

**WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council  
Meeting Notes  
Bellevue City Hall  
March 15, 2012**

**Members Present**

Dr. Don Davidson, Chair (Councilmember, Bellevue); Eileen Barber (Friends of the Issaquah Salmon Hatchery); Tor Bell (Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust); Dick Bonewits (Cedar River Council); Susan Boundy-Sanders (Councilmember, Woodinville); Denise DiSanto (WA Dept. of Ecology [DOE]); Peter Donaldson (Friends of the Cedar River Watershed); Chris Eggen (Deputy Mayor, Shoreline); Nancy Eklund (The Boeing Company); Ted Frantz (Councilmember, Hunts Point); Ava Frisinger (Mayor, Issaquah); Brian Goodnight (Staff Alternate, Snohomish County); Lisa Jensen (Councilmember, Newcastle); Bill Knutsen (King Conservation District [KCD]); Mike Mactutis (Staff Alternate, Kent); Hank Myers (Councilmember, Redmond); Mike O'Brien (Councilmember, Seattle); Larry Phillips (Councilmember, King County); Andy Rheume (Councilmember, Bothell); Carl Scandella (Councilmember, Yarrow Point); Allan Van Ness (Councilmember, Kenmore); Tom Vance (Councilmember, Sammamish).

**Alternates Present**

Jessica Saavedra (KCD).

**Others Present**

Saffa Bardaro (King County); Rika Cecil (Shoreline); Diana Forman (Portage Bay Coalition for Clean Water); Roy George (Alderwood Water District); Frank Leonetti (Snohomish County); Frances Lucero (King County); Kathy Minsch (Seattle); Sarah Ogier (King County); Susan O'Neil (Puget Sound Partnership); Jerallyn Roetemeyer (Redmond); Richard Sawyer (Kenmore); David St. John (King County); Ron Straka (Renton); Annette Frahm (WRIA 8 Team); Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz (WRIA 8 Team); Scott Stolnack (WRIA 8 Team); Jean White (WRIA 8 Team).

**Introductions**

Dr. Don Davidson opened the meeting and introduced new Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) members Richard Bonewits, Cedar River Council, Councilmember Tom Vance, City of Sammamish, and Councilmember Allan Van Ness, City of Kenmore. Dr. Davidson then invited all attendees to introduce themselves.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment

**Approval of Meeting Notes for February 16, 2012**

*The Salmon Recovery Council unanimously approved the meeting notes for the February 16, 2012 meeting.*

**Updates & Announcements**

**King Conservation District (KCD) Funding:**

Bill Knutsen reported that Mason County is the only winner in the Mason County lawsuit. Because of the Mason County Conservation District (CD) lawsuit, the Mason CD account had been placed in escrow for several years while the case went through the court. They were fortunate that the court ruling found that only property owners that protested the assessment had to be paid back by the Mason County CD.

The news isn't as good at KCD, where he said we thought we'd dodged a bullet. We took a bill to Olympia asking them to consider rates and charges in lieu of an assessment, and it passed both houses and is on the governor's desk for signature. Bill mentioned that a group has petitioned the governor to veto

the bill. Presuming the bill is signed into law the KCD can move forward with renewing the KCD assessment under a new system of rates and charges in 2013.

KCD's attorney has determined that 2012 KCD money can't be spent and will stay in escrow. Bill said we have a tax-exempt status to accept gifts, and will contact people to see if they would be willing to gift their assessments back to KCD. With thousands of lots in the county it would be complex. If the money is not gifted to the KCD, it will have to be returned or credited to tax bills in the future. KCD is looking for funding to bridge its 2012 funding gap, and he said he didn't know how we will get through this.

Discussion:

