

GMVUAC February 13, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Meeting Called to order – 7:00 pm

Members Present:

Steve Hiester	Hank Haynes
Peter Rimbo	Sue Neuner
Warren Iverson	Adam Sterling
Susan Harvey	Lorraine Blacklock
Rhys Sterling	

Members Absent:

Stephen Deutschman (proxy to Rhys)
Linda Harer (with notice, no proxy)
Teresa Sweet (with notice, no proxy)

Agenda:

Warren: Add OSS bill hearing, card for Dave Fields.

Peter: Add concurrency ordinance, but Susan will talk about it under committee reports, so there is no need.

Warren moved to approve agenda, Lorraine seconded.

Motion passed

January Meeting Minutes:

Sue: Does not actually attend CRC meetings, receives summary from husband.

Susan: Sent e-mail to Adam with correct spelling of names.

Peter moved to approve minutes, Lorraine seconded.

Motion passed

Public Comment Period: - 7:07 pm

Lisa Chase: HB 1692 is in the legislature, the bill would change marijuana processing to an agriculture classification, while right now it is not classified and no one knows what ordinances to apply. As agriculture, marijuana processing would be immune from public nuisance complaints about odors, any ordinances regarding hours of operation, etc. Encouraging people to write the legislature, bill is scheduled for a public hearing tomorrow.

Peter: Is it still in committee?

Lisa Chase: Yes, first public hearing is tomorrow, and would like it to die in committee.

Susan: It would treat production as agriculture? If under this category, can you not complain about odors?

Lisa Chase: Yes, because odors from agriculture are not considered nuisances if drifting onto other properties. Spokane taking a wait-and-see approach, 6-month moratorium on permits, but hundreds of complaints about odors. Homeowner asked for tax reduction for living across from marijuana production site, not in tax code, but board overturned earlier denial and gave 10% reduction in assessed value because of the odor and need to disclose when selling the property.

Warren: How many sponsors?

Lisa Chase: Nine in total. 6 Democrats and 3 Republicans. There are 15 members on the committee.

Lorraine: Who signed on?

Peter: Can look that up online. Is this the one about nuisance lawsuits?

Lisa Chase: No, that one has to do with composting as agriculture, nuisance not in the House bill.

Warren: What time is the hearing?

Lisa Chase: 8:30 tomorrow.

Warren: Should follow up on this. Regarding OSS management, the House bill has died, Senate bill is still alive but needs comments by tomorrow.

Guest Speaker:

John Taylor, Surface Water Management (SWM)

John: SWM fee increase authorized by King County (KC) Council in November of last year, going into effect this week. Here to provide refresher of why there is a storm water utility, because building stuff changes hydrology, more construction means more runoff instead of evaporation or soaking into the ground. 80% of rainfall in cities becomes runoff which impacts water quality (parking lots, pesticides, etc.), and enters urban creeks. This also impacts quantity of water, creates flash floods. One little creek can have as much water as Skagit river during heavy rains. Another problem is burst beaver dams. Roads act as storm water conveyance systems.

In preparing for the rate increase we looked at what needs to be addressed. \$27M in revenue annually, 1/4 will go to fixing pipes (both for roads and SWM) at \$4M over the biennium, 1/4 will go to supporting farmers and addressing flooding, 1/4 will go to habitat restoration and salmon recovery (matching grant funds), and the last 1/4 goes to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) compliance.

Another issue dealt with by the rate increase is that SWM has a good inventory of pipes under road, but the Roads division does not. \$335-500M cost range for replacing facilities in next 10 years, \$750-830M cost for next 100 years. The Executive proposed a \$258 fee, but passed fee is \$240.44, representing a 40% increase, and an additional \$8M per year, biggest chunk is going to facilities that

will fail within 10 years, we want to eliminate the backlog for things with a risk of failure.

Lisa Chase: Is the rate increase for every home in KC?

John: Just unincorporated KC, every city has their own SWM division and separate fees, this will be on everyone's property taxes next week.

Steve: How much runoff from Maple Valley comes into unincorporated areas (UA)?

John: Good question, Seattle public utilities has similar debates not wanting to pay. SWM is getting ready for the next federal grant, looking at ways of getting people to work better together to manage surface water.

Peter: Analogous to concurrency problem with roads and traffic.

John: It is a balkanized structure, everyone operating under permits that are uniform for each jurisdiction, the state is interested in getting people to work together but cities are not...

