plans for thinning dense young plantation forests that typically have more than 300 trees per acre. This is the same recommendation in the Forest Management Plan for plantation forests on the 120 acre South Fork Tarboo Creek property that NWI acquired last year (see attached FMP, page 21, for example). NWI's selective harvest on older forest, such as the 60 year old Tarboo Forest, are generally less than 20%. This 60% retention restriction could be written into the USFWS Conservation Covenant and/or County deed restriction.

2. *If funding is not available this year and the property were clear-cut, would the proponent still be interested in purchasing the property for purposes of planting a more diverse forest and owning the property long term?*

Once the property is completely clear-cut by Rayonier, it will no longer be competitive for USFWS National Coastal Grant funding (due to the loss of biodiversity, carbon storage, and potential to prevent environmental damage). NWI is depending on NCWC grant for the purchase, with JCCF and donor funds as the required match. NWI is negotiating to purchase from Rayonier by March 2025 at the latest. If NWI does not have funding lined up by then, we will lose the opportunity to purchase the property. The beauty of buying the property with 35 years of tree growth is that we are 35 years ahead in terms of forest restoration. In addition, the additional forest restoration using commercial thinning will pay for itself and provide additional review for stewardship of NWI properties over the long term. Generally, NWI has found that the commercial thin of 35 year old stands breaks even or nets a few thousand dollars per 20 acres, with older forest thinning providing more. However, once clear-cut, the cost to own, steward, and restore the forest will not be covered by thinning.

3. *What are the specific limitations imposed by the Fish and Wildlife conservation easement funding (documentation please)?*

The proposed project will be conserved by four layer of protection: A) federal Conservation Covenant (aka conservation easement), B) county deed restriction, C) ownership by a nonprofit conservation organization, and D) following a specific stewardship plan consistent with conservation goals and to FSC certification standards, as discuss below:

- A) The proposed property would be protected by a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Conservation Covenant recorded on the property at closing that is comparable to a Land Trust conservation easement but enforceable by both the US Fish and Wildlife Service and Washington Department of Ecology. The Covenant also requires express approval of USFWS and Ecology for any change in ownership. For your review, I have attached the Conservation Covenant from NWI's 2023 acquisition of 120 acres of Rayonier forestland on S. Fork Tarboo Creek, a very similar forest conservation project to the proposed project, and highlighted some relevant sections. Like a Land Trust easement, the Covenant has general restrictions as

Conservation Futures Fund Citizen Oversight Committee
Sponsor Question Responses -- NWI
April 2024

well as specific Prohibitions and Permitted Uses. Regarding timber harvest, the S. Fk Tarboo property covenant includes the following:

From Section 2. Specific Prohibitions -

- d. Timber harvest or other removal of vegetation, except for the purpose of restoring habitat or maintaining the Property and its boundaries.**

From Section 3. Permitted Uses and Activities -

- c. Low impact, sustainable forest practices to improve forest diversity and complexity so long as those forest practices have negligible negative impact on habitat, native fish and wildlife, water quality, open space, and environmental values. Any revenues derived from such forest practices will be applied to the restoration and stewardship of preserved conservation properties in the Tarboo Creek and Dabob Bay watersheds owned by Northwest Watershed Institute or other non-profit or government conservation organizations.**

In addition, the USFWS Conservation Covenant requires that stewardship of the property be consistent with the NCWC grant proposal. Below are some excerpts from S. Fork Tarboo Creek property grant proposal, which are very similar to the wording proposed for the West Slope property:

Plans will include protection of the wetlands and selective ecologically-based forestry of existing 35-year old plantation forest in the uplands to help restore older, biological diverse forest habitat.

Under the “benefits to rare habitats” section of the NCWC grant:

Mid and late successional forests are increasing rare in the lowlands of the Puget Sound region due to industrial forestry on short 30-year cut rotations, as well as increasing residential development. The project offers an excellent opportunity to permanently protect and allow natural regrowth and restoration of upland forest for continued growth of older forest habitat over time, including forests of headwater wetlands and streams that generally do not receive protection under state forestry regulations.

Under the “fighting climate change” section of the NCWC grant:

The forest will continue to store more carbon as it grows. Planned selective forestry (variable density thinning) for the SF site in the future will increase growth rates of this dense plantation forest and increase carbon storage. Thinning will also make the plantation forest more structurally and biologically diverse; making it more resilient to damage due to drought, wildlife and other impacts of climate change.

