

KING CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Minutes

September 14, 2005

1 **Supervisors Present:** Max Prinsen, Chair, Scott Wallace, Vice- Chair, Matt Livengood,  
2 Secretary/Treasurer, Bobbi Lindemulder, Member, Richard Gelb, Member

3 **Associate Supervisors Present:** Bill Knutsen

4 **Guests Present:** Linda Hansen, WRIA 9 Project Coordinator, Kathy Wright, King County  
5 Partnership Coordinator, Kurt Brees, Mercer Island, George Jacquish, Farm Service, Michael  
6 Cox, Seattle Public Utilities, Judith Noble Seattle Public Utilities

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

8 **NRCS Staff Present:** Paul Rogers

9 Chair Prinsen called meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Introductions were made around the table.

10 **Wallace moved, Livengood seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to approve the August**  
11 **10, 2005 meeting minutes as read.**

12 The agenda was reviewed and the NRCS report and Finance report were moved to the beginning  
13 of the meeting.

14 Rogers distributed a list of Technical Service Providers projects from the new accounting and  
15 contract system. As a result, it became apparent that there were old contracts that were never  
16 closed out. The affected producers will be contacted to determine status of projects and funding.  
17 The District may hear from the County about this issue. There may be money returned to the  
18 program because of violations of contracts by producers. Rogers will update the District with  
19 producer names as he gets them. There will be no new funding for technical assistance as a result  
20 of this situation.

21 There were two tort claims by producers that have been adjudicated. No injury or fault on the  
22 part of the government was found. The District had been listed on these contracts.

23 Conservation Security Program has \$200 million available nationwide, 4 contracts have been  
24 secured in the Nisqually watershed where there is good interest in the program. The local  
25 working group recommended the Snoqualmie for the next west-side CSP watershed. \$60 million  
26 nationwide is available this year. We are still one to two years from having Snoqualmie in the  
27 program. Producers need to have soil test records and practices in place to apply for program.  
28 Eligible program participants must be food and fiber producers (there should be a higher number  
29 of people eligible due to this change).

30 P. Rogers reported there is \$250,000 available for the EQIP program this year, and there will  
31 probably be the same amount next year. It is possible there will be a national ranking system.  
32 There are three local producers who were awarded contracts this year.

33 Rogers referred to a partial list of activities that NRCS staff can not address this year. The list  
34 includes designs and some practices. This list is what needs to be outsourced. NRCS will grant  
35 about 500k to the Washington Conservation Commission. Money will be distributed to the  
36 districts providing services. The grant will fund 50% of the cost of technical assistance/planning.  
37 The cluster engineer is fully booked right now and can't get to Thurston County where most of  
38 the projects are located. Discussion ensued.

39 Hamilton Lucas presented the financial report. The list of total monthly expenses was reviewed.

40 **Lindemulder Moved, Livengood Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to approve**  
41 **check numbers 8705 – 8761 for the total amount of \$431,319.18.**

42 The budget tracking report was reviewed. The ALEA grant to reimburse for the purchase of  
43 Shadow Lake property is pending. 59% of budget remains while at 30% of the year remaining.  
44 The balance sheet was reviewed, detailing an adjusted equity figure anticipating reimbursements  
45 on the cost of purchasing the Shadow Lake property, including the ALEA grant.

46 **Wallace Moved, Lindemulder Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to approve the**  
47 **September financial report.**

48 The City of Mercer Island and Seattle had projects that they wanted to present to the board as  
49 proposal to get any board concerns as feedback to polish the final application to be made at a  
50 subsequent meeting.

51 Kurt Brees, City of Mercer Island Parks Department, distributed a draft application and plan map  
52 for a native plant demonstration landscaping project at the City of Mercer Island community  
53 center. B. Reed said that she had done a technical assist at the community center approximately  
54 4 years ago. Mercer Island wanted to use their allocation to do landscaping at the center with  
55 native plants. Brees explained the landscape plan. Conservation of water and habitat are key  
56 features as well as reducing maintenance. The work would be done with an existing contractor or  
57 the plants would be purchased and the Washington Conservation Corps would do the work.  
58 There would be signage at the project advertising the King Conservation's role in creating the  
59 landscaping. B. Reed asked the board for their feedback. Wallace asked about irrigation. Brees  
60 responded that watering would occur thru the plant establishment phase. Wallace expressed  
61 concern about the system being temporary and losing plants. Prinsen asked about the City's  
62 obligation to install landscaping as part of its building code. Brees said that this plan was in  
63 excess of what is required by City code. Prinsen asked that the plan show what is above and  
64 beyond City requirements so it is clear that the District is not paying for required landscaping  
65 activities. Gelb said it seemed the project wouldn't be a priority issue for Mercer Island. He  
66 asked about shoreline armoring and invasive species, and if the District funds could be applied to  
67 such a higher value project. Brees said other activities are being prioritized through the City's

