

KING CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Minutes

July 9, 2003

1 **Supervisors Present:** Scott Wallace, Vice Chairman, Lynn Sullivan, Secretary/Treasurer, Bobbi
2 Lindemulder, Member

3 **Associate Supervisors Present:** David Dowd

4 **Guests Present:** Stu Trefry, Washington State Conservation Commission, Judith Noble, Seattle
5 Public Utilities

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

7 **NRCS Staff Present:** Paul Rodgers, Puyallup Service Center

8 Vice Chairman Scott Wallace called the meeting to order at 6:06pm.

9 The meeting agenda was reviewed and B. Reed said that Judith Noble of Seattle Public Utilities
10 would be attending the meeting to answer the board's questions about the SPU non-competitive
11 grant applications that were presented at the June board meeting.

12 June board meeting minutes were reviewed and no changes were made.

13 **Sullivan moved, Lindermulder seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the**
14 **June 11, 2003 board meeting minutes as read.**

15 Introductions were made around the table.

16 Hamilton Lucas reviewed with the board the total monthly expenses for June. There were no
17 items requiring additional explanation.

18 **Sullivan moved, Lindermulder seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the**
19 **checks numbered 7263 thru 7310 for a total amount of \$ 244,825.46.**

20 The balance sheet was distributed and reviewed by the Board. The budget tracking report was
21 reviewed. The current year is now half over with more than 64% of the budget dollars remaining
22 to be spent.

23 **Lindermulder moved, Sullivan seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the**
24 **June financial report.**

25 B. Reed introduced Judith Noble from Seattle Public Utilities, and Noble said she would be
26 presenting background information to the Board regarding previously submitted non-competitive
27 grant applications. The first application she talked about was the Lower Duwamish Outfall
28 Survey. This project has been completed and SPU surveyed private as well as public outfalls on
29 the Duwamish. The information gathered would allow better selection of monitoring sites in the
30 river, which would determine the most effective sites for remediation activities. The project was

*"Promoting sustainable uses of natural resources
through responsible stewardship"*

completed ahead of time because of good tide levels. Lindermulder asked about using grant funds to do work on a Superfund site, and Noble said that the partners in the Superfund clean-up did not want to fund an outfall survey that included private outfalls (like parking lots and property drainage). She was also concerned about the grant funds paying for required sewer work rather than conservation projects. Trefry asked if the maps that will be created will be of any use to the district and B. Reed said it's a possibility, but not likely. Trefry also mentioned that he has a concern about who is keeping track of all the salmon restoration related projects that are being done and that credit is being given to Districts when their funding is used. G. Reed said that applications must state how the proposed project fits under the Conservation District RCW, and if a project is being done on private property it would not be a required function of government so this project appears to cover needs above and beyond SPU mandates. A discussion arose about the number of applications for funding that are studies rather than on the ground projects. Trefry said that at the Governor's meeting regarding salmon recovery there was discussion about this issue and that there is always pressure to do something concrete. Noble said that in some cases there is not enough knowledge to do good projects, that the knowledge needs to be acquired from studies. She noted that the SRF Board started with lots of projects and has been moving to assessments to determine where projects would actually be effective. B. Reed suggested that the description of the project on the application be restated to be explicit about the survey covering private outfall facilities and that the information obtained be used to prioritize remediation sites.

Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$29,967 for the Lower Duwamish Outfall Survey Project.

The next project to be discussed was the Ballard Locks Mapping Project. The board was questioning other sources of funding for the project and Noble said she would detail those sources. The project maps the shoreline of Lake Washington to determine where riprap originally used for bank armoring has fallen into the lake and created habitat for Chinook fry predators such as bass. The Chinook fry are vulnerable because they have to travel through the lake rather than the Duwamish River to get to Puget Sound because of the elimination of the Black River when the lake level was lowered earlier in the century. The maps will help determine where riprap removal projects should be sited in the future. Lindermulder asked if the project was being done on private property and Noble said both public and private lands are included in the mapping. A discussion ensued regarding environmental conditions in the lake and fish habitat. Dowd said he thought the application should be approved as long as the District could obtain the maps for its use. Trefry asked if the maps were going to be in electronic format and Noble said they would be put into a GIS layer.

Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$60,000 for the Lake Washington Ballard Locks Mapping Project.

Next was the database design project. The board was concerned that it was connected to a sewer outfall project and was very close to the survey project approved above. Noble said the first project shows where the outfall pipes are. The database is a repository for this information so it can be related to business inspections for hazardous materials. Currently inspections are being

done but there is no place to put the data obtained during the inspections. Lindermulder thought the businesses that have discharges would be required to have an NPDES permit, but Noble said that many businesses are not “dischargers” but if there is an accident a discharge could happen and go to the river through a private outfall, such as a pipe connected to parking lot drainage. Newer lots have to have catch basins and filters, but older ones do not. Dowd asked about having more detail in budget requests, B. Reed said that detailed spending reports are required on non-competitive grants.

Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$30,365 for the Duwamish Source Control Program Database Design Project.

Noble gave the board an update on upcoming non-competitive grant applications from the City of Seattle. One request will be for funding of a bathymetric study of nearshore and the effects over time of shoreline alteration, and where conditions would be suitable for restoration projects. This grant will be a local match for a Salmon Recovery Funding Board grant. This project is related to a previously submitted Green-Duwamish-CPS Watershed Forum grant application titled *2003 Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project*, but the Board did not approve the application because the area to be covered included areas outside of King County. This upcoming application will be limited to King County waters and will expend City of Seattle assessment allocations.

Another grant application will be for a study comparing pre-spawning Coho salmon mortality in rural and urban creeks. There is 80% mortality in urban creeks and SPU has no funding to continue to study the problem. B. Reed said that there needs to be a way to ensure the non-competitive grant funding is expended only on work performed in King County and not on Snohomish county stream reference sites chosen for the study.

B. Reed said that the City of Seattle Grant Central Station grant application appeared to be for current projects rather than completed ones, as has been the case in the past. G. Reed said the program was a good one because it funds real “shovels in the ground” projects. A discussion ensued regarding the reimbursement of already spent funds. B. Reed said that based upon the track record of the entity, in her opinion there was no problem with funding Grant Central in advance for projects. The grant program covers all sorts of projects, but KCD money is used for environmental projects only.

Lindermulder Moved, Sullivan Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$98,000 for the Grant Central Station Grant Program.

The last grant application to be addressed was from the Cedar- Lake Washington- Sammamish Watershed forum to fund a part time WRIA 8 Steward position. Lindermulder asked why grant funds are being used to hire county employees. B. Reed said that usually a basin steward is a county employee and the funding is used to pay for the time they spend on basin issues. Lindermulder suggested that the District should get a workplan as a way to track what the grant funding is paying for. It was decided that there needed to be concrete objectives for the position. Dowd asked if changing the name of the application would make it more acceptable. B. Reed said that while District has previously awarded non-competitive grants to fund county employees to

working on the Watershed Forums, there have been issues about funding other types of positions, and that these issues have yet to be resolved by the Board. Discussion ensued about grants paying for employee benefits and overhead at King County. B. Reed said that she thought her original discussions with the County about the grant application at hand had focused on funding a grant for a Watershed Forum Coordinator position, but that the application as submitted appears to be for a new position. She said she could send it back as long as she could tell the applicant why the application was being returned.

Discussion ensued regarding whether there was a potential conflict between the grant application and ongoing policy issues. It was agreed that the application was potentially in conflict with a proposed policy being considered by the board. New policies need to be approved in the next several months. B.Reed will work with Prinsen and Sullivan on these policies. The Cedar-Lake Washington-Sammamish Watershed Forum Grant Application was not approved at this time.

