

KING CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Minutes

December 8, 2004

1 **Supervisors Present:** Max Prinsen, Chairman, Scott Wallace, Vice Chairman, Matt Livengood,
2 Secretary/Treasurer, Richard Gelb, Member.

3 **Associate Supervisors Present:** None

4 **Guests Present:** Andrea Copping, University of Washington Sea Grant Program

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

6 **NRCS Staff Present:** None

7 Chairman Prinsen called meeting to order at 6:05pm.

8 Introductions were made and the agenda was reviewed. There were no changes to the agenda.
9 Minutes from the prior meeting were reviewed.

10 **Wallace moved, Livengood seconded, Passed Unanimously a motion to approve the**
11 **minutes as read for the November 2004 King Conservation District Board of Supervisors**
12 **meeting.**

13 Andrea Copping from the University of Washington Sea Grant program gave a presentation
14 about the program and about a proposed partnership between King Conservation District and the
15 Sea Grant program to help fund a position to provide education to nearshore property owners. B.
16 Reed said deliverables would be negotiated between Sea Grant and the District. She wanted to
17 determine if the board was still interested in a partnership arrangement. There has been no
18 position that provides outreach to nearshore property owners and B. Reed has been performing
19 this service on an “as needed” basis. She feels that there is potential in working with this group.
20 It’s not really so different from farm plans, just slightly different issues and BMP’s.

21 Prinsen was concerned about duplicating WRIA work and thought the plans were great but was
22 concerned about getting projects on the ground. B. Reed is currently working on a project that
23 could become a demo project. Prinsen asked about the overhead percentage involved when
24 contracting with the UW. Copping said that funding would be coming from multiple sources and
25 B. Reed said that there would be a “MOU” for deliverables. The proposed commitment would be
26 for one year and be renewable if desired. Copping said there would be a needs assessment to
27 determine what tasks the proposed position would be responsible for. Wallace thought the
28 proposal sounded like a good idea and suggested getting the District’s legal counsel involved.
29 The board asked B. Reed to work to come up with an agreement for partial funding of the
30 proposed Sea Grant position.

31 **Cedar-Lake Washington-Sammamish Watershed Forum Grant Application**

32 **Wallace Moved, Livengood, Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the**
33 **Cedar-Lake Washington-Sammamish Watershed Forum non-competitive grant**
34 **application for \$40,000 from 2004 Assessments for the Seattle Public Utilities 2005 Cedar**
35 **River Mainstem Chinook Redd & Carcass Surveys Project.**

36 **City of Redmond Grant Application**

37 _____ Moved, _____ Seconded; Passed a motion to approve the City of Redmond non-
38 competitive grant application for \$90,000 from 1998 – 2004 Assessments for the *City of*
39 *Redmond Salmon Friendly Water Conservation Demonstration Garden Project.*

40 **This grant application was returned to the City of Redmond after the board determined**
41 **that there were too many substantive questions about the benefits of the project.**

42 **City of Seattle Grant Application Packet**

43 **Wallace Moved, Livengood Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of**
44 **Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$25,000 from 2003 Assessments for the Seattle**
45 **Public Utilities maple Leaf Reach Restoration Project.**

46 **Wallace Moved, Livengood Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of**
47 **Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$70,000 from 2003 Assessments for the Seattle**
48 **Parks Department Luna Park Beach Restoration Project.**

49 **Livengood Moved, Wallace Seconded; Passed a motion to endorse the City of Seattle non-**
50 **competitive grant application for \$50,000 from 2003 Assessments for the City of Seattle**
51 **Cod-roof Demonstration Project, and approve it when a specific project has been identified.**
52 **Gelb recused himself.**

53 B. Reed presented the proposed revisions to the Non-competitive grant program policies. The
54 revision helps include all the information since the beginning of the program and coordinates it
55 into one document. These policies will be re-evaluated after the 2006 assessment approval
56 process has been completed.