Warren: What about property with vacant lots?

John: That is the base fee for all private property, but different fee if commercial. Fees provide money for all other services, beavers, grants, etc.

Susan: What will happen to the beavers?

John: Sometimes crueller to relocate than to get rid of entirely. Really a greater population than is supportable.

Lorraine: What do you know about the UW project for pervious parking lots?

John: It works, and there are rate discounts for pervious surfaces. Low impact development tech has been used, first generation projects were mostly built in the '90s, but nobody knows how they will function over their life cycle. Pervious streets get clogged and no longer work as well without upkeep and vacuuming. They work well out of the gate, but need more maintenance.

Rhys: \$240 fee regardless of lot size? What about pervious versus impervious surfaces? Is it a uniform rate for residential? Any breaks for churches, etc.?

John: If residential, \$244 regardless of size, although Seattle does have a gradient system. No exemptions for churches, but there has been a push over the years for certain business. Can give discounts based on improvements to infrastructure. Hobart Community Church is charged as commercial, cannot really do enough to justify such improvements on a residential property, would cost more to build than it would save, but starting a pilot project with \$0.25M to find what level of cost share will encourage people to take action. Can legally cost-share up to 95% without running afoul of public gift laws even on private property.

Susan: Cost-share? Would Department of Ecology (DOE) get federal money?

John: Usually would take 50 years to recover cost, county would pay for most of the improvements. Grant funds come from other sources, usually a 50/50 match, then use that to leverage money from the legislature, DOE, etc. SWM not dependent on federal money. Most people recognize that anything we do to improve environment would be done by ourselves. Storm water is biggest thing killing Puget Sound, as sewage is usually only one-time events, whereas runoff is worse over the long run.

Lisa Chase: Isn't storm water runoff caused by development in general?

John: It is caused by everyone. 2.5 million people in KC, but infrastructure built in the

'70s that does not take runoff into consideration, need money to improve.

Warren: What about swales in roadside ditches, bioswells, etc.? Friend building house had to jump through hoops, runoff from roofs goes into gravel, is that something Hobart Community Church could do?

John: Dispersion is the cheapest, easiest way of managing storm water.

Peter: What are the Seattle rates?

John: \$470 is the average for all of the classes. Some cities increased SWM fees, some not on the same rate cycle, but all will probably go up next year or in 2018 when new NPDES permits come out.

Rhys: For the grant program, will there be an application process, competition for grants? Would in-kind contributions count?

John: 2-year period over which we will try to figure this out. There are many pilot projects, will report back to everyone by midyear next year. Let me know if you have any ideas.

Susan: Any reason why cities would set different values?

John: It depends on need, some have little rain and runoff, based also on reporting requirements for ecology, etc. Must inspect everything every 3 years, most concerned with catch basins because some have to get cleaned out all the time, also do business inspections.

Lorraine: Water filtering, would it retain oxygenation?

John: Most stuff built in county was to get water off of surfaces as fast as possible. The storm water manual first required flow control in the '90s, and first required water quality treatment in 2001-2002. Now must build something that controls flow and treats quality, such as swales. What kills oxygen is sulfur, phosphates, and nitrates, which cause algae to grow, which then can kill fish from lack of oxygen. Want water flowing out of lands without picking up metals, nutrients, etc.

Peter: Will you be involved in the water permitting study to address the Hirst decision? Heard there will be an 18-month study by DPER. Will there be public involvement, and will we get briefed? Council deadline? Is the legislature trying to do something?

John: Yes, only internal discussion at this point, but asked to free up time to support. Jim Simmons is knowledgeable about groundwater, we will be supporting Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER). Should be getting briefs, but not doing anything yet. Ivan is in charge of the whole effort, but there is no reason why you cannot get briefings, because the Hirst decision is discussed in the comprehensive plan. There is a deadline, but unsure when? We are currently tracking the legislature.

Warren: Does SWM support the Hirst decision? Drilling wells is a huge interest for the rural area.

John: Unsure, nor about our official stance on marijuana production or other issues.

Peter: Assume it would need to be researched first? But SWM does not have much money? We would like to know more about what happens, and would like to be involved.

Lisa Chase: Does SWM map ditches, etc.? Met someone doing that work, invited them to look at their stream, but they would not map it because it was on private land?

