

**Joint Basin Technical Committee
Meeting Summary
July 9, 2014**

In attendance:

1. April Sanders, staff to Supervisor Lambert
2. Brian Murray, King County
3. Brian Ward, City of Bellevue
4. Clint Loper, King County
5. Kathy Minsch, City of Seattle
6. Jeanne Justice, City of Redmond
7. Mike Mactutis, City of Kent
8. Ron Straka, City of Renton
9. Monica Walker, King County

Budget Updates

Brian provided an overview of the 2014 preliminary budget captured in three documents:

- 1) FCD Preliminary Draft 2015 CIP New Appropriation Request
- 2) FCD Financial Plan: 2015 Preliminary Draft
- 3) 2015 Preliminary Draft Operating Budget – FCD

Brian first discussed the FCD Preliminary Draft 2015 CIP New Appropriation Request (Document # 1) and The FCD Financial Plan: 2015 Preliminary Draft (Document #2). He noted that Document #1 now includes an explanation of each project which is in response to Advisory Committees requests and questions.

Comments/Questions

- Clarification was needed on the Corridor Plan Implementation 1, 2, 3,... projects which are line items on the Draft 2015 CIP New Appropriations Request spreadsheet.
 - Brian clarified by stating that these projects are not meant to specify which basin the implementation will take place in, but are placeholders for when the board decides which projects move forward. Once a decision is made by the board, a new project will be established in the appropriate basin and funding will then be moved into that project and basin.
- It was then asked why there are 5 implementation projects instead of 1 large project; it seems to correlate with the 5 basins.
 - Brian stated that the 5 projects are based on the resources we have now and how many projects we could deliver in the 6 year CIP window. We have the capacity to implement 2 large projects through construction and begin on 3 more. Brian will add explanation to the spreadsheet that these are placeholders for projects that are not yet defined.
- Clarification was needed on how the total capital expenditures on the CIP list relate to the financial plan.

- The “grand total” on the CIP corresponds to the “New Capital Appropriation” line on the financial plan.
- The financial plan shows a cash balance (assuming a capital program expenditure rate) and a budgetary fund balance (which assumes a 100% expenditure rate).
- Regarding the Willowmoor project, there was a question on why the qualifiers in the comments section of Document #1.
 - Brian explained that this was because of the relatively low flood risk priority of the project. The funding can be put into design work to match the Redmond Opportunity Fund up to 30%, then the board will decide if it will authorize more FCD funding or pursue grants for construction. BTC members recommended that this explanation be revised to be more clear, and that this project be highlighted in the Advisory Committee discussion since it is unique in not assuming any construction funding at this time.
- On Document #1, the Cedar River Gravel Removal Project needs revised language in the comments section. Ron will provide the updated language.
- It was noted that the description for Russell Rd Upper needs to be changed to show 3 feet freeboard above the predicted *500-year* flood event. It was also noted that this change is a big added value in terms of protection, but not cost.

Commitments/Actions

- Brian will add explanation to Document #1 regarding the 5 Corridor Implementation Projects to clarify that this includes 2 projects through to construction and 3 through design. (complete)
- Revised language changes to the Cedar River Gravel Removal Project and the Russell Road Upper project. (complete)

Brian discussed document #3, the Preliminary Draft Operating Budget. Text columns were added to help explain the ILA category and highlight changes since 2014.

Comments/Questions

ILA Category 1: “Annual Maintenance and Technical Services”

- Add “countywide” to the key changes: “...rather than 4 year cycle countywide.”
- In the same category, specify “maintenance” costs: “...Black River Pump Station maintenance costs...” It was also noted that since a significant portion of the budget is for maintenance, it may just be identified in the category description.
- Brian will clarify sediment removal and fuel costs and which activities are operational and which are capital.

ILA Category 2: “Planning, Communications, and Grants”

- It was asked if funding CRS activities began under the “River Improvement Fund”.

- Yes, it began under the RIF and continued under the FCD. It was also clarified that a portion of staff time (approximately 150 hours in 2015) is related to compliance work specific to King County's CRS rating.
- It was noted that staff should be prepared to describe why King County maintains a Class 2 instead of a Class 5 which has less required documentation/time.
- It was also noted that there are things that King County does that the cities could benefit from – standardized templates, etc. would be helpful to the smaller jurisdictions.
- The King County CRS User's Group was discussed briefly; the intent of the group is to find efficiencies and means to benefit each other. It was also noted that it is important to state that our communities get points for actions they are already doing, regardless of the CRS program. The purpose is to be strategic about regional flood risk reduction activities, taking credit or "points" where appropriate and avoid "chasing points" that are not worth the time and effort.
 - The City of Redmond is in the preliminary stages of entering the CRS Program. Monica will forward information regarding the CRS User's Group to Jeanne Justice.