- B)** In addition the federal deed restrictions, Jefferson County also requires that the proposed property be protected by deed restrictions recorded at closing. These deed restrictions are reviewed and approved by the county and are intended to meet their requirements that the property be conserved as proposed in the grant. I have attached the deed from the “Lincoln Property” that was acquired by NWI as part of the Upper Tarboo Creek Wetlands project funded by Conservation Futures and US Fish and Wildlife. Although not a property where forestry is planned, it gives an idea of the deed restrictions required by the county.

Conservation Futures Fund Citizen Oversight Committee
Sponsor Question Responses -- NWI
April 2024

- C) The proposed owner of the property is a nonprofit conservation organization, rather than a private landowner, which gives additional assurance of long-term conservation and stewardship. NWI's primary purpose as stated in Article 1 of the bylaws is: *the assessment, protection and restoration of ecologically significant fish and wildlife habitats*. NWI has the expertise and capacity to conduct longterm stewardship as needed and oversight from the Board of Directors. Furthermore, operating outside of NWI's legal mission, or for profit, would be illegal.
- D) Finally, NWI will prepare a Forest Stewardship Plan, aka Forest Management Plan, for the proposed property. This has the same purpose as a Land Trust "Stewardship Plan"; describing the natural resources and habitats and laying out at the detailed management for each zone consistent with the more general goals and restrictions stated in the Conservation Covenant. Weed control, forest thinning, boundary survey, and other potential uses are included in the forest stewardship plan. Stewardship Plans are not binding and can be changed with new information and changing conditions over time. They are an excellent means of ensuring that day to day management of the property supports the overall conservation objectives. The Forest Management Plan will be likely be prepared by Northwest Natural Resources Group's lead forester in cooperation with NWI's Stewardship Director/Botanist and Executive Director/Aquatic Ecologist to comply with Forest Stewardship Council Certification standards, the strongest voluntary standards in the US. Attached is the Forest Management Plan for the S. Fork Tarboo Ck property as an example. This FMP includes, under "Desired Future Conditions" Section: *The long-term forest management goal for this property is to facilitate the development of old growth forest habitat characteristics that provide a wide variety of ecological benefits, including carbon sequestration while also managing to provide a sustained flow of high-quality timber products that will generate revenue to support ongoing ecological restoration and conservation efforts*. Detailed stewardship recommendations under each resource topic (wildlife, forestry, water quality..).



Jefferson County Conservation Futures Fund (JCCFF)
Special Meeting: Hybrid between East Jefferson Fire & Rescue and
Zoom Connection
April 23, 2024 from 2:00 to 4:40 PM
DRAFT Summary

Members Present: Tom Backman, District 3; Mary Biskup, District 1; Tom Erlichman, District 2; Richard Jahnke, Interest – Coastal Areas; E. Ryan McMackin, Interest – Wetlands; Joanne Pontrello, Chair, District 2; Ron Rempel, Interest – Wildlife Conservation Biology; Dave Wilkinson, District 1

Members Absent: Rob Harbour, Vice Chair, Interest – Working Lands, Cheryl Lowe – Interest, Habitat Values (joined briefly by phone)

County Staff Present: Tami Pokorny, Natural Resources Program Coordinator; Tressa Linquist, Clerk, Public Health

Others Present: Peter Bahls, project sponsor, and a member of the broader public

I. Call to Order, Roll Call, Determination of Quorum

Chair Joanne Pontrello called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM. Roll call was performed, with two Committee members absent (Cheryl Lowe will briefly join later by phone). With 10 current CFFCOC members, a quorum of 6 is required. There are 8 members present.

II. Public Comments

None.

III. Summary of previous meeting

It was noted that an error was made in the “Members Present” section of the previous meeting summary; former member Jessica Randall was erroneously included. **The summary of the April 02, 2024 meeting was otherwise approved by consensus. *Summary will be corrected prior to release.**

IV. Old Business

CFFCOC vacancy update (Staff)

Tom Backman was officially appointed to the CFFCOC by the BoCC, and Cheryl Lowe was reappointed. One vacancy remains in District #3, and two Open Interests. An individual in District #2 has expressed interest in joining, and others are under consideration.

