



SPOKANE COUNTY
AIR POLLUTION
CONTROL AUTHORITY

WEST 1101 COLLEGE, SUITE 403 ♦ SPOKANE, WA 99201 ♦ (509) 477-4727 Fax (509) 477-6828

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

June 2, 2005 9:00 a.m.

SPOKANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING
LOWER LEVEL HEARING ROOM

PRESENT WERE:

Michele Pope
Commissioner Harris
Matthew Pederson
Mike Brewer

STAFF:

Eric Skelton, Director
Barbara Nelson, Finance & Personnel Admin.
Lisa Woodard
Crystal Alford
Michelle Wolkey, General Counsel

WORK SESSION: There was no work session of the board meeting.

BOARD MEETING: The board meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

Public Concerns

There were no public concerns.

401 Plan Annual Fee – Michelle Wolkey

Michelle Wolkey, SCAPCA General Counsel, explained that the way employees pay into their retirement plan is different from other organizations. Because of its public entity status and a past elective process, employees don't pay regular Social Security or FICA. Instead, in 1985, a two-tiered deferred compensation program was set up. The employees pay the percentage that equals what they would have paid under Social Security into a 457 plan and SCAPCA pays its portion into a 401 plan. When the Board approved this approach in 1985, it gave specific direction that any expenses associated with the administration of the plan would be paid out of the SCAPCA portion as a pro rata distribution among the employees. Between 1985 and 1993, there was no plan fee so it wasn't an issue. In 1993, the plan administrator, ICMA Retirement Corporation, notified SCAPCA that because the participants in the plan and the plan assets had increased significantly, ICMA had to reevaluate the expenses associated with the administration of the plan. ICMA concluded it would charge a \$1,000 annual fee for plan administration and a \$25 per participant fee. The per-participant fee has been consistently paid by the employees, out of their accounts. The \$1,000 fee has been paid by SCAPCA directly and not allocated out to the employees.

The Washington's Constitution has a provision that precludes any increase in salary or compensation to an employee after the work has already been provided (i.e., gift of public funds). That's what occurred in each plan year in which employees in effect, were given an extra \$1,000 distributed among all of them. However, the Board could, at this point, make the payment of the plan administration fee a part of the employees' compensation and then it won't be after the fact.

Michele Pope asked if it was possible to say that the \$11,000 paid to date is something that was done in the past that the Board now approves of, but going forward, there's a change in how the fee is paid for the future. Michelle Wolkey replied that the Board could adopt a new resolution, making a change from this day forward. Going back, there are two options. One is to do nothing and accept that the past practice was done in error. Second, we'd have to go back, which would be an accounting nightmare, and try and reallocate how that money should have gone to all of those employees, some of which don't work for SCAPCA anymore. Mike Brewer offered his opinion that it would be better for the SCAPCA simply to accept the past costs. In going back and trying to reconstruct the allocation, we'd spend \$11,000 in payroll trying to figure it out. Michele Pope asked if we need a motion. Michelle Wolkey suggested this could be handled as an action item at the next board meeting. Eric Skelton stated that since the plan was originally set up by a resolution in 1985, it should be handled as an amendment by a new resolution. Michelle Wolkey concurred that going forward, we want a new resolution so that we have documentation and then asked with respect to the past dollars that have been paid, if we wanted to address that issue in the resolution. Eric replied that this issue could be addressed as one of the "whereas's" in the new resolution. Michelle Wolkey offered to develop a resolution for action by the Board at the next meeting. Eric asked for direction from the Board as to whether SCAPCA will continue to pay the administration fee as part of employee compensation or whether the Board wanted the employees to start paying the fee. If the employees are to start paying the fee, should each employee pay an equal portion or should it be pro-rated in accordance with employee salaries? Matthew Pederson stated that he would be in favor of having the employees pay their portion and pro-rating it in accordance to their salaries. Michele Pope stated that she would be in favor of having employees pay for it, but was uncertain if it should be contingent upon their salaries. Eric added that one reason for making it pro-rata depending on the salaries, is that higher salaried employees receive a higher contribution each month into that account than lower salaried employees. In response to Board comments, Eric stated we would prepare a resolution for the next board meeting that reflects a pro-rata contribution.