- Larry Phillips said the KCD assessments had been the backbone of our funding. We have to sequester the funds in case we have to pay the dollars back, and the King County (KC) general fund isn't in a position to absorb it. He said he hadn't heard about the veto petition, and he noted we will have to talk about how we will fund WRIA 8's salmon recovery efforts in both the short term and long term.
- Carl Scandella commented that the Ballard Locks will play a key role in the next few years with the upgrade of the 520 bridge. He asked if there is any way we can use some of those funds, because the tonnage through the Locks will go up greatly. Jean White replied that she was not optimistic about that, but will mention it to them.
- Ted Frantz asked if, in regards to the KCD funds, would there have to be a letter to each property owner, or could local governments act to release the KCD funds. Bill Knutsen responded that as a property owner, it is my \$10 and he didn't think my local government can speak for me on that.
- Hank Myers inquired if there could be an opt-out provision where a property owner would have to say they want the money back. Bill Knutsen said no, they have to opt in. Councilmember Myers asked if the legislation makes the assessment more legal. Bill explained that the legislation does address the issue in the Mason CD law suit. KCD needed a per-acre charge acknowledging different size parcels, rather than a flat per parcel charge. It's a lot more onerous than just saying the assessment is \$10 per parcel.
- Dick Bonewits asked how long the court allowed KCD to sequester funds. Bill Knutsen responded that it will have to be less than three years.
- Jean White explained that KCD funds do not pay for any WRIA 8 staff, whereas the Snoqualmie and WRIA 9 teams have staff paid partially with the funds. KCD is about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of our funds for our implementation efforts. She reported receiving several phone calls asking what the loss of KCD funding will do to our fish-in, fish-out monitoring efforts. WRIA 8's funding shortfall will be in 2013.
- Scott Stolnack, Technical Coordinator, reported that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of funding for monitoring, spawning surveys, and juvenile out-migration comes from KCD funding. We are looking for funds to cover part of what we are losing in 2013, and we are asking if we can spread 2012 dollars thinner and have some partners take up the extra slack for a year. He explained that we'll have to talk to KCD to see if we can renegotiate the contract to spread it over two years. Hans Berge, the KC project manager for the KCD monitoring grant, has talked to our project partners, Seattle Public Utilities and the WA Department of Fish and Wildlife. It looks like if we can divert some funds to 2013, our fish-in monitoring will be covered. The fish-out monitoring (\$180K) isn't covered yet, so we are looking for opportunities. Scott explained that we don't want to cut it because Chinook spend two to five years at sea, and any given year we could have two, three or five-year-old fish coming back. If we lose one year of data, we lose data for three to five years of salmon. He said the short answer is we have at least half of the amount covered for fish-in, and are still working on fish-out.
- Jean White noted that the KCD funding is up for reauthorize in 2013, and we need to know what the new KCD assessment will look like under this new system of rates and charges versus a per parcel fee. She asked when we could expect to have public meetings about the KCD reauthorization. Bill Knutsen explained that we plan three public meetings in April. One will be in conjunction with the Advisory Committee meeting, one will be in North KC, and one in South KC. He said we need to get information from citizens on how we spend our money before we can negotiate the interlocal agreements.

- Don Davidson remarked that we discussed writing a supportive WRIA 8 letter to the governor saying we hope she'll sign the legislation, but it is hard to get a letter approved this quickly with this many people. Bill Knutsen commented that if you're going to write a letter on behalf of KCD to the governor it would be helpful to have it say all this veto stuff is nonsense.
- Chris Eggen said he expects this will have an effect on the assessments cities get from KCD. Bill Knutsen clarified that it will. Councilmember Eggen suggested that individual cities could write a letter, and he asked when it needs to be in Olympia. Bill explained that the legislation is on the governor's desk for signature.
- Larry Phillips noted that the window of opportunity is very short, and it begs the larger question. We've got our individual contributions to keep our program alive but we've lost funding for our projects. We need to do some interim work before the next meeting about what our options are and how we can fund projects. Don Davidson responded that we can roll that discussion into the budget conversation at the May meeting, when this issue might be a little clearer.
- Hank Myers asked if we need to do a motion in order for our mayor to write a letter. Don Davidson explained that each city can do as they please. Dr. Davidson said if his own name goes on a letter, he needs to talk with others around the table, and it is hard to get this group working quickly.
- Jean White commented that Mayor Joan McBride is having the City of Kirkland write a letter today.

#### **Other Announcements:**

Jean White, Watershed Coordinator, said she would not read all the updates to keep the meeting short, so please review the update summary.