V. Sub-Committee Reports

Materials Sub-Committee: Tom E, Rick, Ron will meet after this session to begin their review process. They request that Committee members share any comments they may have so far about the scoring process or other materials.

The Committee was encouraged to reread the Bylaws section concerning Sub-Committees to familiarize with the rules governing their function. The rules around Sub-Committee quorum were discussed.

StoryMap Sub-Committee: Tressa reiterated what had been done to-date, no new update. Still working on a letter requesting landowner permission to photograph the funded lands.

VI. New Business

A. Scoring/Ranking Review

Tami reminded the group that no new information should be requested today, despite the presence of a sponsor in the room (as a member of the public). Projects should be evaluated only on what has been presented so far. The total amount of funds available to the CFFCOC to disperse this year is \$15,000 more than the original estimate, at \$280,000. Tami reviewed the process for making motions for actions, that for each project a motion should be first made to deem it eligible for funding, and then a second motion should be made for the recommended funding amount. She let the group know that they are free to dive as deeply into the score data as they choose. Tressa sent the scores on to the group via email at this time. The language in the Bylaws related to Conflicts of Interest was displayed, and the Committee was asked to pause to finally consider any conflicts they may have. No one voiced any conflicts of interest, and there were no objections to anyone's participation today.

The overall scoring results for the three projects were displayed (average, min, max, SD, and %CVs). Tarboo Forest had the highest average score (253/321, 78.9%), followed by Humbleberry Farm (240/321, 74.7%), and finally Deerfoot Forest (196/321, 61.0%). Tarboo Forest and Humbleberry meet the 70% requirement to be eligible for funding. While Deerfoot Forest did not meet the 70% minimum score to be automatically considered, it had a high standard deviation, indicating disagreement among committee scores for that project. **[Committee member Cheryl Lowe joined briefly at this time by phone]** The committee explored individual scores for this project.

The data for all individual answers for Tarboo Forest were displayed. Question 5 was reviewed and discussed – what is meant by “program or plan” and “public review and comment/input”? There was discussion around three of the application questions and the effect of multipliers, and one member adjusted his score.

Rick moved to deem the Tarboo Forest project worthy of funding. Mary seconded. All voted in favor.

The individual scores for Humbleberry Farm were reviewed, beginning with criteria 9, related to habitat for anadromous fish and that aspect of the project and scores were discussed.

It was requested that the displayed spreadsheet show the question numbers next year.

Question 11 was reviewed, regarding climate resiliency. One member felt that Tarboo Forest showed the greatest evidence for potential carbon sequestration and opportunities for climate mitigation, and a brief conversation was had about the pros and cons of agriculture in addressing climate-related challenges.

It was requested that the raw scores, prior to the multiplier, are displayed next year. This will allow the committee to more easily compare their choices.

Ron moved that the Committee consider Humbleberry Farm worthy of funding. Ryan seconded. 7 voted in favor, and one opposed. The motion passed by majority.

Individual scores for Deerfoot Forest were reviewed. Members focused on the matching contribution and the definition of silviculture as it may pertain to this project.

Concern was expressed about meeting the Conservation Futures stewardship obligation and the content of conservation easements in this regard.

Attention then turned to a comparison of the conservation values and trajectories of the Tarboo forest as compared to Deerfoot.

Tom E moved to deem Deerfoot Forest worthy of funding. Rick seconded. 7 voted in favor and one opposed. The motion passed by majority. It was noted that if the project is ultimately recommended for funding, that choice will have to be justified due to the low average ranking score.

The requested funding amounts were displayed. The total amount available is \$280,000, with \$402,000 asked. Ryan asked what next year's budget would be if all funds were spent? About \$265,000 would be available in 2025. Ron suggested that the acquisition portion be funded for Humbleberry Farm, not the O & M, and to give the rest to Tarboo Forest. The group weighed the likelihood that each project could achieve its goals, threats to funding and the lands themselves, and the legal and other mechanisms to ensure the public interest is retained, even when a sponsoring entity dissolves.

Ron moved that the Committee recommend fully funding Tarboo Forest at \$150,000, consistent with the stewardship plans provided in the application and the sponsor's responses to the Committee's questions. Dave seconded. All voted in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Because the Humbleberry Farm is depending on other funds that will expire soon, Ryan noted that the funds were more urgently needed for Humbleberry Farm than Deerfoot Forest.