Executive Session of the Board

The Board went into executive session, pertaining to matters of potential litigation at 9:20 a.m. for approximately 15 minutes. The Board Meeting resumed at 9:35 a.m. Eric Skelton stated that the outcome from the executive session is that the staff and our attorney will pursue a legal recourse regarding abuse of the SCAPCA web site.

Report Back on Outdoor Burning Surveillance – Crystal Alford

Crystal Alford gave an overview of the staff work that was done last fall and this spring with increased outdoor burning surveillance. She recounted the fact that in July of last year, the Board directed staff to increase surveillance, with respect to a field presence on the weekends in the fall. This increased surveillance was based on a concern expressed by a member of the public about smoke impacts in his neighborhood from outdoor burning. This resident lived northwest of Colbert, in an area where the lots are five acres or more and in forested areas. There was some concern expressed by Board Members that there was illegal burning occurring outside the eight-day designated spring yard and garden burn period and that a lot of it was occurring during the weekends when there wasn't a staff field presence. To address these concerns, staff proposed working five weekend days in the fall to see what kind of burning (e.g., yard & garden, silviculture, legal, illegal) was occurring.

In the fall of 2004, the staff worked eleven weekend days in the field. There were 45 fires observed and 34 of those fires were silvicultural in nature, falling under the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Eleven fires fell under SCAPCA jurisdiction (i.e., not silviculture related) and of those eleven fires, the staff issued six Notices of Violations (NOV) for illegal burning. In the spring, the staff worked 14 weekend days and observed 41 fires that fell under the DNR burning program and 37 under SCAPCA's program. The staff issued 18 NOVs for illegal burning in the spring. Twelve of the NOVs were issued during the designated spring yard and garden waste burning days and six were issued during the other weekend days, outside of the burn season. During both the fall and the spring, the field staff stopped and talked to people that were either suspected of burning or were known to have been burning and provided educational materials on how and when to burn correctly.

The amount of time spent on weekend outdoor burning surveillance, over the spring and fall seasons, translated into 264 hours total comp time accrued. This was time that could not be spent on other key programs that SCAPCA would have otherwise focused on during normal business hours. Our conclusions were that the majority of burning observed during October and November did not fall under SCAPCA's burn program, as it was forest debris (silvicultural) burning. There were very few illegal fires discovered for the amount of time spent on surveillance in the fall. There were six NOVs issued in the fall as the result of 129 hours spent looking for illegal fires.

The staff's recommendation was to continue with eight or more days of weekend surveillance in the spring and discontinue the surveillance in the fall. One more idea discussed was how best to address public concerns about smoke impacts. SCAPCA could request that DNR impose more restrictive requirements in their written burning permits in smoke sensitive areas, such as smaller pile size, requiring fires to be put out at the end of the day, and burning one pile at a time. The Advisory Council concurred with these recommendations and further recommended that portable air monitors be placed in smoke sensitive areas to measure the fine particulate levels from smoke impacts. Their thinking was that if we measured fine particulate matter in levels that would trigger impaired air quality, then SCAPCA could restrict burning in those areas until such a time as the air quality returned to an improved level.

Eric requested the Board's guidance in two specific areas. The first one being whether the Board concurred, based on our experience with weekend burning surveillance in the fall, it's

not worthwhile incurring overtime and compensatory time accrual to continue fall burning surveillance. Secondly, whether the Board agreed to establishing portable air monitoring capability in high smoke impact areas.

