

KING CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Minutes

June 12, 2002

1 **Supervisors Present:** Bill Niccolls, Chair Scott Wallace, Vice-Chair, Max Prinsen, Member.

2 **Associate Supervisors Present:** Pat O'Hanley

3 **Guests Present:** Mark Clark, Washington Conservation Commission; Judith Noble, Keith
4 Kunko, Seattle Public Utilities; Kirk Anderson, Clint Loper, King County DNRP

5 **Staff Present:** Geoff Reed, Brandy Reed, Marla Hamilton Lucas

6 **NRCS Staff Present:** None

7 Meeting called to order at 6:01 PM with Bill Niccolls, Chair, presiding.

8 Agenda was reviewed, and Clark mentioned that he had several items to be covered in new
9 business. B. Reed said she had an additional grant to present.

10 B. Reed gave the board a short update on the ALEA grant and the District's partnership with
11 Shadow Lake Bog (which Prinsen is involved with) to make the grant application. The Board
12 expressed its support for the proposal, which will allow the District to sponsor purchase of a
13 portion of the Bog and adjacent buffer, with SHADOW being responsible for the maintenance of
14 the property. B. Reed said that she had to submit the application on June 1 so it was submitted
15 without a board resolution. If the Board approves a resolution to approve the grant application,
16 the resolution will be forwarded to complete the grant application packet.

17 **W (Wallace) moved, N (Niccolls) seconded, vote suspended until the expected arrival of**
18 **Sullivan. Prinsen abstained.**

19 Wallace mentioned that his objection to the Raging River project that was presented at the prior
20 board meeting is due to the District's non-competitive grant money being spent to pay for county
21 employee overhead in planning the project rather than actually constructing the project. B. Reed
22 said that our funds would be used to design the project, and that other grant funds are being
23 applied for. Wallace said that river improvement funds are available to the tune of \$2.5 million
24 dollars for projects such as this. B. Reed asked if the concern was that we fund hard costs not
25 overhead and Wallace responded that he felt that our non-competitive grant funds were paying
26 for county personnel. B. Reed said there is a risk the project might not happen.

27 Wallace left at 6:07.

The meeting was suspended at this time due to a lack of a quorum. Discussion ensued regarding the state Envirothon competition, board member Sullivan is on the state board for the Envirothon.

Sullivan arrived at 6:21 and as a quorum was obtained, the meeting resumed. Discussion regarding Shadow Lake Bog and the ALEA grant resumed. Sullivan wanted to know if the District would own the Bog, and B. Reed said the District would have a 30 % interest and under the terms of the grant, the property must remain a public interest in Shadow's name. Prinsen can't sell the bog. If Shadow dissolves, the bog will revert to the Cascade Land Conservancy. Prinsen gave a short description of the Shadow Lake Bog project.

Sullivan voted to approve the Shadow Lake Bog ALEA grant application, and her vote was added to the vote held previously in the meeting. Motion passed.

Last month's minutes were reviewed and Sullivan asked about the item regarding her appointment as acting chair during the last meeting. There was discussion about Wallace being able to present an issue to the board while serving as chair for the meeting. Niccolls suggested the board re- address the motion allowing Wallace to advocate for a critter pad cover with the district's blessing. Prinsen explained the situation and it was agreed to add the phrase " to allow Wallace to bring an issue before the board" to clarify why Sullivan was appointed acting chair.

P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion to approve the May 8th 2002 minutes as amended.

Hamilton Lucas presented the list of May 2002 checks for Board review. Niccolls asked for an explanation of what the Imp and PS grant items were for (they were the deposits made when the payments were received for the 1st quarter grant billings).

P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion to approve the checks numbered 6582-6625 in the amount of \$56,839.52.

The balance sheet was then presented through May 31, 2002. Considerable assessment funds were received due to payment of property taxes. The watershed forums and municipalities are being encouraged to apply for their funds in a timely manner.

The budget tracking report was distributed for review and the details for some line items were given to the board. Niccolls asked for clarification on the NRC/ Sara Hemphill contract and how the money is budgeted. He asked for a projection on how much she is planning to need and for how long to do the work. Other expenses that are over budget were explained and reasons given for the overages.