- People were asked to take a poll on their preferred Salmon Recovery Council (SRC) meeting time, which ended up getting a little complicated. A slim majority supported meeting from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., while others thought we couldn't cover everything in two hours. She said we will try meeting from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. for a couple of meetings and check back in with you.
- The WRIA 8 team has been successful in raising visibility of the Ballard Locks issue with the Congressional delegation and local governments. Jean reported that yesterday she was invited to a meeting the Corps was having for local officials and Congressional staff about lowering the dam safety rating from 4 to 2. A March 20<sup>th</sup> press event will talk about it. The Locks are not in immediate danger of failure, the Corps has a plan to address potential issues, and they will have 80% of things addressed by the end of 2012. She said this is not like Howard Hansen Dam with lots of unknowns, but an aging infrastructure that they know really well. If it fails, it won't be catastrophic, and they were trying to be reassuring. Jean said she asked at the meeting if fish passage will be addressed in any of the work the Corps is doing to address safety issues, but it wasn't clear if it will be.
- Puget Sound Partnership is hosting a workshop on the Corps' levee vegetation management on Wednesday, April 4, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the UW-Tacoma Campus.
- The Williams Pipeline crossing of the Cedar River won't occur at Rainbow Bend, thanks to concerns expressed by King County, WRIA 8, and others. They are looking to cross the river at their existing pipeline location near the intersection of Jones Road and Highway 169. They are on a very fast track, and WRIA 8 will continue to follow the issue.
- The Puget Sound Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) will meet on April 6 to prioritize near-term strategies in the Puget Sound Action Agenda Update. The Puget Sound Leadership Council will review, finalize, and adopt the Action Agenda on April 26. Jean said we heard reassuring things at the Watershed Leads meeting that nearshore things will happen for salmon, and that salmon are likely to be one of the top three priorities.

#### **Committee Reports:**

Jean White referred SRC members to the Committee Reports section of the handout for updates.

#### **Three-Year Workplan Update**

Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, Actions & Funding Coordinator, said we use three basic lists to implement the WRIA 8 Salmon Conservation Plan:

- Comprehensive List: Complete list of habitat projects, land use actions, and outreach and education activities;
- 10-Year Start List: Annually-updated subset of Comprehensive List focusing on the projects most feasible to implement in first ten years (170 projects); and
- Three-Year Work Plan: Annually-updated subset of 10-Year Start List consisting of the most important projects, as well as most feasible to start or complete in the next three years.

Jason said we update the Three-Year Work Plan and 10-Year Start List every year to both track the implementation of projects and for grant eligibility. Projects applying for KCD funds must be on the 10-Year Start List. Both the Implementation and Technical Committees reviewed the proposed updates, and the Technical Committee recommends the following additions, of which he provided quick highlights

New project/program additions:

- Nine high priority restoration and protection projects (two in the Cedar, one in the Sammamish River, one in Bear Creek, one in Evans Creek, one in Kelsey Creek, one in Cottage Lake Creek, two along Lake Washington shoreline); and
- One non-capital/programmatic priority addition focused on invasive species control as part of the riparian restoration strategy, including corresponding general invasive species control projects for each subwatershed area.

He said these additions reflect how we are adaptively managing the Plan over time.

Updates to projects on the Three-Year Work Plan and 10-Year Start List:

- Expand descriptions of four habitat projects to include new sub-projects, scope changes, or adjust project areas (one along Lake Washington shoreline, one along Issaquah Creek, one along Sammamish, one in Bear);
- Refine descriptions of two non-capital/programmatic priorities (riparian restoration and protection strategy, outreach and education to increase support for salmon recovery)
- Remove one completed project (Clearwater School project on North Creek).

Discussion;

- Carl Scandella asked if we are matching our goals. Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz responded that the five-year Implementation Progress Report shows that we are only about 14% into the Start List, when we expected to be closer to 50%. The estimated resources were much higher than what we've received.
- Carl Scandella inquired how the budget matches up to what we think we'll need. Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz explained that the WRIA 8 Plan estimates what we'll need and what we'll get. We have \$5 million to \$6 million less than what we need to be on track to implement the 10-year Plan.
- Don Davidson commented that the five-year Progress Report was excellent. It gives you a good idea of what we've accomplished and where the money comes from. It's important that we all review it. Jason added that we have more copies if you want to give them away.
- Ted Frantz asked if KCD funds were for 2012 or 2013. Don Davidson responded that 2012 KCD grant dollars are not available – the funding would have been contracted for use in 2013. Jean White explained that many people who wanted their projects on the 10-Year Start List anticipated applying for KCD funds, and now the grant round will have 1/3 of the dollars expected.
- Peter Donaldson suggested we can use the time to infiltrate the schools. By then the students will turn 18 and vote.
- Larry Phillips asked if SRFB grants require local match. Jean White replied that some of our partners expected KCD funds to provide their 15% required match, and there will be some scrambling.

