



# CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

For the Department of Environmental Services

Regular Meeting Summary  
**Wednesday, March 6, 2013**  
**6:30 PM – 8:30 PM**  
**Public Service Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Training Room**  
**1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver**

**Members Present:** Jim Carlson, Don Moe, David Morgan, Nancy Olmsted, Susan Rasmussen, Art Stubbs, Virginia van Breemen

**Members Absent:** Troy Maxcy, Brian Peck

**Staff Present:** Bobbi Trusty, Ron Wierenga

**Partner Agency Staff Present:** None

**Public Present:** None

**I** ROLL CALL

The January 9, 2013 meeting summary was approved as submitted

**II** PUBLIC COMMENT – feedback

None

**III** Clean Water Commission – Communications with the Public

Ms. Olmsted and Mr. Carlson provided an overview of the Clean Water Commission at the Watershed Stewards Workshop. Clean Water Program funding was part of the discussion and the feedback received for a restructure of the fee to address the programs funding issues was very positive. Ms. Olmsted suggested utilizing the Stewards network to extend the commissions reach into the community for outreach opportunities.

Ms. Rasmussen shared that a 120 acre tree farmer let her know that he received a nasty letter and picture of his property from the Vegetation Management folks last year. The farmer was frustrated because in order to get the picture of the tansy, they would have to go through a gate and onto his property. The farmer didn't want to spray because of the baby trees, but was told to get rid of the tansy or get fined. Out of frustration, the farmer took drastic measures to remove the tansy by mowing them down along with the trees.

**IV** Clean Water Commission 2012 Annual Report

The commissioners discussed the report and the length of time that it would take to start collecting an increased fee should the Board of County Commissioners increase the fees.

**Motion 2013-03**

Mr. Morgan made a motion to accept the 2012 Annual Report with the modifications discussed. Mr. Stubbs seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed.



## CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

For the Department of Environmental Services

**V** 2013 Topics of Interest

This topic was tabled until the May meeting.

**VI** Discuss 2011-2012 CWP Budget Summary

Mr. Wierenga reviewed an informational Q and A Budget Handout. The Commissioners thought that the handout provided good information and discussion. They asked that Mr. Wierenga edit the handout per the discussion and distribute it back to them for their use.

Mr. Wierenga also gave an update on the Programs legal issues:

- In the Federal Clean Water Act case, the judge lifted the stay on the case so now the lawsuit can proceed. The Plaintiffs filed a motion asking for a partial summary judgment. The county filed an argument against that. The judge is now reviewing the case. Mr. Wierenga reminded the commission that the county is still working under the judge's injunction precluding the approval of stormwater plans that don't meet the state's flow control standard.
- In the State Appeal case, the Supreme Court judge denied our petition to review the case and now the county options are exhausted. The county will work with the Washington State Department of Ecology to see what needs to happen next.

**VII** PUBLIC COMMENT – feedback

None

**VIII** ADJOURN – 08:38PM

Summary provided by: Bobbi Trusty / 360-397-2121 x 5268



# CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

For the Department of Environmental Services

Monthly Staff Update – via email

**Date:** March 6, 2013

**Division:** Policy and Planning

**Staff Name:** Ron Wierenga **Email:** ron.wierenga@clark.wa.gov **Phone:** 360-397-2121x4264

## **TOPIC 1: 2011-2012 Biennial Budget Review, Frequently Asked Questions**

*Note: This document was prepared for discussion purposes only as a way to stimulate thinking about program finances. Commissioners are encouraged to ask additional questions of staff to help develop their understanding and opinion of how the program collects and spends money.*

### **What were the Clean Water fund revenue totals for the last budget cycle? What were the sources of revenue and amounts?**

- Total revenue was \$12,024,515. Sources were as follows:
  - Clean Water Program Fee \$9,878,671
  - Grants \$1,246,256
  - Transfers \$271,000
  - Other Revenue \$628,588

### **What was the total Clean Water fund expenditure for the last budget cycle?**

- The total expenditure was \$16,274,981

### **How was the difference in revenue and expenditures accounted for in 2011-12?**

- In order to continue providing core services, the county used Clean Water Fund balance to make up for the revenue shortfall.

### **How much was spent on salary and benefits? What is the authorized staffing for the program currently?**

- Total expenditure for salary and benefits was \$3,760,027, which includes other departments' staff providing various core services, including capital project delivery. The total authorized staffing for the Clean Water Program is 18 with 4 vacant positions that were approved in 2012. The Clean Water Fund is used to partially support approximately 80 staff members in other departments, which is a way to limit program staffing while continuing to provide services.

### **How much was spent to meet NPDES municipal stormwater permit requirements?**

- Total expenditure on permit mandated activities was \$13 million.

### **How much was spent on other required activities such as indirect, overhead, legal fees, etc?**

- Total expenditure on county-required activities was \$2 million.





proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY  
WASHINGTON

# CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

## For the Department of Environmental Services

### How much was spent on other stormwater management activities and what services were provided?

- Total expenditure on other activities was \$1.2 million, including water quality monitoring in streams and watershed assessments, such as the Vancouver Lake Partnership.

### What is the current balance of the Clean Water Fund?

- The estimated investable fund balance was \$470,000 at the end of January 2013.

### What is the estimated Clean Water Fund balance at the end of this biennium?

- All of the available fund balance was included in revenue projections to support the adopted budget, so essentially zero.

### How much was spent on each core service area of the program?

- Service area expenditures in the last biennium were as follows:
  - Program administration \$1.9 million (12%)
  - Stormwater capital projects \$6 million (37%)
  - Customer service \$55,000 (< 1%)
  - Education and outreach \$840,000 (5%)
  - Environmental review \$1.1 million (7%)
  - Inventory and monitoring \$2 million (12%)
  - Maintenance \$3.8 million (24%)
  - Planning and policy \$400,000 (2%)

### What activities are included in program administration?

- Much of the program administration expense is required by the county. About 60% of the program administration expense goes to countywide indirect, department overhead, and county land/building rent. Payments are also made for risk insurance and to the Treasurer to collect the Clean Water Fee. Another 30% is spent on staff time for managers and office staff, as well as training for program staff. The rest of the expense is for supplies and services; like pencils, copiers, computers, cell phones, vehicles, etc.

### How many capital projects were built in 2011-12?

- Twelve total, not including several tree planting projects on county-owned land.

### What core services are provided in 'environmental review'?

- County staff in multiple departments provides code enforcement, facility maintenance inspection and technical assistance, erosion and sediment control inspection, code implementation support, business and residential water quality complaint response, and pollution source control inspections for businesses.

### How does the maintenance spending compare to previous budget cycles?

- Maintenance expenditures in 2011-2012 were about \$3.8 million, compared to about \$2.3 million in each of the previous two budget cycles. Costs are increasing due to several factors, including a growing facility inventory, aging infrastructure, and permit-required timelines for addressing maintenance deficiencies.

*End of summary*