Introductions were made for Judith Noble and Keith Kurko from the City of Seattle. They gave a presentation on how the District's non-competitive grant funds are being used by the City. There were several projects that were presented during a salmon friendly charette that are now actually going to be constructed. Additionally, the near shore habitat is getting more focus for projects, as research is showing how important the near shore is to salmon survival.

65 B. Reed wanted to insure the board had a clear understanding of the relationship of the City of
66 Seattle funding and the WRIA 9 Forum Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project
67 grant previously submitted to the Board, the Seattle work will contribute to the WRIA 9 Forum
68 project as “in kind” match to obtain more federal money for project.

69 Some of the other projects being funded include Salmon Bay acquisition, Duwamish Riparian
70 Enhancement and an Instream Flow conference. Prinsen asked if there would be reports from the
71 conference, so the results of the conference would be portable.

72 Kirk Anderson and Clint Loper from King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
73 were introduced. They made a presentation on the Raging River project in response to questions
74 from the board raised during last month’s meeting.

75 1) Who owns the property where the project will be built? Answer: There are two parcels,
76 one is a 7 acre FEMA purchase for mitigation purposes and the other is a King County
77 purchase of .4 acres.

78 2) Is there support of the local residents for breaching the levee? Answer: The breaching
79 doesn’t affect any landowners except for a county road. Removing the dike will relieve
80 pressure on the opposite bank and allow for flood storage on the property mentioned
81 above. This will reduce the chance of flooding downstream. Downstream neighbors have
82 not yet been contacted, but the project will have to go through the SEPA process, and
83 they will be alerted and informed of the project at that time.

84 3) How was the project ranked in the Rural Drainage program? Answer: the Rural Drainage
85 fee can be use for all sorts of river related projects. As collection of the fee is new in the
86 rural areas, there is a need to assess capital projects- which areas have had past
87 complaints and what projects are on the near term action agenda. The criteria for ranking
88 projects are problem resolution, significance, frequency of problem, effectiveness, how
89 urgent the problem is, how feasible the project is, and the possibility of funding leverage
90 with other agencies.

91 4) What are the flood reduction benefits of the project? Answer: Currently, the river can’t
92 access its floodplain and backs up behind the levee area and pushes downstream faster.
93 This project will rehabilitate the traditional flood storage area. The pond at Camp Terry
94 will be eliminated as a result of this project; it has been a flooding problem.

95 5) What is the number of river miles enhanced by the project? Answer: 800 ft along the
96 river, 200 ft perpendicular to the river. 7.5 acres are restored to floodplain at the widest
97 portion of the river before it’s mouth. There are no buildings on the 7.5-acre site.

98 6) Where is the feasibility study? Answer: Three feasibility studies were done along with a
99 presentation for the project (an outline was handed out). District non-competitive grant
100 money will leverage with other money to complete the design phase of the project.
101 \$50,000 of KCD money will allow application for Salmon Recovery Board Funding.

102 Niccolls asked if the \$50,000 from KCD for the early stages will cover “soft costs” rather than
103 project costs. Clint responded that KCD funding is not necessarily up front; they’re looking at a

104 total pool. Other leverage type projects are acquisitions, so there's less salary. On a restoration
105 project such as this, salary and overhead costs are higher because of the design and permitting
106 work that is required.

107 Niccolls asked if \$280,000 was the total for the project. Clint said time is realistic with ESA
108 permitting; it is a multi year project.

109 Prinsen said that in the past KCD funding has paid for engineering and design on a project, but
110 the actual construction is not funded. He wanted assurance about the likelihood of total funding
111 for the project. Also, he was concerned about the use of construction fill materials and the effect
112 on neighbors downstream. Kirk said that a survey hasn't been completed but it looks like there is
113 no construction fill on the site. Prinsen asked about silt that might go downstream and expressed
114 his surprise that there hasn't been much public outreach on this project yet. Kirk said that silt was
115 not a concern and that the people downstream should notice some benefits from the project.