John: If they were mapping storm water systems they would only be mapping public

lands, not looking at private property. If there is a creek, it is on a map somewhere. Mostly concerned with where the pipes are, in a cooking oil spill last year, we were able to find the responsible party by tracing back pipe lines on a map. All pipes are required to be mapped by the end of 2017.

Hank: Are boats not an issue for Puget Sound wildlife? Would probability of damage to salmon vary by stage in life? Habitat recovery?

John: Salmon not usually harmed by boats, but take much more damage from storm water runoff.

Steve: Thanks again for rescheduling.

Warren, Rhys: Would like business cards, will contact with possible pilot projects.

John: Have done several presentations in communities, but no complaints yet. Did this early enough in the process to allow for public input, but nobody really opposed, well-accepted so far.

Susan: With the urban problem, is there any chance for reimbursement?

John: Will never get reimbursed for runoff from cities. To fix everything in KC to function the same as a "forest" would cost \$4-9 billion, most need is in Bellevue/Seattle, but they will probably come up with something at some point, and KC is prioritizing what they need to work on.

Peter: Regarding the Hirst decision, how do cities get involved when watersheds are in rural areas? Water needs to get down to aquifers.

John: Hirst is about the reliability and quantity of water over time, need to do more studies. Unsure how regional aquifers are affected.

Susan: Water in aquifer around Lake Retreat will reach Kent in 10 years, should be monitoring that now?

John: Will tell Ivan that GMVUAC has strong interest in Hirst response, would like to be briefed. A lot of people don't care, but we are doing best to make sure people know what the impacts are.

Warren: Need 5 acres to drill single family well, but can drill community well if smaller. A lot of lots approved by KC, people paying taxes on them, will be told at some point that they cannot drill a well, and will then be worthless. Has been paying taxes on property for 30 years.

John: We didn't do this, it was a Supreme Court ruling, and we are trying to figure out how to respond. It doesn't prohibit anyone from drilling a well, but would need to conduct studies first.

Peter: Will this study prevent drilling wells that were already exempted?

John: Unsure, might need to do individual studies.

Hank: A community well is still a possibility, can create a mini water district and do a common impact study?

Steve: But lots would need to be contiguous?

John: Don't know the answer, need to look more at the Hirst decision first, it was about untrammelled development.

Peter: There was a comprehensive plan update, an amendment looked like it would allow wells with some mitigation?

John: Right now the language is unclear, will come back with more concrete codes after research is done.

Council Business: - 8:05

Stewardship Letter Vote: Rhys Sterling

Rhys: We need to vote on whether to adopt the stewardship letter drafted by Peter.

Donna Brathovde: Did you get my comments?

Peter: Yes, Susan also had good comments about making the points more clear, can make an executive summary with bullet-point recommendations.

Rhys: Style and format can still be changed, but as far as content goes it is very well written. Sent it out to everyone.

Susan: This is an urban/rural buffer between Maple Valley and Black Diamond, has the stewardship committee involved those cities? They may not like hundreds of bikers and could contribute to our concerns. Craig Goodwin is knowledgeable about this area.

Donna Brathovde: There has been discussion about contacting Black Diamond, but their status is unstable. Those people should be coming to meetings, but we have not been reaching out to anyone as a committee.

Susan: Bring Tiger Mountain residents into the discussion? This very thing has happened to them, and they get no help from KC.

Donna Brathovde: Other places where mountain bikers are maxed out caused groups to set sights on Black Diamond Open Space, there is support in KC Council for mountain biking, has given them almost exclusive use of Black Diamond natural areas? Even though designated as multiuse? Goal should be to protect wildlife, but they want it to be like Duffy Hill. Real issue is not equestrian use, but that KC is not observing its own policies on urban/rural buffers, has already permitted mountain bike trails that go into wildlife corridors. Trails were built under an old DPER permit, and now they are building new trails.

Susan: Is nobody assigned for DPER?

Donna Brathovde: Community participation grant (CPG) proposals approved by parks, cannot figure out if they are getting new permits reviewed by DPER or based on an old permit. Special interest groups are being granted exclusive use of trails, equestrians can use Danville/Georgetown (8.5 miles of trails), not as much as mountain bikers use in Henry's Ridge, appear to be applying different criteria? Equity and social justice are county policies, requires county to look out for all people's interests, but parks is approving near exclusive use.

Lisa Chase: Trail etiquette usually states that bikes yield to everyone else?