ILA Category 3: "Flood Hazard Studies and Mapping"

- It was noted that this work could inform city CAO updates if new hazard mapping were available in 2015.
- It was asked what the flood viewer is.
 - The Flood Viewer is a pilot effort on the Cedar River that takes data from FIS and makes a more user friendly web interface. You can see areas of flooding with various parameters chosen. This pilot effort is currently under review with the Executive Committee.
- It was asked what Floodplain maps are being used for the flood viewer.
 - The Flood Viewer uses Best Available Information rather than FEMA Maps.
- There was support from the group for this type of tool, noting that the more information we can get to the public about hazards, the better. It was also mentioned that we have to be careful that the information is accurate and credible.
- Brian will forward the National Weather System example from the State of Iowa with the same concept.
- It was asked which basin will be next.
 - Yet to be determined. Cedar River Pilot is under discussion with Executive Committee now.
- It was asked if flood photos will be included. This helps to show what a flood looked like in a given location.
 - The Flood Viewer model and the photos together give a better picture of the flood issue. Makes sense to connect the two, though they are not currently proposed to be combined into one tool.

ILA Category 4: "Flood Prep, FWC, Post Flood"

There were no questions or comments on this category

ILA Category 5: “Finance, Budget, Admin”

There were no questions or comments on this category

ILA Category 6: “Program Implementation”

- It was asked if the HPA for large wood is for the Cedar River only.
 - The HPA is focused on the Cedar but comes up in multiple areas so there will be a programmatic HPA. This is being scoped now and looking to go countywide.
- It was asked what the Farm-Flood-Fish (FFF) task force is.
 - The FFF task force is a county Comprehensive Plan policy called for to create a stakeholder group and create a process. The Rivers Section (and the Flood Control District) are participants in that group.

ILA Category 7: “Total Overhead – Combined County, Department and Division”

Brian noted that the insurance costs are likely to decrease so the costs in this category are likely to decrease by about \$120,000.

- A question was asked about the burden rate and what is the overhead rate King County is charging.
 - Brian will provide a breakdown of the overhead.
- There are 42 positions currently (mix of FTE and TLT). It was asked in terms of reimbursing the operating budget from capital, how many positions does that equate to – how many FTE’s are on capital 2014 vs 2015.
 - Brian will get the number. (see below)
- It was mentioned that the term “loan-out” was confusing.
 - The term will be changed to “billable time”
- It was asked if the Service Provider Evaluation is looking at the capacity of the grant program. There is more work, with the now three grants programs, and thus a decreased ability to process and manage the grants. Was this evaluated when the new grant program was added?
 - The Service Provider Evaluation looks at the capacity to carry out the overall work program for the District, so this will be included.
- A question was asked about staffing under discussion with the Executive Committee. Brian described staffing capacity analyses for 2014 and subsequent discussions with FCD staff. The staffing proposal under discussion with the Executive Committee is intended to help stabilize workloads to reasonable levels for contract administration, infrastructure maintenance, and grant development. This is related to an item identified in the 2015 budget overview document discussed with the Advisory Committee, where it was noted that two temporary positions are currently scheduled to end in the first quarter of 2015. (note: the Executive Committee unanimously recommended the 2014 budget revision for these positions on 7/9; the full Board will consider this recommendation on 7/21).

Commitments/Actions

- Brian will forward examples of the Flood Level Viewer from the [National Weather Service](#) and the [State of Iowa](#).
- Brian will provide a breakdown of the overhead (breakdown by account is under review and will be sent separately).
- Brian will revise the operating budget document to resolve the “reimbursement from capital” line. This is a technical budgeting issue, and it is more clear and consistent to incorporate the reimbursement into the appropriate ILA category so that the differences between 2014 and 2015 are more clear.
- Brian will provide information on the allocation of staff to capital and operating projects and programs. (See below, based on preliminary draft work program). This reflects an increase of approximately 3,200 hours billed to the capital fund compared to the 2014 staff allocation. The preliminary draft 2015 staff allocation is:

Fund	Hours	Positions	% of Billable Time
Capital	31,261	15	44%
Operating	40,139	27	56%
Total	71,400	42	100%