

SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE*

Department:	Dept. Contact/Phone:	CBO Contact/Phone:
City Light	Mike Haynes/684-4185	Greg Shiring/386-4085

** Note that the Summary and Fiscal Note describes the version of the bill or resolution as introduced; final legislation including amendments may not be fully described.*

1. BILL SUMMARY

Legislation Title:

AN ORDINANCE relating to the City Light Department; accepting statutory warranty deeds to the Beeson, Brecht, Chen, Crosson, Fresonke, Judd, Marsall, McElfresh (two properties), Metzler and De Llaguno, and Rasmussen properties in Skagit County, Washington, and the Ring Family Limited Partnership property in Snohomish County, all for salmonid habitat protection purposes; declaring certain real property rights surplus and no longer required for providing public utility service or other municipal purposes, and ratifying the grants of Deeds of Right to the State of Washington on the Beeson, Brecht, Chen, Fresonke Judd, Marblemount LLC, McElfresh properties, and Rasmussen for salmon recovery and conservation purposes; placing said lands under the jurisdiction of the City Light Department; and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts.

Summary and background of the Legislation:

This legislation authorizes the General Manager and Chief Executive Officer to accept statutory warranty deeds to the aforementioned properties in Skagit and Snohomish Counties, and ratifies the grants of Deeds of Right for nine of those properties to the Washington State Salmon Recovery Funding Board (“SRFB”) for habitat protection purposes. All the properties were purchased as part of City Light’s Endangered Species Act (“ESA”) Early Action Program under the authority of Ordinance 121114. Both the Program and Ordinance stated criteria by which the City committed to assist in threatened species recovery and these properties meet the criteria by protecting salmonid habitat. Funding for the property acquisitions included \$624,000 in City Light funds and \$475,000 from the SRFB. This legislation places the acquired properties under the jurisdiction of the City Light Department. The funding for these acquisitions was already budgeted and does not require a new appropriation.

2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project? ___ Yes ___ X No

3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Does this legislation amend the Adopted Budget? ___ Yes ___ X No

Does the legislation have other financial impacts to the City of Seattle that are not reflected in the above, including direct or indirect, short-term or long-term costs?

The properties will require monitoring to protect current habitat conditions. A land management plan was developed for the ESA Lands and funding has been set aside for both

management and monitoring of these properties. Grant funds are pursued as needed to maintain or improve habitat conditions.

Is there financial cost or other impacts of *not* implementing the legislation?

City Light would be out of compliance with the terms of the signed grant with the SRFB. This may ultimately result in a loss of the award for the properties and subject City Light to funding the purchase of the properties with other resources, including but not limited to ratepayer funds.

4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

a. Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?

No.

b. Is a public hearing required for this legislation?

Yes, a public hearing is held concurrent with Council hearing on the Ordinance.

c. Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?

No.

d. Does this legislation affect a piece of property?

Yes, a map is included as an Attachment 1 to this Summary and Fiscal Note.

e. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative. Does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? What is the Language Access plan for any communications to the public?

None. As we work with willing private sellers, there are no communications with the public regarding the purchases of the properties.

f. Climate Change Implications

1. Emissions: Is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way?

This legislation is likely to have a negligible impact on carbon emissions, with an overall slight decrease over time. Trees will be planted on the properties, capturing carbon, but to make a measurable difference, the trees would have to be fully mature. Trees planted on the properties in the next few years will not fully mature for upwards of 60-80 years. From a carbon emissions standpoint, not implementing the proposed legislation will not have a significant impact either way.

2. Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle's resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.

This legislation is likely to have a negligible impact on climate resiliency, with an overall slight increase. As described in the previous question, trees will be planted on the

properties, capturing carbon, but to make a measurable difference, the trees would have to be fully mature. Trees planted on the properties in the next few years will not fully mature for upwards of 60-80 years. From a climate resiliency standpoint, not implementing the proposed legislation will not have a significant impact either way. There are no intersections of resiliency and race and social justice impacts for the reasons stated in Question 4e.

- g. If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program's desired goal(s).**

NA.

List attachments/exhibits below:

Summary Attachment 1 – Map of Properties