116 Sullivan asked if an Environmental Impact Study or a checklist would be used for the project. It
117 was unclear which would be used, but the issue would be addressed in the SEPA process. This
118 will require a Biological Assessment, which is included in the project budget. There are many
119 different approvals necessary for the project. However, levee removals are rated high as
120 restoration projects, and even if there is no SRF board funding available a way will be found to
121 complete the project.

122 Niccolls said that King County could use our non-competitive grant to obtain leverage but it
123 should not be distributed until other funding becomes available. Sullivan mentioned that King
124 County has committed to return non-competitive grant money for projects that have not been
125 completed. B. Reed said KC has not yet returned any funds.

126 B. Reed suggested that there be a condition on the non-competitive grant award so that if
127 leverage funds are not obtained then the District grant is returned. This policy would be
128 consistent with other non-competitive grant awards.

129 Prinsen attempted to formulate a motion and discussion ensued regarding the timing of
130 acquisition and spending on the project. There was discussion about a possible change of district
131 policy about the distribution of non-competitive grants.

132 **P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion to approve the Snoqualmie**
133 **Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for \$50,000 for the Raging River**
134 **Preston Reach Restoration Project subject to the condition that \$50,000 would be refunded**
135 **to the District if matching funds for the project are not obtained by December 2004.**

136 B. Reed presented non-competitive grant applications from the Cedar/Lake
137 Washington/Sammamish (WRIA 8) Watershed Forum. Prinsen commented on the returned
138 funding list and noted that all the money had not been allocated. It appears that some projects
139 were not completed and the money is to be returned but the paperwork has not been completed.
140 The projects became unfeasible.

141 The money will be allocated back to new projects. The District will reissue the checks when
142 applications are approved for new projects.

143 The first application presented for approval is for a 20-acre open space purchase, Redmond 74.
144 The site has possibilities for future salmon restoration.

145 **S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8**
146 **Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the Sammamish Valley Floor Open**
147 **Space Purchase – Redmond 74 Site in the amount of \$150,000.**

148 The next application for approval was the WRIA 8 Strategic Assessment. This assessment
149 includes a watershed model and will provide information for the final WRIA 8 conservation
150 plan.

151 **P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion approving the WRIA 8**
152 **Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the WRIA 8 Strategic Assessment –**
153 **Phase I in the amount of \$100,000.**

154 Rock Creek Acquisition was the next project submitted. This acquisition will allow for future
155 improvement of fish passage at the culvert under the water supply pipeline right of way.

156 **S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8**
157 **Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the Rock Creek RM 0.3**
158 **Acquisition in the amount of \$ 92,000.**

159 A project that will measure the migratory success and survival of juvenile salmon in the WRIA 8
160 watershed was next up for board approval.

161 **S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded, Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8**
162 **Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the Differential Migratory Success**
163 **of WRIA 8 Juvenile Salmonids Study in the amount of \$119,125.**

164 The final project presented for approval was the 2002 Lake Washington Basin Chinook studies.
165 This project was submitted previously, this current submission has a slightly reduced scope of
166 work so as to reduce the cost. The project will continue spawner surveys to gather information
167 about the origin and genetics of the returning Chinook.

168 **P (Prinsen) moved, S(Sullivan) seconded, Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8**
169 **Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the 2002 Lake Washington Basin**
170 **Chinook Studies in the amount of \$46,439.**

171 B. Reed presented a scope of work for a Green-Duwamish-CPS (WRIA 9) Watershed Forum
172 revised noncompetitive grant application for the “Salmon in the Nearshore” technical workshop.
173 Discussion ensued and the board requested that the \$50,000 project be resubmitted in the non-
174 competitive grant application format so the costs and benefits of the project could be evaluated
175 more effectively.