Ryan moved that the committee recommend partially funding Humbleberry Farm with the remaining \$130,000. Mary seconded. The use of requested O & M funds was reviewed. **Joanne amended the motion to say that up to \$12,000 may be used for O & M as requested. Tom E seconded the amendment. All voted in favor, the motion passed unanimously.**

It was reiterated that Deerfoot was found worthy but will not be funded. Joanne will address this in her recommendation letter to the BoCC.

VII. Next meeting date

The next meeting will be in September, 2024 (exact date TBD). Sub-Committees to be ready to report at that time.

VIII. Announcements

Tami gave thanks to Tressa and to the group for their help and cooperation this cycle.

IX. Public Comment

Sponsor guest gave thanks to the Committee, stating that projects might seem small but really helps with obtaining other funds.

X. Adjournment

Chair Joanne Pontrello adjourned the meeting at 4:31pm.

Meeting summary prepared by Tressa Linquist.

***Tressa to correct April 02 meeting summary, add question numbers to ranking data spreadsheet, rework summary data spreadsheet to show raw scores without multiplier.**



JEFFERSON COUNTY

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA 98368 | Web: www.co.jefferson.wa.us/communitydevelopmentTel: 360.379.4450 | Fax: 360.379.4451 | Email: dcd@co.jefferson.wa.us

 SquareONE Resource Center | Building Permits & Inspections | Development Review | Long Range Planning

TO: Tami Pokorny, Jefferson County Water Quality and Environmental Health
 FROM: Joel Peterson, Associate Planner
 DATE: June 11, 2024
 RE: 2024 Jefferson County Conservation Futures Program Property Acquisition
 and/or Operations and Maintenance Project Applications

Summary of DCD Findings for 2024 Conservation Futures Program:

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Project Type</u>
1. Deerfoot Forest	Easement
2. Humbleberry Farm	Easement
3. Tarboo Wildlife Preserve—West Slope Forest Acquisition	Acquisition

The Department of Community Development (DCD) has reviewed the proposed 2024 Jefferson County Conservation Futures Program *Property Acquisition and/or Operations and Maintenance Projects* and provides the following findings.

When a local government chooses to use Conservation Futures Fund money to purchase an interest in land, it must consider and analyze whether taking land out of the 'stock' of land that can be developed leaves enough land subject to development to accommodate allocated housing and employment growth (RCW 84.34.240). From our analysis, we find that the proposals do not negatively impact housing supply or employment growth.

Methods:

Housing Analysis: DCD reviews the estimated number of potential dwelling units that may be forgone by the Conservation Futures actions and the effect this may have on the County's ability to accommodate our projected 20-year population growth, (within the current 2018-2038 planning period and also within the upcoming 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review using recently available population data from the Office of Financial Management); and how the actions may affect the County's ability to provide employment growth in the same 20-year planning period. Note that any determination made in this exercise is only an estimate based on current zoning and a map review of possible site conditions.

Employment Growth Analysis: Potential impacts resulting from the Conservation Futures program actions on Jefferson County's ability to provide for anticipated employment growth were reviewed by observing current employment conditions on the parcels and in the vicinity of the project parcels, the prevalent employment sector in the area, and consideration of any other

potential effects resulting from conservation action that may limit or enhance the County's ability to provide for economic development or jobs.

Findings:

1. **Housing.** The proposed easements and acquisitions of the 2024 Conservation Futures program would be for conservation purposes. Extinguishing development rights could preclude the opportunity for approximately 11 total theoretical residential units--single-family residential dwelling units (SFRs) and accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The theoretical yield is primarily based on acreage. The subject parcels were not found to have Critical Areas that may restrict residential development options.

Jefferson County has documented a surplus of vacant and underdeveloped parcels, beyond that which is necessary to accommodate the land needs of the County's projected population during the 20-year planning period (2018-2038 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element). Also, projected growth rates for Jefferson County remain at about the current rate. As found in past evaluations, the proposed 2024 conservation actions do not reduce the County's capacity to accommodate future planned growth.

2. **Employment Growth.** No commercial areas are included in the protected properties. Employment or business development that could be forgone by loss of residential dwelling units or employment use of the land is not apparent. Potential employment opportunity may include home business or cottage industry opportunities. There is no documentation to suggest that a reduction in rural employment may exist due to a shortage of residential parcels that could support home business or cottage industry. Employment in the project areas would likely consist of agriculture, home businesses, cottage industries or in the natural resources sectors.