68 open space program. The idea of the proposed project is to provide an example for residents.  
69 Gelb thought the proposal would have a small impact protecting natural resources as compared  
70 to other projects such as reducing shoreline armoring. Brees thought the selling point of the  
71 landscaping project is its high visibility - the community center is used for weddings and other  
72 events. Wallace asked the amount of lake shoreline associated with the community center, and  
73 how close the project is to Luther Burbank park shoreline. Prinsen asked if the feedback was  
74 useful. Gelb asked about design standards- is this project superceding the standards. There was  
75 concern on the part of the board about doing practices that are already required by code. Brees  
76 thought he could meet this standard as current landscaping standards in the City's code are pretty  
77 low.

78 It was agreed that it was a good approach to have conversation in advance about the project  
79 before submission.

80 B. Reed introduced a proposal from SPU on the Eco Roof project. Judith Noble from SPU gave  
81 some background on the original grant proposal previously submitted to the Board and  
82 introduced Michael Cox. The original proposal detailed a cost share program to assist with the  
83 installation of green roves on public buildings in Seattle. SPU would like to change the proposal  
84 from green roof installation to monitoring and evaluating the efficacy of existing green roves. M  
85 Cox said he had been trying to evaluate some green roof projects locally but needed some good  
86 sites to monitor for their ecological effectiveness. He showed some photos of the green roves on  
87 the new Ballard Library, the Ross Park shelter, and Fire Station 10 that he was interested in  
88 studying. Garfield High School was mentioned as another possible site. Prinsen asked about the  
89 monitoring parameters. Cox said he was doing flow amounts, water quality such as temp and  
90 nutrients. Wallace asked about the increased heating and cooling costs associated with green  
91 roofs. Discussion ensued on this topic. Hansen asked about species makeup of green roofs.  
92 Lindemulder asked how many green roofs are in King County. B Reed said they should  
93 resubmit a new application to reflect the scope of work. Wallace asked about the cost to  
94 construct compared to a conventional roof. Gelb talked about the incentives SPU is working  
95 onto encourage green roof construction. Noble mentioned how reduced runoff would help  
96 address existing CSO problems in Seattle. It was decided to rewrite the grant application to  
97 address the items the board discussed specifically the reduction in storm-water component of the  
98 study. Noble said they would re- do it for next months meeting

99 B Reed presented the WRIA 9 application for the Newaukum Basin Characterization Project.

100 The project proposal entails a study of the habitat conditions in the creek to provide a base line  
101 upon which future work can be implemented. Hansen gave some additional information on the  
102 proposal. Kathy Wright told the board that the project is part of a cooperation agreement with the  
103 Army Corps of Engineers. Hansen said the County hopes to MSFEG through a grant for culvert  
104 work in association with the project. Prinsen asked if the creek flowed through the city of  
105 Enumclaw which it does for a short reach. Knutsen asked about the amount of spawning habitat  
106 in the 14 miles of the creek. Gelb said he thought the study should be about more than salmon  
107 and should include other species. Geld asked to add wildlife habitat to the agreement language

108 which was agreeable. Lindemulder asked about whether another study was really needed as she  
109 thought this study of Newaukum was already completed. Hansen said this study would address  
110 data gaps in previous studies. Discussion ensued on how these studies are coordinated and lead  
111 to implementation of projects. A lot of Federal money is expected to come to the watershed  
112 based on this and other completed studies.

113 **Gelb Moved, Lindemulder Seconded; Passed Unanimously motion to approve the Green-**  
114 **Duwamish-CPS Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for \$103,000 from**  
115 **2004 Assessments for the King County Newaukum Basin Characterization Project with a**  
116 **few small modifications.**

117 The agreement revision requests were reviewed by the Board.

118 **Livengood Moved, Wallace Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to amend the grant**  
119 **agreement for the King County DNRP WLRD Inventory of Currently Productive Fish**  
120 **Habitat in WRIA 9 Project, canceling the project and approving return of the grant funds in**  
121 **the amount of \$35,000.**

122 The Coe Clemens creek project from the City of Snoqualmie is requesting a change to the scope  
123 of work. They want to install beaver deceivers, and reduce the amount of riparian plantings and  
124 cancel grade control structures. The board agreed to deny the current revision request, asked for  
125 a new application for the proposed activities, and a new revision request to cancel the previously  
126 awarded project.