176 Next was the approval of the Dairy Nutrient Management Plans. The District has completed
177 plans for 38 of the 40 dairies in King County. The two remaining dairies did not want plans
178 completed. One new dairy may be starting operations in the future. The District’s dairy planner,

179 Clare Flannagan-Lubinda is to be congratulated for meeting today's deadline for approved
180 nutrient plans.

181 **P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded, Passed a motion to approve the list of 38 Dairy**
182 **Nutrient Management Plans for dairies in King County.**

183 There was discussion about the actual number of dairies in the county, it was determined that
184 there are 41 dairies instead of the 42 reported in last month's minutes.

185 The District has met its obligation under state law for dairy plans. Now the emphasis will be on
186 implementation of those plans. Clark noted that statewide the CD's have done a pretty good job
187 of covering all the dairies.

188 B. Reed mentioned that the 2003 Program of Work was submitted to the King County council,
189 but that it has been deemed necessary to approve the Program of Work by a motion of the board.
190 Clark said that if the board authorized submittal of the Program of Work, then it should be valid,
191 but according to council staff, credibility for the plan would be increased if the board moved to
192 approve it.

193 Niccolls asked if the Envirothon should be included in the provisions of the plan. It was decided
194 that there were not yet enough specifics regarding the program to include it in the workplan.

195 Clark mentioned that the district should have a blanket policy on spending for the State Auditor.

196 **S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded Passed a motion to approve the King**
197 **Conservation District's 2003 Program of Work (Workplan) as submitted to the King**
198 **County Council on June 1, 2002.**

199 The Council will be reviewing/approving the 2003 Program of Work in July.

200 Clark mentioned that the District operations review needs to be scheduled with the staff; possible
201 dates are near the end of July.

202 He detailed some of the staff changes happening at the Commission, and the effect of the new
203 farm bill on availability of funding for small farms.

204 Niccolls brought up the GIS update. Discussion ensued regarding the necessity of upgrading to
205 version 8.1 at this time. He also revisited the Envirothon issue, regarding what the District's role
206 would be, maybe imitating something at the county level? Discussion ensued regarding the
207 Envirothon.

208 G. Reed said that board elections have been scheduled for June 25.

209 There being no further business,

210 **Prinsen moved, Sullivan seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to adjourn the meeting at**
211 **9:35pm.**

212

213 _____
214 Authorized Signature _____ Date _____
215
216 Summary of Motions
217 W (Wallace) moved, N (Niccolls) seconded, vote suspended until the expected arrival of
218 Sullivan. Prinsen abstained.
219 Sullivan voted to approve the Shadow Lake Bog ALEA grant application, and her vote was
220 added to the vote held previously in the meeting. Motion passed.
221 P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion to approve the May 8th 2002
222 minutes as amended.
223 P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion to approve the checks numbered
224 6582-6625 in the amount of \$56,839.52.
225 P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion to approve the Snoqualmie
226 Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for \$50,000 for the Raging River
227 Preston Reach Restoration Project subject to the condition that \$50,000 would be refunded
228 to the District if matching funds for the project are not obtained by December 2004.
229 S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8
230 Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the Sammamish Valley Floor Open
231 Space Purchase – Redmond 74 Site in the amount of \$150,000.
232 P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded Passed a motion approving the WRIA 8
233 Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the WRIA 8 Strategic Assessment –
234 Phase I in the amount of \$100,000.
235 S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8
236 Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the Rock Creek RM 0.3
237 Acquisition in the amount of \$ 92,000.
238 S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded, Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8
239 Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the Differential Migratory Success
240 of WRIA 8 Juvenile Salmonids Study in the amount of \$119,125.
241 P (Prinsen) moved, S(Sullivan) seconded, Passed a motion to approve the WRIA 8
242 Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for the 2002 Lake Washington Basin
243 Chinook Studies in the amount of \$46,439.
244 P (Prinsen) moved, S (Sullivan) seconded, Passed a motion to approve the list of 38 Dairy
245 Nutrient Management Plans for dairies in King County.

246 S (Sullivan) moved, P (Prinsen) seconded Passed a motion to approve the King
247 Conservation District's 2003 Program of Work (Work plan) as submitted to the King
248 County Council on June 1, 2002.

249 Sullivan moved, Wallace seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to adjourn the meeting at
250 9:35PM.