The Deerfoot Forest property has not been an employment center. Both Humbleberry Farm and Tarboo Wildlife Preserve will continue to function as working landscapes.

Jefferson County has identified natural resource conservation as playing a role in economic development, contributing to a draw—as opposed to a loss—of economic development interests and potential employment growth to the area due to the quality of life and healthy environment.

Additional Findings from the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan:

3. The action is consistent with the goals and policies of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan for the preservation and enhancement of open space. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan identifies goals and policies for the preservation and enhancement of open space as follows:
 - **Policy LU-P-15.2** Protect open space consistent with the goals and policies of this plan and in cooperation with County Conservation Futures and other land conservation programs.

- **Open Space Goal OS-G-1** guides Jefferson County to “Preserve and improve the quality, value and extent of open space lands.” **Open Space Policy OS-P-1.4** “Identify and conserve critical wildlife habitat, including nesting sites, foraging areas, and migration corridors within or adjacent to natural areas, open spaces, and developed urban areas. Preserve especially sensitive habitat sites that support threatened species and wildlife habitat in developed areas.”
 - **Natural Resources Goal NR-G-1** guides Jefferson County to “Encourage the conservation and long-term sustainable use of resource lands so their continued future use will not be precluded by other uses; and encourage the long-term sustainability of natural resource-based economic activities through Jefferson County.
 - **Economic Development Goal ED-G-6** guides Jefferson County to “Encourage economic development that sustains natural resources and open spaces, protects environmental quality, encourages non-motorized recreation and transportation, and enhances Jefferson County’s overall quality of life.”
4. None of the proposals include property in an Urban Growth Area or Rural Commercial area.

Scope of Review:

This review is conducted solely to ascertain the current Conservation Futures project’s potential effect on housing supply and Employment growth. Any statements about the potential for future development or land divisions is predicated upon many factors for site suitability. All applicants are encouraged to take advantage of Community Development’s customer assistance programs so that technical provisions of Jefferson County Code can be explained and applied to particular site-specific situations.

Attachment 1: 2024 Conservation Futures Housing and Employment Analysis Spreadsheet

Attachment 1: 2024 Conservation Futures Housing and Employment Analysis Spreadsheet

Attachment 1: CONSERVATION FUTURES HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT ANALYSIS 2024										
	APN	Zoning District	Project Acreage	Current SFR+ADU	Additional Theoretical SFR Yield of Project Acreage	ADU Allowance	Est. Net New Theoretical D.U./ADU	Site Characteristics	Housing	Employment/Jobs
PROJECT NAME										
Deerfoot Forest Easement	701052002,	RR20	28	2	0	0	0	Current uses are residential and designated forest land. Two residences are reported on the RR20 parcel. Only one residential building permit (1977) is found on the RR20 parcel, with Assessor notes for an ADU (1981) for which no building permit was found. No permit data is found for the RR5 parcel, which may have one SFR and one ADU. No Critical Areas were found to be present. The site is situated at the headwaters of both Donovan Creek and Tarboo Creek. The forest stand is regrowth from a 1920 timber cut and provides diverse 104-year old second-growth forest ecology.	Parcel consolidation would extinguish development rights for one (1) additional SFR and one (1) potential ADU.	The two parcels will be combined and a conservation easement will restrict further development. There will be no apparent loss of employment or jobs as a result of this project.
	701052011	RR5	8.9	0	1	1	2			
			36.9	2	1	1	2			
PROJECT NAME	APN	Zoning District	Acreage	Current SFRs	Additional Theoretical SFR Yield	ADU Allowance	Est. Net New Theoretical D.U./ADU	Site Characteristics	Housing	Employment/Jobs
Humbleberry Farm Easement	701182003	AP20	17.7	1	0	1	1	Current use is residential and agriculture. There is one permitted SFR structure and no known ADUs. The farm is comprised of prime agricultural soils, and is designated and assessed as Open Space Agriculture. The project is part of a corridor of protected property in the Quilcene Bay watershed.	If each of the three parcels were developed with one SFR and one ADU, there could be an additional five (5) residential structures.	There will be no apparent loss of employment or jobs as a result of this project. The goal of the project is to protect productive and historic farmland, and protects this existing use into the future.
	702131003	AP20	28.2	0	1	1	2			
	702131020	AP20	5	0	1	1	2			
			50.9	1	2	3	5			

