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**COMMITTEE ACTION**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Proposed Substitute Ordinance 2019-0069.2, which would establish selection criteria and advisory committee structure for four Parks Levy grant programs, passed out of committee on September 9, 2020 with a “Do Pass” recommendation. The Ordinance was amended in committee with Amendment S1 to increase the number of city or park district representatives on each of the three advisory committees to "up to nine," with cities or park districts in each of the nine advisory committees being represented. The amendment also makes a number of technical or clarifying changes.*** |

**SUBJECT**

Proposed Ordinance (PO) 2020-0069 would establish a process for evaluating and awarding grants for the four grant programs established as part of the 2020-2025 Parks, Trails and Open Space Levy ("the levy") and would establish three advisory committees to evaluate the grant proposals.

**SUMMARY**

In April 2019, the Council passed Ordinance 18890, which placed on the August 2019 ballot a proposition authorizing a six-year property tax levy to support parks and open space throughout King County, and concurrently passed Motion 15378, which detailed the Council’s intent for the use of the levy funds. The motion included guidelines for four grant programs: (1) capital project and open space acquisitions; (2) aquatic centers; (3) open space for river corridors; and (4) targeted equity. The motion required DNRP to transmit an ordinance by January 31, 2020 to propose grant processes and protocols for the four grant programs, as well as to propose one or more advisory committees to review grant applications and make recommendations for the programs.

PO 2020-0069 proposes processes for the four grant programs and proposes three advisory committees to review awards. These are broadly summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Parks Levy Grant Program Proposal Overview**

| Program Name | Committee Makeup | Eligible Entities | Funding Frequency |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Urban Parks and Open Space | Cities/park districts, school districts, and nonprofits | Cities, towns, and met. park districts | Biennial |
| Targeted Equity | Cities/park districts, open space equity cabinet, and nonprofit/community organizations | King County, cities, towns, tribal organizations, nonprofits, community organizations | Two tracks: Annual and Continuous |
| Aquatics Facilities | Same committee as Urban Parks and Open Space | Cities, towns, met. park districts, school districts, other public entities | Biennial |
| Open Space – River Corridors | Cities, tribal organizations, community organizations/districts/ salmon forums | King County, cities, towns, tribal organizations, Port districts, Flood control districts, Diking and drainage districts, Conservation districts, Non-profit organizations, Salmon recovery forums | Biennial |

There is also a striking amendment which would increase the number of city or park district representatives on each committee to "up to nine," and state that a city or park district in each of the nine county council districts should be represented on the committee. It would also make a number of technical or clarifying changes to match executive intent.

Additionally, there is a line amendment which would make King County an eligible entity for the Parks Capital and Open Space grant program, for projects in urban unincorporated areas of the county.

**BACKGROUND**

In April 2019, the Council passed Ordinance 18890 ("the levy ordinance"), which placed on the August 2019 ballot a proposition authorizing a six-year property tax levy to support parks and open space throughout King County. The ordinance set an initial levy rate of 18.32 cents per $1,000 of assessed value (AV) and was expected to generate approximately $810 million over the life of the levy, to fund various projects and programs including:

* Up to $8 million of the levy proceeds for a capital construction project at the Seattle Aquarium;
* Up to $44 million of the levy proceeds to for pool maintenance, capital improvements and construction;
* Up to $22 million of the levy proceeds for integrated floodplain management;
* 47% of the remaining proceeds for acquisition of open space, continued development of regional and other public trails, other capital improvement projects and major maintenance of the county’s open space system, and community partnerships and grants;
* 40% of the remaining proceeds for King County’s park system operations and maintenance, with no more than $10 million of this amount being used for targeted equity grants;
* 8% of the remaining proceeds for distribution to the towns and cities of King County for their town or city parks system operations and capital improvement projects; and
* 5% of the remaining proceeds for environmental education, maintenance and conservation programs at the Woodland Park Zoo.

Concurrent with the levy ordinance, the Council passed Motion 15378 ("the levy motion"), which detailed the Council’s intent for the use of the 2020-2025 levy funds. The motion included guidelines for the four grant programs identified in the parks, trails and open space levy: (1) capital project and open space acquisitions; (2) aquatic centers; (3) open space for river corridors; and (4) targeted equity.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The motion required DNRP to transmit an ordinance by January 31, 2020 to propose grant processes and protocols for the four grant programs, as well as to propose one or more advisory committees to review grant applications and make recommendations for the programs.