Donna Brathovde: Not in Black Diamond Open Space or Duffy Hill, that only applies to one trail while everything else requires everyone to yield to bikers. Backcountry trails are through woods, mountain bike trails are winding and looping, less than 4% of property has any 4-acre sites not within sight of a bike trail.

Warren: Thanks for bringing this to our attention.

Donna Brathovde: Unfair to be subsidizing the activities of a private interest group.

Susan: Where are we at right now? Now trying to do a CPA?

Donna Brathovde: Kelly Heinz in charge, county started approving everything without overarching stewardship plan, now county saying we have to honor those permits, CPGs, partnered with Parks.

Peter: Website mentions doing CPA, but don't know when.

Donna Brathovde: County permit states that no more than 1% can be covered in trails, but by a conservative estimate, they have already exceeded that trail density on Black Diamond Open Space and Henry's Ridge, around 1.4%. If Herbrand property is included, the estimate comes down to 1.06% of the area. No room to build more trails and still adhere to the permit.

Susan: Real intent is to create a concentrated biking center, public is being misled, CPA should be based on anticipated end use, traffic impact, etc. Did not get that message at the meeting.

Donna Brathovde: Bikers clearly saying they want it to be a destination park with competitions, etc. It is passing the mark between passive and active recreation, because county reclassified it. Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance is the largest in country, does a lot of lobbying in Olympia.

Susan: Who is Kelly's boss?

Donna Brathovde: Kevin Brown is head of Parks.

Tom: Should try speaking with Bob Burns.

Peter: What is the role of the committee you're on? Does it include all factions?

Donna Brathovde: It started in November with two phases to the stewardship plan: forest health (pretty good plan), and recreation component (more controversies). Kelly Heinz is the coordinator, a representative from Backcountry Horsemen, a private homeowner of Rock Creek Ranch, the Washington Trails Association, the Maple Ridge Highlands community, a teacher from Tahoma High School, a student from Tahoma, my husband and myself, and several others. There is a paid lobbyist in the steering committee.

Tom: Not unusual for committees, lobbyists are everywhere...

Peter: What is your final product? When will you be finished?

Donna Brathovde: Goal is to create a plan for what recreation and where, but consensus is not going to happen. Kelly proposes setting future guidelines for future proposals to measure against criteria (for bike facilities, etc.). Meeting last week was the second, next we will be drafting a proposal to present to Parks, should be by spring. Kelly wants a forest management plan, no specific recommendations on recreation, but would like guidelines for any future proposals.

Peter: The draft letter we put together lists policies, but those already exist. Do you need to remake them?

Donna Brathovde: Trying to restate county policies in management plan.

Tom: Stewardship programs are on top of those policies, with momentum stewardship programs can push policies forward.

Susan: What is the deadline?

Donna Brathovde: February 28 is the deadline for public comment on the stewardship plan.

Rhys moved to approve the letter written by Peter, subject to formatting by Peter and Susan, Lorraine seconded.

Motion passed

Peter: Will reformat it and send it out tomorrow.

Susan: Will contact Black Diamond and Maple Valley, because nobody from city is involved.

Rhys: This does not preclude us from taking further action later on, but we are under a deadline for public comments.

Peter: Would like to know more about the CPA process.

Donna Brathovde: Will try to get that info from Kelly.

Rhys: Thank you for your work, and good luck, as many of these user groups don't appear to get along.

Hank: Any agreement between the groups on safety?

Donna Brathovde: No speed limit for mountain bikers, that's why hikers have to yield, and horses not allowed.

Peter: Request for agenda change because Tom is here, would like to give time for website overview.

Website: Peter Rimbos - 8:39

Tom: Linda was great as a design person, PR committee's role is important. Will need to figure out what to do if Linda is unavailable. Agreement last year with Peter is to move site to WordPress so technical knowledge not as necessary. It is an open source platform, and 25% of all websites are on WordPress. Objective for design requirements from June 2016 was to move all content from current website to WordPress, there were a few other objectives but that was the primary one. That was accomplished two weeks ago, but it is only the first step, can do many new things with WordPress. Four Creeks has been on WordPress for a few years now, the president handles all updates (agenda, calendar updates, etc.), president is not an IT person at all. Four Creeks is more of a service-oriented model, but GMVUAC is different. Understands that there are business reasons with Steve for not doing cutover yet, but can change websites in less than 24 hours, question is whether February 18 is an important date, as that is when payment renewal is required. Linda did a good job of redesigning the homepage.