PROJECT NAME	APN	Zoning District	Acreage	Current SFRs	Additional Theoretical SFR Yield	ADU Allowance	Est. Net New Theoretical D.U./ADU	Site Characteristics	Housing	Employment/Jobs
Tarboo Wildlife Preserve--West Slope Forest Addition Acquisition	801282005,	CF80	40.38	0	1	1	2	There are no residential structures on the two commercial forest parcels. Due to the primary use of a CF80 parcel as forestry, a limited-sized (one acre) portion of the parcel may be used as residential without removing the forestry tax status. Current use is forestry. As part of the Tarboo-Dabob Bay watershed, the project provides landscape-scale connectivity for large mammals.	The one-acre limit for residential use on each commercial forest parcel may theoretically accommodate a SFR and ADU on each parcel, for a total of four (4) new theoretical residential structures.	There will be no apparent loss of employment or jobs as a result of this project. The program will allow selective timber harvest of the existing tree plantation. The ancillary uses of walking trail system and educational outreach does not preclude continued use as forest parcel. Protection of the parcels will provide ecosystem services that benefit many other properties.
	801283001	CF80	40.41	0	1	1	2			
			80.79	0	2	2	4			
Summary Totals:			168.59	3	5	6	11			

STATE OF WASHINGTON
County of Jefferson

Dedication of Conservation Futures Funds to the }
 Tarboo Wildlife Preserve – West Slope Forest }
 Addition Project, as Authorized by and in }
 Accordance with Jefferson County Code }
 Section 3.08.030(7) to Provide a System of Public }
 Open Spaces }

RESOLUTION NO. _____

WHEREAS, Conservation Futures Fund tax levy collections, authorized under RCW 84.34.230, are an important means of retaining community character and accomplishing the open space policies and objectives of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan that encourage the coordinated acquisition of key open space lands for long-term protection; and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County is authorized by RCW 84.34.210 and 84.34.220 to acquire open space land, agricultural and timber lands as defined in RCW 84.34.220; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Futures Fund Citizen Oversight Committee has reviewed project applications for 2024 and made its funding recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Jefferson County Code Chapter 3.08; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Jefferson County Conservation Futures Fund Program, Northwest Watershed Institute, as project sponsor, requests funding towards the fee simple acquisition of two (2) parcels of land located in S28 T28N R1W with Assessor's Parcel Numbers 801282005 and 801283001; and

WHEREAS, the County retains enough developable land to accommodate the Tarboo Wildlife Preserve, West Slope Forest Addition project as well as the housing and employment growth that it is expected to receive, thus satisfying the requirement in RCW 84.34.240(3); and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County considers it in the best public interest to contribute financially to this open space project.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. Jefferson County hereby dedicates up to \$150,000 in Conservation Futures Funds towards eligible acquisition expenses for the Tarboo Forest –West Slope Addition project, contingent upon presentation of a matching contribution of at least fifty percent (50%). The sponsor anticipates that the matching contribution will be eighty-two percent (82%) at the time of project completion.
2. This dedication of funding may be nullified if a submittal for reimbursement, accompanied by documentation of matching funds sufficient to complete the acquisition, is not received from the sponsor within three years of the signing of this resolution.

Resolution No. _____ re: Dedication of Conservation Futures Funds to the Tarboo Wildlife Preserve,
West Slope Forest Addition project

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2024 in Port Townsend, Washington.

SEAL:

JEFFERSON COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

Kate Dean, Chair

Greg Brotherton, Member

Carolyn Gallaway, CMC
Clerk of the Board

Heidi Eisenhour, Member

STATE OF WASHINGTON
County of Jefferson

Dedication of Conservation Futures Funds to the }
Humbleberry Farm Project as Authorized by and in }
Accordance with Jefferson County Code }
Section 3.08.030(7) to Provide a System of Public }
Open Spaces }

RESOLUTION NO. _____

WHEREAS, Conservation Futures Fund tax levy collections, authorized under RCW 84.34.230, are an important means of retaining community character and accomplishing the open space policies and objectives of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan that encourage the coordinated acquisition of key open space lands for long-term protection; and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County is authorized by RCW 84.34.210 and 84.34.220 to acquire open space land, agricultural and timber lands as defined in RCW 84.34.220; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Futures Fund Citizen Oversight Committee has reviewed project applications for 2024 and made its funding recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Jefferson County Code Chapter 3.08; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Jefferson County Conservation Futures Fund Program, Jefferson Land Trust, as project sponsor, requests funding towards the acquisition of conservation easements on three (3) parcels of land located in S18 T27N R1W with Assessor's Parcel Numbers 701182003, 702131003 and 702131020 and to reimburse operations and maintenance costs; and