**ANALYSIS**

The proposed ordinance proposes processes and protocols for the four grant programs, and sets up three advisory committees to review grant applications and make recommendations to the Council. As the guidelines for these programs were largely contained within attachments to the levy motion, rather than the levy ordinance, the Council could choose new or different direction on most of the issues discussed below.

Sections A through D below describe the grant programs, Section E describes the advisory committee proposals, Section F describes administration of the programs, and Section G provides a summary of outreach done in developing this proposal.

**A. Urban Parks and Open Space Grant Program**

The levy ordinance directed a portion of levy proceeds to be used for "capital improvement projects and major maintenance repair or replacement of parks or recreation infrastructure in metropolitan park districts, towns or cities" and "acquisition, conservation and stewardship of additional open space lands, natural areas, resource or ecological lands, rights of way for regional trails and urban green spaces." The levy motion further directed that such uses be consistent with Attachment A to that motion, which provided guidelines for the program.

Eligible Projects, Entities, and Areas

Attachment A to PO 2020-0069 contains the executive's proposal for this program. Attachment A states that grants would be available for "a broad range of land protection and outdoor recreation, including park acquisition and development, habitat conservation, community gardens, and construction of outdoor and active recreation facilities" that provide public access, and these grants would be evaluated by the advisory committee on a biennial basis, with funding recommendations made to the Council every two years.

As proposed, grant applications would be evaluated in four separate categories: Open space acquisition, active recreation, passive recreation, and local trails. Though not stated explicitly in Attachment A, the executive states that in practice, having these four separate evaluation categories means that the committee, in consultation with advisory committee staff, would determine the proportion of funding that would be available to each project category, and projects in different categories would therefore not be competing against each other. Executive staff states that this was done in response to feedback from cities and park districts.

Cities, towns, and Metropolitan Park Districts would be eligible to apply for these grants. It should be noted that Attachment A to the levy motion lists King County as an eligible entity as well and gives criteria for King County-initiated projects. However, the County is not proposed as an eligible entity for UPOS grants in the proposed ordinance. Executive staff stated that they believe that the County can achieve its acquisition goals through the conservation futures program versus accessing funds through this grant program, and therefore have removed the County as an eligible entity. As proposed, unincorporated areas outside of metropolitan park districts would only be able to receive funding if a city, town, or metropolitan park district made the proposal.

Additionally, the word "urban" in the title of the program implies that only areas within the urban growth boundary are eligible for funding, however, this is not specified within the eligibility criteria. As a number of metropolitan park districts cover rural areas, it is unclear if these projects would be eligible.

Finally, the levy motion states that lands primarily in agricultural use should not be eligible for acquisition funding, but that clarification is not made in the attachment to the proposed ordinance.

Project Selection Criteria

Attachment A contains the following proposed criteria for UPOS grant program projects, which would be used by the proposed advisory committee to determine which projects would be recommended for funding.

1. *How the application meets the goals outlined by the King County Council such as:*
   1. *Acquisition of park and open space land which results in increased public access and use*
   2. *Development of new or renovated recreational facilities such as ballfields, sport courts, or play areas*
   3. *Development or renovation of passive recreational facilities such as trails (community and hiking), interpretive facilities, and community gardens*
   4. *Acquisition of lands to allow future development of regional trails*
2. *Additional criteria for consideration shall include:*
   1. *Furthering established Countywide priorities: Equity and Social Justice, Strategic Climate Action Plan, improving water quality and increasing habitat, for example through green stormwater infrastructure, Land Conservation Initiative, implementation of the recommendations in the State of Play Report*
   2. *Partnership: the project is supported through partnership and will be measured by resulting community benefits, as well as the strength and diversity of partnership*
   3. *Project has been identified in an adopted plan*
   4. *Project is located in an underserved area or provides recreational access or benefit where none currently exists.*
3. *Implementation Strength*
   1. *Projects must demonstrate certainty in success of delivery*
   2. *Projects must demonstrate how successful implementation will be measured over time*
   3. *Projects should identify cost effectiveness and ability to leverage other funding or in-kind donations*

It should be noted that the first set of criteria are listed as "such as," meaning that the committee can choose whether or not to consider these criteria and could consider different criteria. Executive staff has stated that the phrase "goals outlined by the King County Council," is intended to mean that that the committee can incorporate additional goals that reflect county priorities.