127 **Livengood Moved, Wallace Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to deny the**  
128 **agreement revision request for the City of Snoqualmie Coe Clemmons Creek Restoration**  
129 **Project, to request a new revision request canceling the previously awarded project, and to**  
130 **request a new grant application detailing the modified project activities.,**

131 G. Jacquish gave the FSA report. He reported on elections for the FSA board. He also reported  
132 on the disaster programs he is working on locally. The FSA conservation programs were  
133 discussed.

134 The funding principles for the District non-competitive grant program were discussed. Staff  
135 intended to walk through the document tonight but it would take a considerable effort. Prinsen  
136 thought it was best for board members to do some homework on the document before reviewing  
137 it as a group. The idea of a sub-committee was discussed. Gelb and Livengood volunteered for  
138 a sub-committee. Gelb asked for some brief discussion immediately. He asked about the  
139 references to the regional task force and thought it irrelevant and the board agreed whole  
140 heartedly. Discussion ensued on changes to the document that are needed. Gelb, Livengood and  
141 B Reed were assigned to a sub-committee to develop the funding principles. Gelb said the grant  
142 progress reports should be more public to boost the program, possibly web-based. He also  
143 thought we should do implementation audits on projects. Prinsen asked about communicating  
144 our strategic plan perhaps as part of the funding principles. The board liked the written materials  
145 that were presented by B. Reed. B. Reed asked about the board's recommendations on remitting

146 grant funds in full in advance or retaining a percentage of the grant award until project  
147 implementation has been documented by the District. The Board agreed to retain a percentage.  
148 B. Reed also asked for input on eligible expenses. Discussion ensued on whether compliance or  
149 mandated activities should be eligible. It was generally agreed that mandated activities would  
150 not be eligible. She also asked about utilizing a sub-committee to review grant applications  
151 before they are reviewed by the full board. Prinsen and Livengood thought applications would  
152 be discussed in detail at board meetings regardless of a sub-committee recommendation, but  
153 thought a technical review committee might be a good idea instead.

154 G. Reed reviewed work completed to date on the District's outreach effort to the cities regarding  
155 the renewal of the assessment. The one page summary was discussed. Letters sent to cities  
156 requesting a briefing with city councils have been sent and Sara Hemphill is working on  
157 scheduling these meetings.

158 G. Reed presented the draft power point presentation for the city outreach effort the district is  
159 working on. Discussion ensued on adding a few slides on emerging local resource challenges  
160 that we are facing in order to build up to the 10 dollar assessment proposal. G. Reed agreed to  
161 continue working on the presentation with input from the board. Prinsen thought the 10 dollar  
162 assessment proposal should be right up front and then give background but that was shot down.  
163 The one page public relations document was reviewed and comments provided.

164 The preliminary "talking points" were distributed for review.

165 Gelb briefed the rest of the board on the NRI project progress. The issue of data management  
166 was discussed as well as GIS capabilities. He suggested considering using the Seattle Urban  
167 Nature project – a Seattle non profit. B Reed reported on her work with the District's IT  
168 consultant regarding computer hardware requirements to manage the data in-house. Gelb said he  
169 would talk further with the Seattle Urban Nature project.

170 Wallace distributed a report from the meeting in NACD area meeting Spokane he attended with  
171 Sara Hemphill. He said it was productive meeting and was glad he went.

172 The WACD northwest area meeting will be held September 29th. Wallace will attend with staff.

173 **There being no more business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:07 pm.**

174

175

176

177 \_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

178

**Summary of Motions**

179 **Wallace moved, Livengood seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to approve the August**  
180 **10, 2005 meeting minutes as read.**

181 **Lindemulder Moved, Livengood Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to approve**  
182 **check numbers 8705 – 8761 for the total amount of \$431,319.18.**

183 **Wallace Moved, Lindemulder Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to approve the**  
184 **August financial report.**

185 **Gelb Moved, Lindemulder Seconded; Passed Unanimously motion to approve the Green-**  
186 **Duwamish-CPS Watershed Forum non-competitive grant application for \$103,000 from**  
187 **2004 Assessments for the King County Newaukum Basin Characterization Project with a**  
188 **few small modifications.**

189 **Livengood Moved, Wallace Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to amend the grant**  
190 **agreement for the King County DNRP WLRD Inventory of Currently Productive Fish**  
191 **Habitat in WRIA 9 Project, canceling the project and approving return of the grant funds in**  
192 **the amount of \$35,000.**

193 **Livengood Moved, Wallace Seconded; Passed Unanimously a motion to deny the**  
194 **agreement revision request for the City of Snoqualmie Coe Clemmons Creek Restoration**  
195 **Project, to request a new revision request canceling the previously awarded project, and to**  
196 **request a new grant application detailing the modified project activities..**

197 **There being no more business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:07 pm.**