The board was given an update on the ALEA grant. B. Reed said that the grant has been awarded to the District to facilitate the purchase of the bog at Shadow Lake, and S.H.A.D.O.W. is currently dealing with family politics around the sale of a 42-acre parcel that the grant funds will purchase. The parcel may go to auction before the District receives the grant money. Discussion ensued regarding the timing of the receipts and what to do if the property is auctioned before cash is available. The board discussed the District loaning money to buy the property before the grant is received, however, there is another Conservation Futures grant that will be contributing to the purchase of the property. This grant has no connection to the District's ALEA grant award, so the discussion centered on the role of the District as a possible lender of the Futures grant money.

Wallace said that the District should not become a lender in this situation and that S.H.A.D.O.W. could take the grant award to a bank and get a loan against the promised funding. Staff had mentioned the situation to the District's legal counsel, who said that lending the money was not a problem as long as the District received interest on the loan.

The board decided that they were not comfortable lending on the Conservation Futures money to S.H.A.D.O.W., but that since the ALEA grant money would be coming to the District, fronting only the ALEA grant money to S.H.A.D.O.W. would be acceptable. The tricky part is that if S.H.A.D.O.W. does not get the cash from both grants at the same time, the purchase may not go through and the need for the grants will go away. Discussion ensued regarding the relationship of Prinsen to S.H.A.D.O.W. and the purchase of Shadow Lake Bog habitat.

The Van Hoof Dairy Nutrient Management Plan was presented to the Board for certification as required.

Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed a motion to certify the Van Hoof Dairy Nutrient Management Plan.

G.Reed said that the Western/ Pacific Conservation Districts meeting would be in Colorado. The KCD annual meeting would be held just prior to the Shadow Lake Bog Frog Frolic Celebration on August 17th. He said that board members needed to remember reimbursement forms for mileage to the meeting.

The feasibility study has been completed for the Dairy Digester, and King County will be taking the next steps to put an investor group together to construct it on the Enumclaw plateau. Power companies that are involved can get green credits and private investors can get tax breaks. The dairies in the area really want the digester to be built so they can increase the number of cows in their operations. The key to the process is the use of reverse osmosis to filter the water produced during the process so that it is useful for "gray water" applications.

The District will be hiring a farm planner to replace Sarah Cook, who took a job in Oregon.

Rogers gave the NRCS report. The local working group is looking to revamp the EQIP process so that a variety of projects can be funded, not just big projects. There is CREP training next week to try to get consistency in how the various Districts run the program.

Due to budget chaos, it is uncertain when Pedro Ramos' position will be filled. Since the Seattle area is very expensive to live in, it is difficult to get applicants.

Rogers distributed a flowchart about the Technical Service Providers program and explained how it worked. NRCS is reviewing sites for a visit by a "high government official" in the near future.

B. Reed said she did not have new information on the non-competitive grant overhead policy review. She did talk with a finance manager at the County who said that County staff really couldn't make a decision but that the District should make a policy and present it to the department head of the Water and Land Resources Division.

Trefry mentioned that there was a "night and day" difference in the District board meeting from 7 years ago and congratulated the Board and staff on the change. He said that due to staff changes at the Commission the District operations review is 8 months behind and he would get it scheduled as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05pm.

Authorized Signature

Date

Summary of Motions

Sullivan moved, Lindermulder seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the June 11, 2003 board meeting minutes as read.

Sullivan moved, Lindermulder seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the checks numbered 7263 thru 7310 for a total amount of \$ 244,825.46.

190 Lindermulder moved, Sullivan seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the
191 June financial report.

192 Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the
193 City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$29,967 for the Lower Duwamish
194 Outfall Survey Project.

195 Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the
196 City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$60,000 for the Lake Washington
197 Ballard Locks Mapping Project.

198 Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the
199 City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$30,365 for the Duwamish Source
200 Control Program Database Design Project.

201 Lindermulder Moved, Sullivan Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the
202 City of Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$98,000 for the Grant Central Station
203 Grant Program.

204 Sullivan Moved, Lindermulder Seconded; Passed a motion to certify the Van Hoof Dairy
205 Nutrient Management Plan.

206 The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 pm.