The second set of criteria are listed as "shall include," meaning that the committee must consider those criteria. The first two "implementation strength" criteria are listed as "must," so projects would be required to demonstrate certainty in success and how successful implementation will be measured, but the third criterion, related to cost-effectiveness and leveraging other funding, would not be a requirement.

**B. Targeted Equity Grant Program**

The levy ordinance allowed for up to $10 million to be used for a targeted equity grant program, the purpose of which was described by Attachment B to the levy motion as "to increase access to and the use of parks, open space and public recreation facilities in underserved communities."

Eligible Projects, Entities, and Areas

Attachment B to PO 2020-0069 contains the executive's proposal for this program. Attachment B states that grants would provide funding "to achieve equitable opportunities and access to parks and recreation in unincorporated King County and King County towns and cities for underserved areas and populations, including people with disabilities."

Eligible projects would include:

1. Capacity building to include community outreach and planning around new or improved access to local parks and open spaces
2. Land acquisition located specifically within an Opportunity Area or that serves a community of need based on established determinants of equity and consistent with KCC 26.12.003.J[[2]](#footnote-2)
3. Capital projects or programs that address unmet needs in underserved areas
4. Projects that provide additional access to disabled individuals

The levy motion limited projects to two specific types – projects located in equity areas (now called opportunity areas), as defined in K.C.C. 26.12.003, or programming or projects designed to increase access to or the use of parks and recreation facilities by individuals with disabilities. The proposed ordinance does not restrict projects based on these criteria, allowing funding for projects outside of defined opportunity areas in addition to within them.

Additionally, as codified, only the Conservation Futures Tax Advisory Committee has the ability to make an ad hoc determination of whether a project is in an opportunity area.[[3]](#footnote-3) This ordinance would also give the Targeted Equity Grant Advisory Committee such authority.

King County, cities, towns, tribal organizations serving residents of King County, non-profit organizations, and small or emerging community organizations without a 501(c)(3) status, through a partnership with a fiscal agent are proposed to be eligible for these grants. It should be noted that Attachment B to the levy motion did not list King County as an eligible entity for targeted equity grant funding, but the County is listed as an eligible entity as part of this proposal. The executive has stated that King County was added as an eligible entity "to ensure that those areas of King County which are currently underserved or identified as opportunity areas be eligible for application. This would include those communities of White Center, Skyway, east Federal Way and other neighborhoods where the County is the local service provider and access to park and recreation facilities is limited."

Project Selection Criteria

Attachment B contains the following proposed criteria for Targeted Equity grant program projects, which would be used by the proposed advisory committee to determine which projects would be recommended for funding on an annual basis.

1. *Project proposals should be explicit regarding benefits to public access and recreation for identified underserved areas of King County. Examples of project benefits include:*
   1. *Acquisition of open space in a targeted equity area*
   2. *Providing recreational facilities specifically to serve disabled individuals*
   3. *A community driven planning action which results in either the recommendation or implementation of new recreational facilities to increase park and open space access for underserved individuals and/or communities*
   4. *Development or renovation of recreational facilities that will result in increased access and use by an underserved community*
   5. *Implementation of culturally appropriate recreational programs that provide new or increased opportunities for expanded use of park and recreation facilities or open spaces by underserved individuals and/or communities*
   6. *Actions that build community awareness, engagement, and organizing to increase access and utilization of new or improved local parks and open spaces by underserved communities, and ensure park and open space infrastructure investments are made based on community input*
2. *Additional criteria for consideration shall include:*
   1. *Community involvement, i.e. strength and diversity of partnerships and community stewardship; how communities are engaged in outcomes.*
   2. *Furthering established countywide priorities: Equity and Social Justice, Strategic Climate Action Plan, improving water quality and increasing habitat, for example through green stormwater infrastructure, Land Conservation Initiative, implementation of the recommendations in the State of Play Report.*

*3. Implementation Strength*

* 1. *How their project plans increase access to parks and recreation facilities or programs*
  2. *Ability to leverage other partners such as community groups and non-profits*
  3. *Certainty of success in delivery*
  4. *Cost effectiveness of the proposal*
  5. *Identification of continued stewardship plan*
  6. *How successful implementation will be measured over time*

As with the other grant programs the initial set of criteria are "should" criteria, and the second set are "shall" criteria. However, unlike the other grant programs, the implementation strength section does not include "shall" language, so a lower threshold for implementation strength would exist for this program than for the others.