Michele Pope asked, in regard to the spring burn season, how many staff were involved prior to last year and whether that included weekends. Crystal Alford replied, in the spring, SCAPCA has always performed weekend surveillance because we have our yard and garden burn season going on. In addition, there has been surveillance on a few weekend days before the designated burn weekend and a few weekend days afterward. It's usually at least eight weekend days, but in the spring of 2005 we had 14 weekend days of surveillance. Michele Pope asked if on those 14 weekend days staff only issued six NOVs. Crystal replied, in the fall we issued six NOVs and in the spring we issued 18 total, six of those 18 occurring on days that were not burn days. Eric interjected that the inspectors could have issued many more NOVs. They saw many oversized piles, prohibited material, etc., but didn't issue an NOV every time they saw an illegal fire. Crystal stated that our practice has been if it doesn't seem to be a particularly flagrant violation (e.g., someone who had two fires burning when it should only be one pile), the staff would give a verbal warning and provide brochures which explained the guidelines. The staff probably could have issued at least twice as many violations just during those designated burn days, if we wanted to strictly enforce the program.

Mike Brewer stated that he was in favor of discontinuing the fall surveillance but look further into setting up an air monitoring program in smoke sensitive areas. Michele Pope stated that SCAPCA should discontinue the fall surveillance and go back to the eight days of spring surveillance but don't pursue an air monitoring program for smoke sensitive areas. She stated that the DNR is doing a good job and we live in an area where silvicultural burning simply is what's going to happen. If a person buys a house in five-acre lot areas, smoke is something they're going to have to deal with. Matthew Pederson stated he agreed with discontinuing added surveillance, but would like to see cost figures on a monitoring system for smoke sensitive areas. Michele Pope cautioned that every time we add a program, we are adding a cost at a time when the budget is tight the way it is with a deficit looming in the future. Instead, we should concentrate our efforts on programs that matter the most and in areas that matter the most. Matthew reiterated that he would like to look at financial figures before deciding on the monitoring program. Eric offered to bring the financial information back at a future board meeting.

COLA Distribution – Barbara Nelson

This was a follow up item from a previous meeting's discussion about the distribution of a cost-of-living adjustment for FY-06. Barbara Nelson presented spreadsheets, showing the effect of giving a flat COLA (i.e., a COLA in which each employee receives the same dollar amount) as opposed to a 2% COLA, given as a percentage of salary. It was pointed out that employees on the lower end of the salary scales come out considerably better with the flat rate COLA. For example, for the employee receiving the lowest salary, rather than receiving about a \$600 annual pay increase, based on a percentage, would instead have \$1,085 added to their annual salary. As a consequence, there would be compaction within the 8-step system. All of the steps within the current salary scales are separated by 4% increments. If a flat amount is

added to each step, the percentage between steps is compacted and over a number of years, the compaction increases. There would also be similar compaction between promotional positions.

Commissioner Harris stated that the intent of a flat rate COLA is to reward the people down at the lower end of the salary scales for the hard work they do, to the same degree as the people at the top. He stated he has always had a problem with compensating higher salaried employees with a greater COLA than what is given to lower paid employees. He pointed out that the way to solve how this approach might mess up the salary scales is to make it a one time pay event as a lump sum added to each employee's paycheck and next year we'll be back dealing with it again in whatever way the Board wants to do it at that time. He stated his intent was to see that the PFC (i.e., the lowest paid employee) gets the same amount as the General (i.e., the highest paid employee) because the PFC on the day-to-day basis is working harder and doing more. The only thing the General does is take the heat. That's what he's paid for, compensated to take the heat.

Commissioner Harris went on to state that according to his first glance at the pay scale, it looks like there is way too much management staff for the number of employees at SCAPCA. When administrative costs or management costs cumulative total is more than the worker bees, there's a problem. That's how businesses go broke. Eric Skelton stated that as a member of management, he would like to respond. He pointed out that if you look on the surface, having five managers may appear to be management heavy. But, in SCAPCA's case all five managers, myself included, do much more than just strictly manage. We all do mid-level work as well. Using Barbara Nelson (Finance and Personnel Administrator) as an example, Eric pointed out that in addition to supervising the clerical staff, Barbara handles all budgetary and personnel actions. Eric added that he could make similar examples with all of the other managers and that SCAPCA was benefiting by a lot of work from each manager, in addition to just managing.