Steve: What would be the reason for not cutting over now?

Tom: None, should get \$120 refund. Steve renewed early, but can ask Network Solutions to get that back. Current site visitors prior to June is less than 2 visitors per month, so cutover would be easy. Why not switch over now? Everything is ready to go. Assuming a cutover on Friday, one objective is to allow committees to handle their own pages, but not yet ready to do customization for each page. PR committee is critical because you decide what image to present, but might want to do design work first (font, sidebars, etc.), could take a year to figure out. Only need to decide now whether to do the cutover, lots of links are in place that don't go anywhere yet (e-mail account, signup for updates, etc.), it is for the council to decide.

Hank: Is there a way to encourage people to come to meetings rather than just contact by e-mail? Any way to have the area map in folders?

Tom: Current site has the most current map produced in October as a thumbnail, can

click on it to get a high-resolution map jpeg, link to atlas map up to 700 dpi.
That's a challenge for the PR committee.

Rhys: That's more up to Linda, we just want to know whether Tom's work is done, and we can decide the other stuff later.

Tom: Can cutover at any point, will still provide tech support down the road, but managing content will be up to the council and not Tom. Website currently in a form where you can manage content without worrying about design tech.

Rhys: Not concerned with getting \$120 for renewal back when we still have policy decisions to make. Doesn't want to be forced into an arbitrary deadline.

(argument ensues and Tom storms out)

(Tom later unilaterally destroyed all of the data in his possession related to the new website. This data was the property of the GMVUAC and represented many hours of work from both Linda and Peter. As a result, the GMVUAC will now have to hire a web designer and remake the new site from scratch.)

Peter: Updates will be made on the new website. Will have no problems, has been working with Tom. Doesn't care about cutover date, but keeping both means requiring more work.

Steve: The whole point is that we don't need to do the cutover today.

Rhys: Would like a transition period, because once we convert it's done.

Sue: I think people would like a training session?

Peter: Currently working with Tom to write procedures for adding updates, should be easy without training.

Adam: There's only 2 people accessing the site per month as it is, so we should keep this in perspective. Switching over now would not adversely affect anyone.

Steve: Will need to alleviate Tom of having to do updates, if we don't do it now it'll drag on forever.

Warren: Should we just keep it another 2 months?

Steve: We can the cutover at any time.

Peter: Will mention to Tom that we would like a 1-2 month transition period with both sites up, will send everyone procedures. There is a test site for figuring out how to do this. Tom has backed up all the data in case of any loss.

Susan: Has the \$120 renewal fee already been paid? (Yes)

Card to Dave Fields: Warren Iverson - 9:10

Warren: Dave Fields was a member of the GMVUAC for many years, came to Hobart in 1989, was a real estate appraiser and short-story writer, among many other things. Dave died of a heart attack, there should be a funeral at Tahoma National Cemetery because he is a veteran. Had several close calls leading up to his death, was involved with the fire department, and they took the news of his death hard. Will inform you when something comes up for Voice of Valley.

Onsite Sewage System Bills: Warren Iverson

Warren: OSS legislature proposal HB 1632 died last week, SB 5281 companion bill is alive and well supported, scheduled for executive session tomorrow. The bill would eliminate the requirement for OSS monitoring contracts for house building permits, eliminate the requirement for dedicated easements for access to OSS, and must not exclude repair to OSS to previous functioning state. Many septic drain fields from 30 years ago easy to damage. HB 1348 and HB 1349 prioritize human use of water to counteract Hirst decision. Please support these bills and contact the Senate members for SB 5281.

Peter: Cannot tell from COOMWA pamphlet what the specific language of the bill is. What three provisions are added by the legislation?

Adam: Can look the bill text up online.

Rhys: It is a very extensive bill, creates a more manageable system.

Peter: Not voting on it today, can bring it up next month if the bill is still alive

Concurrency Ordinance E-mail Vote: Peter Rimbos

Peter: Susan and Peter sent questions to KCDOT, received answers, don't see any reason to make comments on concurrency ordinance, as the real problem is Regional Concurrency.

Committee Reports: - 8:22 pm

Reports postponed until next meeting.

Hank passed around information on boat damage to salmon.
Closed executive budget meeting moved to next month.

Chair adjourned meeting.

Meeting Adjourned – 9:34 pm