In addition to the annual funding track discussed above, the executive has proposed "an open rolling application process for grants less than $15,000." As written, it is unclear who would review the continuous grants, what criteria would be used, and if and when these funding recommendations would be transmitted to Council. Executive staff stated:

"There was feedback from the Open Space Equity Cabinet that for small grants of less than $15,000 that can result in getting projects off the ground quickly, there should be a process in place to quickly review and fund. These would generally be capacity building exercises for communities to identify their recreation needs or small programming grants. It is the intent of the Parks Division to develop a quick review process in coordination with the Advisory Committee. At a minimum this would require a recommendation of approval from Parks staff. Options might include a sub-committee of the Advisory Committee or acknowledgement of receipt and opportunity to review and comment by the members of the Advisory Committee. Grant awards of less than $15,000 would not be subjected to Council review."

**C. Aquatics Facility Grant Program**

The levy ordinance allowed for up to $44 million to be used for publicly owned pools for capital improvement projects, construction, and major maintenance repair or replacement projects. The levy motion further stated that $8 million would be set aside for the Weyerhaeuser King County aquatic center, with the rest of the proceeds being used for the aquatic centers grant program.

Eligible Projects and Entities

Attachment C to PO 2020-0069 contains the executive's proposal for this program. Attachment C states that grants would provide funding "for a broad range of improvements to public aquatics facilities located in King County," noting that the opportunity to learn how to swim and continued access for swimmers is a regional priority. Cities, towns, metropolitan park districts, school districts, and other public entities that own aquatic facilities would be eligible. This is in line with what was approved in the levy motion.

Eligible Projects would include the following for new or improved aquatic capital facilities:

1. Feasibility studies
2. Design
3. Permitting
4. Construction

Attachment D to the levy motion also listed land acquisition for the purpose of public aquatic facilities as an eligible project type, but this is not included in the executive's proposal. Executive staff has stated that acquisition is intended to be an eligible project.

Additionally, Attachment D to the levy motion provided additional funding guidelines, as follows:

*There is no minimum for capital requests. Capital grants for new aquatic centers are capped at $5,000,000 or 25% of a facility’s total cost, whichever is lower.*

*Capital grants for existing facilities are capped at $5,000,000 and grants from $1 - $100,000 can provide up to 100% of a projects total cost, grants from $100,001 - $2,000,000 can provide no more than 50% of a project’s total cost and grants from $2,000,001 - $5,000,000 can provide no more than 25% of a projects total cost.*

*If a facility serves multiple purposes, to calculate project cost, only infrastructure necessary for an aquatic center may be included.*

*Grants up to $100,000 may be awarded to support planning or feasibility studies related to development of a publicly-owned aquatic facility.*

These requirements are not included in the executive's proposal. Executive staff has stated that they are supportive of these funding minimums and maximums, and plan to include them in the final application process. Councilmembers could choose to include them as part of this ordinance as well.

Project Selection Criteria

Attachment C to the proposed ordinance gives the following selection criteria for Aquatics Centers Grants, which the advisory committee would use to make funding recommendations on a biennial basis:

The Committee will make its recommendation to the Department of Natural Resources and Parks based upon the eligibility and selection criteria as well as the strength of the applicants to demonstrate:

1. *How the application meets the goals outlined by the King County Council such as:*
   1. *Addressing an unmet need for aquatics recreation and water safety*
   2. *Availability for public use*
   3. *Creating new or expanded programming opportunities*
   4. *Preserving, protecting, or enhancing the structural integrity of an existing facility*
2. *Additional criteria for consideration shall include:*
   1. *Furthering established countywide priorities: Equity and Social Justice, Strategic Climate Action Plan, improving water quality and increasing habitat, for example through green stormwater infrastructure, implementation of the recommendations in the Project Play Report*
   2. *Partnership: the project is supported through partnership and will be measured on community benefits, as well as strength and diversity of partnership*
   3. *Project has been identified in an adopted plan*
   4. *Project is located in an underserved area or provides recreational access or benefit where none currently exists*
3. *Implementation Strength*
   1. *Projects must demonstrate certainty in success of delivery*
   2. *Projects must demonstrate how successful implementation will be measured over time*
   3. *Projects should identify cost effectiveness and ability to leverage other funding or in-kind donations*

As with the previous programs, the initial set of criteria are listed as "such as," and thus wouldn't necessarily be required to be considered, and the second set are "shall" criteria, which would be required to be considered. 3.a. and b. would be requirements to receive funding.