Commissioner Harris replied by stating, "I have to tell you (Eric), I don't think you do your job half the time." He recounted an example from several years ago where Eric was asked to go out and look at a situation involving Goodrich Corporation, when they were having problems building the plant. Commissioner Harris stated that the Board told Eric to go out there and talk to them, but he never did go. He also stated that he didn't want anybody to think he was picking on the management staff, pointing out that he also is in management and puts in more hours every week than any of his employees and that's why he's compensated for it. He reiterated that he felt strongly that compensation, putting bread on the table, is just as important at the lower echelon as it is at the top echelon. The Secretary II is not a member of the Spokane Club, but somebody on the management team may be. He admonished Eric for getting a little testy and then reminded Eric that he was only in his position at the pleasure of the Board and if he wanted more money, he should look somewhere else.

Eric Skelton requested Board action on the COLA item. Commissioner Harris moved to go with a flat (i.e., same dollar amount for each employee) COLA, as either a flat adjustment to regular pay or as a one-time pay event to achieve that objective. Matthew Pederson seconded it. Michele Pope asked if Commissioner Harris was saying the flat rate would be a one-time increase in pay. Commissioner Harris stated he doesn't have a problem with which way it goes, it's just that there is a certain dollar amount the way it is calculated. It came out at \$1,085.60 a

year as a flat amount for each employee. If we incorporate the flat amount into the salary structure, there's some concern about how it throws the step increases out of tilt. Commissioner Harris reiterated he was okay with giving the COLA as a one-time pay event, which is legal to do. His objective is to see that the people down at the low end of the salaries, for once in their life get the same amount of money as management. He restated his motion is to award a \$1,085.60 pay increase to each SCAPCA employee by whatever methodology works the best either as a one-time pay event or as a monthly breakdown, even though that approach affects the step increases. Barbara, by way of clarification, asked if the salary scales would remain unchanged and if current employees would then receive this amount as a one-time increase in compensation. Matthew Pederson answered "yes". Motion passed unanimously.

Minutes of the May 5, 2005 Board Meeting

Michele Pope moved to approve the May 5, 2005, board meeting minutes and Commissioner Harris seconded it. Motion passed with Michele Pope, Commissioner Harris and Matthew Pederson approving and the one abstention being Mike Brewer.

Public Information/Education Update

Lisa Woodard highlighted a few items during the month of May. We hosted an "Air Quality & Meteorology" teacher workshop for 20 attendees at Gonzaga University with NOAA and KXLY. We are underway getting all of our programs set up for summer. Summer is the time of year we do our "It All Adds Up To Cleaner Air" campaign. We have approximately 70 work sites signed up this year to implement the program at their work sites, reaching about 40,000 employees. We have partnering gas stations on board and have printed gas toppers and other materials that will be at gas stations this summer reminding people that when they are refueling, not to top off, tighten gas caps and take other actions that will reduce ozone forming vapors during the summer.

Activity Report for April

The activity report for April was skipped over.

Voucher Approval for May \$152,409.04

Mike Brewer moved to approve the May 2005 vouchers and Michele Pope seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

Income/Expense Statement for Period Ending April 2005

Eric Skelton stated that the statement reflected being through 10 months of the fiscal year. There is nothing specific to point out unless there were any questions. There were no questions.

Resolution 05-12 – Adopt FY-06 Budget (Public Hearing)

Barbara Nelson gave an overview of the proposed FY-06 Budget for the year beginning July 1. There were very few changes to the projected revenue, as compared to the current year. Our basic grants are expected to be the same. We are planning to discontinue the oxygenated fuel program, so there is no revenue shown for that program. The Special Purpose grants include the woodstove grant, PM_{2.5} air monitoring and the air toxics study. The local assessment will remain unchanged. The calculations to apportion the local assessment for each of the cities and county will continue to use the combination method of the population and the property values. While the total amount collected will remain the same, the disbursement is adjusted depending on the relative changes in the property value and the population within each jurisdiction.