57 Prinsen suggested that the policies be coordinated with the goals for the District contained in the
58 draft strategic plan. Gelb suggested having projects align with filling natural resource gaps. A
59 discussion ensued. The suggestion was made to hire someone to run the grant program. A point
60 based approval system was suggested, but it requires a lot more administrative work to operate.

61 B. Reed presented the 2005 Draft Workplan and Operations Budget. The draft is to be finalized
62 at the January board meeting. There was discussion about the natural resource inventory not
63 being in the budget and should a consultant be hired to pull the information together from
64 existing sources? Prinsen said that the Conservation Commission is looking at having all CD's
65 do resource inventories, as required in the RCW. They want King to be the proving ground for
66 this work. It is important to determine what resources for this work can be obtained from the

67 Commission. Discussion ensued. It was decided to add some funding for a consultant, and to
68 take special care in drafting the scope of work for this project.

69 Additional items were discussed. These included the dairy digester, implementation of BMP's, a
70 more proactive position for the District engineer, Envirothon, and intergovernmental outreach,
71 which will be a big item in 2005, with the renewal of the assessment. The WACD is attempting
72 to get an urban committee organized. Gelb thought he might be able to be involved.

73 As regards the budget, Prinsen asked about the \$140,000 revenue shown for KC Critical Area
74 Ordinance. G. Reed said he thought it would be more like \$295,000- \$250,000 for CAO, \$45,000
75 for ADAP. It was agreed that the \$295,000 number was more realistic, and the expenses for the
76 programs would be reviewed to make sure they are correctly included in the expenditure side of
77 the budget. It was suggested by Gelb that the financial statements use the phrase "net revenue" as
78 opposed to "gross profit".

79 **Wallace moved, Gelb seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the Draft**
80 **Workplan and Budget for 2005 for the King Conservation District.**

81 G. Reed distributed several amendments to the King Conservation District Employee Handbook
82 for Board review. These amendments addressed several issues: a policy on payment for
83 professional registrations for staff, a policy on staff working at home and a policy on outside
84 consulting and employment.

85 **Wallace moved, Gelb seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the amendments**
86 **to the King Conservation District Employee Handbook as presented to the Board.**

87 Hamilton Lucas presented a letter authorizing the closure of the Rainier National Bank account
88 used for the Department of Ecology Dairy Loan Program. The program ended last year.

89 The list of checks for November was presented.

90 **Gelb Moved, Wallace Seconded, Passed Unanimously a motion to approve checks # 8211-**
91 **8258 in the amount of \$ 72,443.69 for the month of November 2004.**

92 The balance sheet was reviewed. Unrestricted balance is approx \$1.2 million. The budget
93 tracking report was distributed for board review. 14% of the budget remains with 8% of 2004
94 remaining.

95 **Wallace Moved, Gelb Seconded, and Passed Unanimously a motion to accept the November**
96 **Finance Report as presented.**

97 Discussion ensued on the 2006 assessment renewal and budget projections based upon different
98 funding levels. Prinsen reported that he is still working on raising the assessment ceiling working
99 with WACD. If we are not successful Prinsen suggested we would propose a revised split with
100 the forums and municipalities such that KCD would receive \$2 per parcel per year instead of the
101 current \$1 per parcel per year.

102 There is a Forum leadership meeting on January 6, 2005. Municipality and forum leaders will
103 present their vision for the use of assessment funding. The board discussed the strategy for the
104 meeting, and how to discuss the grant program in context of the District draft strategic plan.
105 Louise Miller will facilitate the meeting.

106 The draft CAO agriculture rule has been posted for public review. Individual board members
107 may comment on the draft until January 7, 2005 if they wish. Staff will be going to KC trainings;
108 the next one is on December 15 from 10-12pm at WSU Extension in Renton. A discussion
109 ensued.

110 Gelb had expressed concerns about the urban polling places for the 2005 Board of Supervisors
111 Election at the previous meeting. He said that he has gotten approval for the use of the lobby of
112 the new Seattle City Hall for the March 22 election. All other polling places will remain the same
113 as in prior years.