**D. Open Space – River Corridors Grant Program**

The levy ordinance allows up to $22 million to be used for "habitat restoration, open space acquisition or recreational opportunities, or any combination thereof, associated with integrated floodplain management capital improvement projects and to outreach and education related to the benefits of integrated floodplain management projects." Attachment E to the levy motion gave further guidance on the Open Space – River Corridor Grant program associated with this funding.

Eligible Projects and Entities

The proposal states that the following projects are eligible, if located on riparian lands and used for public purposes:

1. Acquisition
2. Improvement
3. Protection
4. Provision of or improvement of access to a waterbody

Attachment E to the levy motion also included planning, feasibility and design, and project-specific outreach and education as eligible projects. These are not included in the proposal. Executive staff states that these are intended to be included as eligible projects.

Funding would be awarded on a biennial basis.

The following entities would be eligible for funding:

* King County
* Cities and towns
* Tribes or tribal organizations serving residents of King County
* Port districts
* Flood control districts
* Diking and drainage districts
* Conservation districts
* Non-profit organizations
* Salmon recovery forums

The proposal differs from what was approved in the levy motion insofar as King County was not listed as an eligible entity in that legislation. Executive staff stated its belief that the exclusion of King County in the levy motion was an oversight, and therefore included King County as an eligible entity because "a substantial amount of existing river corridors are located in the rural and unincorporated King County and projects located along these corridors would provide substantial local and regional benefit with respect to flood reduction, habitat protection and passive recreation."

Project Selection Criteria

The following are proposed as project selection criteria for the Open Space – River Corridors grant program:

1. *How the application meets the goals of a multi-benefit project outlined by the King County Council, including:*
   1. *Provides passive recreational benefit to the public*
   2. *Improves or restores critical riparian habitat*
   3. *Integrates recreation, access, and/or habitat benefits with flood protection*
2. *Additional criteria for consideration shall include:*
   1. *Furthering established countywide priorities: Equity and Social Justice, Strategic Climate Action Plan, improving water quality and increasing habitat, for example through green stormwater infrastructure, Land Conservation Initiative, implementation of the recommendations in the State of Play Report*
   2. *Partnership: project is supported through partnership and will be measured by the proposed strength and diversity of partnership as well as community benefits*
   3. *Project has been identified in an adopted plan*
3. *Implementation strength*
   1. *Projects must demonstrate certainty in success of delivery*
   2. *Projects must demonstrate how successful implementation will be measured over time*
   3. *Projects should identify cost effectiveness and ability to leverage other funding or in-kind donations*

As with the selection criteria for the other programs, the first set of criteria would be suggestions for consideration, the second set would be required to be considered, and 3.a and 3.b would be requirements for funding.

**E. Proposed Advisory Committees**

Table 2 below shows the proposed makeup of the advisory committees for the four grant programs. The same committee is proposed to make recommendations for both UPOS and Aquatics Facility grants.

**Table 2: Parks Levy Grant Advisory Committees Comparison**

| Program | Urban Parks and Open Space Grants AND Aquatics Facility Grants | Targeted Equity Grants | Open Space – River Corridors Grants |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # of Committee Members | Up to fifteen | Up to Fifteen[[4]](#footnote-4) | Up to fifteen |
| Committee Makeup | * City/park district reps: up to seven * School district reps: up to four * Non-profit reps: up to four | * City/park district reps: up to five * Open Space Equity Cabinet Reps: up to five * Non-profit and community-based organization reps: up to five | * City reps: up to five * Tribal Organization reps: up to two * Nonprofit organization reps: up to four * Community organization, districts (park, flood, conservation, diking), or salmon recovery forum reps: up to five |
| Frequency of Awards | Biennial | Two tracks: Continuous and Annual | Biennial |

Executive staff has stated that, where city or school district representatives are listed as representatives, that these members would be employees of a city or school district, rather than a person living or working within the jurisdiction.

For each committee, the attachment states that geographic equity would be prioritized. Executive staff has clarified that the intent is that representation from cities in different regions of the county will be sought for appointments.