Looking at the expenses, the salaries are the biggest expense and will account for about 79% of budget expenditures. The value equivalent of a 2% COLA is included. The education program will cost about \$107,000. The rest of the expenses are for the basic operational needs for the agency running a status quo program. Michele Pope asked if the \$107,000 included salaries or whether it just reflected the cost of the programs themselves. Lisa replied it is for programs only, plus the intern's salary. Michele Pope asked if she understood correctly that we have two full-time education staff plus a part-time intern. Lisa stated that we have an intern that works about 12 hours a week.

Barbara Nelson also went over the employee contribution toward their medical premiums, pointing out that these amounts are analogous to what the County is having their employees pay.

Barbara pointed out that the total amount for travel is budgeted at \$45,000, which includes training to keep the compliance and engineering staff up to speed on the laws and the changing requirements. Michele Pope asked what is the actual per person cost for training and travel. Barbara answered that the \$45,000 is for the training and travel needs of the full staff of 20.

Barbara also pointed out that the Equipment Reserve Account includes money that we've placed in reserve for replacing vehicles, office equipment and monitoring equipment. We're proposing to add \$10,000 to that account again this year, which will bring the total to \$156,263.

The reserved fund balance includes our advanced travel and the petty cash fund as well as the Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) funds, which are held in reserve because they have specific requirements for their expenditure. The Kaiser SEP funds, which have been used for the Vehicle Emission Repair Program (VERP) and the Voluntary Accelerated Vehicle Replacement (VAVR) Program for several years, is expected to be completely expended in FY-06, effectively ending the programs. The Woodstove Replacement Project funds, originally appropriated in our current year, is proposed to be carried forward for expenditure through FY-06. The SEP funds, brought in from the Baker Commodities settlement, will be used for an ultra-low sulfur diesel project with Central Valley School District. The remaining amount, held as the end of the year reserved fund balance, will be \$24,241.

The unreserved designated fund is for projects, equipment and vehicle replacement. No new special projects are proposed for FY-06 so there is no appropriation for that funding.

\$25,000 is proposed to be reserved for the elementary school program, which will make a total of \$100,000 set aside for the school program. A specific appropriation will be necessary at some future date before the elementary school program funds can be used. So the total in our unreserved designated fund balance will be \$425,254.

The unreserved undesignated fund balance is our fund balance that is available to balance the shortfall between revenues and expenses. In order to balance the FY-06 budget, it will be necessary to appropriate \$224,632 out of that unreserved fund balance, leaving an expected year-end unreserved undesignated fund balance of \$607,639. Looking at the long-range plan, if there are no revenue increases and expenses remain the same, we project a negative fund balance figure by FY-08.

Michele Pope stated she wanted the Board to reconsider its present commitment for expenditure on a future elementary school program, stating she was opposed to such a program for two reasons. One, she thinks that those tax dollars would be more appropriately placed into the unreserved undesignated fund to balance future budget shortfalls. Two, the program would take tax dollars to create a program that parents have no control over, and take children and teachers out of the classroom for something that is really inappropriate. There are already enough education programs that go on. Those funds would be better used for the general budget to minimize the costs to businesses for their compliance. Eric Skelton asked Michelle if she was referring to diverting to the unreserved fund balance, only the \$25,000 which is proposed for the FY-06 budget towards an elementary school program or was she asking for the full \$100,000 that we've accumulated over the last three or four years towards that program to be diverted to the unreserved fund balance. Michele Pope answered yes to both scenarios. Taking school kids out of the classroom without any parent kind of input or control is an inappropriate expenditure of tax dollars.

Barbara Nelson provided clarification on the specific issue of tax dollars. That money has been placed into the project account over the last few years and its source is civil penalty collections. When SCAPCA collects civil penalties (over and above a modestly budgeted amount), rather than creating an impression that SCAPCA is trying to live off penalty collections, it goes into a projects fund from which special projects are funded at the Board's discretion. It would take special Board action and a detailed program or project outline before the money could be appropriated for expenditure on an elementary school program. So by setting funds aside at this point, we're not appropriating it. At some point in the future if the Board chose to remove the money from the project fund, the Board would have the authority to do so.