WHEREAS, the County retains enough developable land to accommodate the Humbleberry Farm project as well as the housing and employment growth that it is expected to receive, thus satisfying the requirement in RCW 84.34.240(3); and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County considers it in the best public interest to contribute financially to this open space project,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. Jefferson County hereby dedicates up to \$130,000 in Conservation Futures Fund monies towards reimbursement of eligible acquisition expenses for the Humbleberry Farm project. Funding is contingent upon presentation of a matching contribution of at least fifty percent (50%). The sponsor anticipates that the matching contribution will be eighty-two percent (82%) at the time of project completion.
2. Jefferson County hereby dedicates up to \$12,000 of the \$130,000 in Conservation Futures Fund monies towards reimbursement for eligible operations and maintenance expenses incurred within ten years of the signing of this resolution, contingent on a matching contribution of no less than the amount of Conservation Futures Fund monies requested for operations and maintenance.

Resolution No. _____ re: Dedication of Conservation Futures Funds to the Humbleberry Farm project

3. This dedication of funding may be nullified if a submittal for reimbursement, accompanied by documentation of matching funds sufficient to complete the acquisition, is not received from the sponsor within three years of the signing of this resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2024 in Port Townsend, Washington.

SEAL:

JEFFERSON COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

Kate Dean, Chair

Greg Brotherton, Member

Carolyn Gallaway, CMC
Clerk of the Board

Heidi Eisenhour, Member

STATE OF WASHINGTON
County of Jefferson

Dedication of Conservation Futures Funds to the }
Deerfoot Forest Project as Authorized by and in }
Accordance with Jefferson County Code }
Section 3.08.030(7) to Provide a System of Public }
Open Spaces }

RESOLUTION NO. _____

WHEREAS, Conservation Futures Fund tax levy collections, authorized under RCW 84.34.230, are an important means of retaining community character and accomplishing the open space policies and objectives of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan that encourage the coordinated acquisition of key open space lands for long-term protection; and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County is authorized by RCW 84.34.210 and 84.34.220 to acquire open space land, agricultural and timber lands as defined in RCW 84.34.220; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Futures Fund Citizen Oversight Committee has reviewed project applications for 2024 and made its funding recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Jefferson County Code Chapter 3.08; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Jefferson County Conservation Futures Fund Program, Jefferson Land Trust, as project sponsor, requests funding towards the acquisition of conservation easements on two (2) parcels of land in S5 T27N R1W with Assessor's Parcel Numbers 701052002 and 701052011 and to reimburse operations and maintenance costs; and

WHEREAS, the County retains enough developable land to accommodate the Deerfoot Forest project as well as the housing and employment growth that it is expected to receive, thus satisfying the requirement in RCW 84.34.240(3); and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County considers it in the best public interest to contribute financially to this open space project,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. Jefferson County hereby dedicates up to \$0 in Conservation Futures Funds towards reimbursement of eligible acquisition expenses for the Deerfoot Forest project. Funding is contingent upon presentation of a matching contribution of at least fifty percent (50%). The sponsor anticipates that the matching contribution will be fifty-three percent (53%) at the time of project completion.
2. Jefferson County hereby dedicates up to \$0 in Conservation Futures Funds towards reimbursement for eligible operations and maintenance expenses incurred within ten years of the signing of this resolution, contingent on a matching contribution of no less than the amount of Conservation Futures Funds requested for operations and maintenance.
3. This dedication of funding may be nullified if a submittal for reimbursement, accompanied by documentation of matching funds sufficient to complete the

Resolution No. _____ re: Dedication of Conservation Futures Funds to the Deerfoot Forest project acquisition, is not received from the sponsor within three years of the signing of this resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2024 in Port Townsend, Washington.

SEAL:

JEFFERSON COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

Kate Dean, Chair

Greg Brotherton, Member

Carolyn Gallaway, CMC
Clerk of the Board

Heidi Eisenhour, Member