For each of the three committees, the executive proposes that the Council have no formal role in appointments, stating that the King County Executive would seek input from King County Councilmembers on advisory committee recommendations and provide notification to the King County Council 30 days prior to appointment. In further discussion with Council staff, executive staff stated "Given that there could be up to 45 advisory committee members, the Executive has recommended a process by which Council approves the composition [shown in Table 1] based on interest expressed to date, and the Executive would appoint the members."

**F. Administration**

As proposed, DNRP would staff the four grant programs and three associated advisory committees. Administration would include development of the process, application materials, announcements, review process, contract development and administration, project tracking, financial accounting, project reporting, and audit function. Staff would also transmit the proposed list of grant awardees for each program and associated funding ordinances to Council on the schedule given for each program.

DNRP expects that 18 percent – 20 percent of levy funding allocated to each program will be used for administration, which it states is consistent with other similar grant programs. DNRP is in the process of developing its 2021-2022 budget and has not yet developed a proposal for how many FTEs would work on each program.

**G. Summary of Outreach Process**

Executive staff provided the following information regarding outreach done while developing the proposed ordinance and associated attachments.

"There were several methods utilized to obtain feedback from stakeholders that include the following: The King County Park Directors group, an active body of Park Directors representing the cities and park districts within the County, were engaged numerous times in a variety of ways. This included briefing specifically to the larger body, individual briefings to many cities, and surveys seeking additional feedback from these cities (roughly 25) and park districts. The Open Space Equity Cabinet was also engaged thoroughly with meetings dedicated to the Targeted Equity Grant Program. The cabinet also established a sub-committee to identify key areas upon which to weigh in. Tribal feedback was sought and received, both through the [Open Space Equity Cabinet] as well as a survey group providing insight on the Open Space-River Corridors Grant Program. Parks staff engaged with non-profits such the Trust for Public Lands, The Nature Conservancy, Mountains to Sound Greenway, ECOSS and Seattle Parks Foundation, community groups such as the Ballard P-Patch, SPLASH 2.0, and wheelchair hikers. Additionally, staff engaged recreation experts at the state level through the Recreation and Conservation Office as well as locally through the Play Equity Coalition. Internal meetings and discussions also took place with the Water and Land Resources Division and Best Starts for Kids. In conjunction with the Conservation Futures Program, several public meetings were held in North Seattle, Burien, Kent, White Center and Bellevue to provide information about Parks Levy grant opportunities.

Specific feedback centered on the following:

* Composition and diversity of advisory committees – ensuring there were technical experts and individuals knowledgeable on grants such as Urban Parks and Open Space, Open Space-River Corridors and Aquatics as well as community advocates, non-profit, and diverse representation for Targeted Equity.
* Review process – several recommendations to utilize a model similar to CFT in which the advisory committee made final recommendations on projects after hands on review
* Leveraging partnerships – bringing additional stakeholders to the table to ensure success
* Addressing unmet needs. Prioritizing projects in communities where no facility or inadequate service provision exists
* Ensuring that projects and programs result in, or focus on, increased access to public recreation
* Provide additional consideration for those projects which advance the environmental and equity goals of the County, cities and local communities."

**AMENDMENT**

Striking Amendment S1

Striking amendment S1 would increase the number of city or park district representatives on each committee to "up to nine," and state that a city or park district in each of the nine county council districts should be represented on the committee.

It would also make a number of technical or clarifying changes to match executive intent. These include:

* Renaming the Urban Parks and Open Space grant program to Parks Capital and Open Space grant program
* Using the name "Aquatic Facilities grant program" throughout (the executive proposed ordinance sometimes referred to it as the Aquatic Centers grant program.")
* Clarifying that the project selection criteria are for the purpose of evaluating the relative strength of applications and are not mandatory
* Listing eligible project types as laid out in the Parks Levy Motion
* Clarifying that city and school district representatives must be elected or employed officials of the city or school district

The striking amendment also reorganizes the language in the four attachments for clarity.

Amendment 1

Amendment 1 would make King County eligible for funding through the Parks Capital and Open Space grant program, for projects located in urban unincorporated portions of the County.

1. The guidelines for the four grant programs can be found in Attachments A, B, D, and E to Motion 15378. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Mis-cited as 003.E in the attachment [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. K.C.C. 26.12.003.J.2 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Although the transmitted document states "fifteen," executive staff has stated that the intent was "up to fifteen." [↑](#footnote-ref-4)