Michele Pope asked if it wasn't also true that SCAPCA receives grants which are designated toward education programs but only because SCAPCA has chosen to use the grant funds for that purpose (i.e., couldn't that same money from grants be used to offset the costs for compliance programs). Barbara replied, "yes" and added that some of the grant funds are already being used for that purpose. Michele then suggested that we should take a closer look at the grant allocation process so that grant money isn't automatically used to fund education and instead allot the grant funds to offset compliance costs, at which point we could consider directing the project money from penalty collections towards education. Eric Skelton added that

we are operating under a Board approved policy that places penalty money in a projects account. Michele Pope asked if SCAPCA has a policy regarding grant money in terms of how it's allocated, whether towards education or compliance programs. Eric replied that grant money always has very specific strings attached to how we can use it, under a Federal Performance Partnership Agreement. The grant money partially funds the air monitoring program, education program, permitting program, web site, SIP work and regulation development. Michele then asked if we could change how EPA allocates those funds. Eric replied that we could ask DOE to renegotiate our Performance Partnership Agreement.

Matthew Pederson stated he didn't believe that we should be using taxpayer's money to pay teachers for such extras when we already pay them a salary to educate the children. Air quality should be part of their regular science class instruction. He asked how many classrooms does SCAPCA staff presently go to each year? Lisa Woodard replied we do about 12, it's on a request basis. Lisa also pointed out that after we have done a Countywide program, then a lot of requests come in over the next three or four years for follow up classroom presentations before it tapers off. Matthew added we have a big county and 12 classrooms in a year really doesn't seem like the greatest impact for these funds. If we had taken those same funds and shifted it towards community events, such as Children's Day in August, the Spokane County Fair or other community events, then we could reach a broader audience and not only educate the children, but educate adults at the same time. Lisa replied that SCAPCA participates in almost every community event. The concept of the multi-media school program is that you are taking the message to the whole elementary school population in a year. You team up with other environmental agencies that want to get the message out to schools to share the costs. Teachers are involved in the development of the program and parents can be involved also. This is an idea where we don't go into individual classrooms, but we go into an assembly type format. It is providing a tool to schools that are mandated, by the State, to teach environmental education, along with all of the other different disciplines that are taught at the schools; the reading, the writing, everything is incorporated so that we're helping the schools to achieve those key learning requirements. Eric Skelton added that under our current education program, if you look at the time that we actually devote to community events versus in classroom presentations, we are spending much more time at community events reaching the community at large, than we are doing individual classroom presentations.

Lisa added that the school outreach budget for last year was \$5,000. That included two teacher workshops and we reimbursed for substitutes for those teachers. This year we're proposing a slight increase of \$7,000 for our school program and to hold off doing teacher workshops for a few years. We will implement an award winning program that was developed by the State, with EPA funds, on idling and look at the impact that idling is having at the schools as parents are waiting to pick up their kids. Our core education budget is separate from the money we've been building over the years, in hopes of doing a large-scale program in our elementary schools again. Those are two separate programs. Michele Pope asked, regarding the large school assembly program approach, if there is any sort of evaluation as far as effectiveness. Lisa responded, "yes". Ten years ago we hired a firm that worked with all three public agencies, the County, Water Quality Division, Spokane Regional Solid Waste System and our agency. We conducted an in-depth pre and post survey of the kids and were able to have market

measurements of awareness defining what an aquifer is and where we get our drinking water, what's an inversion and the basics that were taught during the 45-minute program.