114 **Gelb moved, Wallace seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the change of the**
115 **Seattle area polling place from the UW Center for Urban Hort to the new Seattle City Hall,**
116 **601 Fifth Avenue for the 2005 Supervisor Election.**

117 As there was no NRCS staff present, there was no NRCS report.

118 The board discussed the recent WACD annual meeting held in Tacoma.

119 There is money in the budget for one person to attend the NACD meeting in Atlanta in February.

120 The "Office Fest" will be held on December 21 at noon, supervisors are invited. There will be a
121 gift exchange- \$5 limit.

122 Prinsen congratulated Gelb and Livengood for their awards as new supervisors at the recent
123 WACD meeting. It was mentioned that Prinsen received an award for best new supervisor.

124 B. Reed said that she needed the Board to authorize Prinsen to sign a contract with Cooke
125 Scientific Services for project monitoring

126 **Wallace moved, Livengood seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to authorize the Chair**
127 **to sign a contract with Cooke Scientific Services for project monitoring.**

128 **There being no more business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 pm.**

129

130

131 _____
Authorized Signature

_____ Date

132

133 Summary of Motions

134 Wallace moved, Livengood seconded, Passed Unanimously a motion to approve the
135 minutes as read for the November 2004 King Conservation District Board of Supervisors
136 meeting.

137 Cedar-Lake Washington-Sammamish Watershed Forum Grant Application

138 Wallace Moved, Livengood, Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the
139 Cedar-Lake Washington-Sammamish Watershed Forum non-competitive grant
140 application for \$40,000 from 2004 Assessments for the *Seattle Public Utilities 2005 Cedar*
141 *River Mainstem Chinook Redd & Carcass Surveys Project.*

142 City of Redmond Grant Application

143 _____ Moved, _____ Seconded; Passed a motion to approve the City of Redmond non-
144 competitive grant application for \$90,000 from 1998 – 2004 Assessments for the *City of*
145 *Redmond Salmon Friendly Water Conservation Demonstration Garden Project.*

146 This grant application was returned to the City of Redmond after the board determined
147 that there were too many substantive questions about the benefits of the project.

148 City of Seattle Grant Application Packet

149 Wallace Moved, Livengood Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of
150 Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$25,000 from 2003 Assessments for the *Seattle*
151 *Public Utilities maple Leaf Reach Restoration Project.*

152 Wallace Moved, Livengood Seconded; Passed unanimously a motion to approve the City of
153 Seattle non-competitive grant application for \$70,000 from 2003 Assessments for the *Seattle*
154 *Parks Department Luna Park Beach Restoration Project.*

155 Livengood Moved, Wallace Seconded; Passed a motion to endorse the City of Seattle non-
156 competitive grant application for \$50,000 from 2003 Assessments for the *City of Seattle*
157 *Cod-roof Demonstration Project, and approve it when a specific project has been identified.*
158 Gelb recused himself.

159 Wallace moved, Gelb seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the Draft
160 Workplan and Budget for 2005 for the King Conservation District.

161 Wallace moved, Gelb seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the amendments
162 to the King Conservation District Employee Handbook as presented to the Board.

163 Gelb Moved, Wallace Seconded, Passed Unanimously a motion to approve checks # 8211-
164 8258 in the amount of \$ 72,443.69 for the month of November 2004.

165 **Wallace Moved, Gelb Seconded, and Passed Unanimously a motion to accept the November**
166 **Finance Report as presented.**

167 **Gelb moved, Wallace seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to approve the change of the**
168 **Seattle area polling place from the UW Center for Urban Hort to the new Seattle City Hall,**
169 **601 Fifth Avenue for the 2005 Supervisor Election.**

170 **Wallace moved, Livengood seconded, Passed unanimously a motion to authorize the Chair**
171 **to sign a contract with Cooke Scientific Services for project monitoring.**

172 **The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 pm.**