Michele Pope made a motion not to add the additional \$25,000 into the reserve funds for the elementary school program. Eric asked if the motion was to redirect those funds back into the projects account as undesignated or to redirect those funds out of the projects account and into the unreserved undesignated fund balance. Michele Pope clarified that the motion was to allocate the \$25,000 that was intended for the elementary school program into the undesignated unreserved fund balance. Eric asked about the other \$75,000 that has been put aside for that program the last three years. Michele asked if that needs to be dealt with at this particular time or does that mess things up as far as how you allocate funds on everything else. Barbara Nelson stated it wouldn't mess anything up but that it is not necessary to make a motion or take action on this at this time as to the fate of the already reserved \$75,000 because it is not being appropriated for expenditure at this time.

Michele Pope clarified that her motion was to move the \$25,000 that was intended for the elementary school program to the undesignated unreserved fund balance and leave the other \$75,000 in the projects account alone for future discussion. But she also wanted to make it known that she opposed assembly programs at the elementary schools. Commissioner Harris seconded it. Michele Pope, Commissioner Harris and Matthew Pederson voted in favor of the motion and Mike Brewer was opposed to the motion.

Commissioner Harris moved to approve the FY-06 Budget in its entirety with the exception of the motion just made. Mike Brewer seconded the motion but added a friendly amendment that a check mark be placed on the resolution next to the option for the Flat Dollar Increase on the COLA. Motion passed unanimously.

Resolution 05-13 – Adopt Budget for Diesel Particulate Filter Pilot Project

Eric Skelton stated that last month the Board approved SCAPCA moving forward with a diesel particulate filter project for Central Valley and Sedro Woolley School Districts. This project is totally funded by State School Bus Retrofit Account Funds with the exception of \$30,000 which comes from a Baker Commodities settlement to fund the bio-diesel portion of the project. By approving this resolution, the budget is established so that these funds can be spent for that purpose approved last month. Mike Brewer moved for approval of Resolution 05-13 and Commissioner Harris seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

Resolution 05-14 – Appropriate SEP Funds for SFBD Replacement Project

Eric Skelton stated that this item was in follow-up to what Barbara Nelson was talking about in the budget presentation. In the current FY-05, we had a \$25,000 appropriation for a woodstove exchange program. We have partially spent those funds in FY-05, but not all of those funds. These funds specifically come from a settlement agreement with Huntwood where a certain amount of money would go either towards a woodstove replacement program or the motor vehicle repair program. In this case, we are presently using it for the woodstove replacement program. By approving this resolution, it moves the remainder of the funds into

FY-06 for continued expenditure. Michele Pope moved to adopt Resolution 05-14 and Mike Brewer seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

Resolution 05-15 – Adopt a Policy for General Conformity Deminimis Levels

Ron Edgar stated that as part of the Federal General Conformity Rules, whenever Federal funds are spent on a project, the proponents are required, under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to verify that the actions or project will not cause problems with the local area's implementation plan for meeting air quality standards. SCAPCA has received requests from Habitat for Humanity for conformity determinations on single houses that have no impact on the air quality. This resolution would set up a policy of deminimis levels. Only very large projects that approach 100 tons or more of pollutant emissions would be required to have any kind of a consultation or review by SCAPCA. Mike Brewer moved for approval of Resolution 05-15 and Commissioner Harris seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

Board Concerns

Possible cancellation of July 7 or August 4 board meeting

Eric Skelton added that we are required by State Law to hold 10 board meetings per year. Typically we cancel one or more of the summer board meetings. This is our sixth board meeting of the year. We need to have at least four more meetings this year, so if we hold Board meetings in September, October, November, and December we meet that minimum. He asked what was the pleasure of the Board in terms of canceling one or both of those summer board-meeting dates? Commissioner Harris stated he would prefer canceling both. Mike Brewer and Matthew Pederson stated that they didn't have a preference. Commissioner Harris stated that even though we cancel these two meetings, if something does come up and we need to meet, we could call a special meeting. Commissioner Harris moved to not meet in July and August and Matthew Pederson seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

There were no other Board Concerns.

Mike Brewer made a motion to adjourn and Commissioner Harris seconded it. Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

The next Board Meeting will be September 1, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in the lower level of the Public Works Building.

MATTHEW PEDERSON, CHAIR

ERIC SKELTON, SECRETARY