***The Salmon Recovery Council unanimously approved the Technical Committee recommendations for the 2012 updates to the Three-Year Work Plan and 10-Year Start List.***

## Independent Review of King County's Project Practices

David St. John, King County, reported that the two big drivers for the independent review were:

- Performance management: When Christie True became Director of the KC Department of Natural Resources (DNRP), she already had an interest in making sure we're doing business the right way.
- Concerns about engineering and construction methods: Some people thought projects weren't done effectively.

DNRP wanted an independent assessment and contracted with Montgomery Watson Harza (MWH). David said we worked with them to develop the scope (objectives and outcomes), and then set them loose to run the show. MWH vetted potential Independent Expert Panel (Panel) members, refined the scope with the Panel, and coordinated their work. DNRP didn't want people who had done a lot of work with county. Members of the Panel were:

- Dr. Paul DeVries, P.E., R2 Resource Consultants;
- Dr. Chris Frissell;
- Dr. Yung-Hsin Sun, P.E., MWH;
- Dr. Doug Whittaker, Confluence Research and Consultants; and
- Tracy Yount, Sapere Consulting.

The Panel convened in Seattle twice to meet with relevant staff from KC Water and Land Resources (WLRD) sections/programs; meet with stakeholders without KC to gain perspective on concerns; visit project sites; and conduct Panel business. Site visits included the Cedar Rapids Project, the Lower Tolt Reconnection Project, the Herzmann Levee Project (Cedar), and other projects on the Cedar and Green Rivers.

Guiding Questions were:

- Are KC project implementation practices considered appropriate, adequate, and reasonable relative to standard professional practice?
- What specific improvements could be implemented to better insure that projects effectively balance all project objectives and meet industry standards?

David explained that we didn't give the Panel a script but gave them big picture questions. The exact questions and reporting were up to the Panel and MWH. This wasn't a project by project investigation. We said they could review individual questions if they wanted. We were looking for systemic problems: is there something we need to do at program level to make sure projects are done well?

The Panel found that WLRD does use scientifically accepted principles for managing floodplains. David went over the major findings and recommendations, which include:

1. King County hasn't explained the shift from "hard engineering" to "ecological/dynamic" floodplain management strategies well enough to people who live along rivers. People found the changed conditions unappealing and threatening. Recommendation: Develop and communicate an overarching strategic river management plan to explain this.
2. Project level objectives need clarity and need better communication. Recommendation: Clarify objectives at the project scale.
3. Public and stakeholder collaboration should be more timely and uniform. Stakeholder outreach wasn't predictable to stakeholders and they didn't feel their input was being addressed. We need to communicate at basin-wide and strategic planning scales. Recommendation: Involve stakeholders earlier in project development.
4. Engagement of stakeholders regarding recreational usage should be more formal. The Panel strongly encouraged DNRP to spend more effort on recreation, including developing an Office of River Public Use. Recommendation: Involve stakeholders more formally and systematically.

5. Uncertain aspects of project consequences should be recognized. It's very hard to predict with 100% certainty at the project scale, and people may feel threatened and harmed if there's a failure.  
Recommendation: Recognize and manage inherent uncertainties.
6. Standardize project monitoring and improve post-project mitigation response. Monitor around your objectives, be consistent, and follow up. Recommendation: Standardize and act on project monitoring.
7. Lack of integrated program elements creates an increased risk profile. The number, scope, and complexity of projects have been expanding, and David noted that the Flood District now has a staff of 35. DNRP needs to revisit the risk portfolio for these projects. We need a risk assessment, a way to identify and address risks, and make sure we're meeting policy drivers. We need more interaction with regulatory agencies for direction to address regulatory drivers up front. He said it is in our interest to communicate regularly and transparently. Recommendation: Comprehensively assess and manage current programmatic risk.

David reported that Christie True is seeking input on the Panel report, and it is still timely to provide feedback. He said she will review the report and feedback, and set priorities for the response.

#### Discussion:

- Dick Bonewits asked for two to three examples of citizen concern along the Cedar River. David St. John mentioned Cedar Rapids, where logs moved and got hung up, areas where trees fell and created recreation hazards, and issues with levees. He said there is a need to communicate objectives and what the public will see.
- Dick Bonewits inquired if there was a significant recreational interest in the comments received. David St. John reported that we received comments from the River Safety Council on the report. Dick asked if he recognized a bias in the community. We had 12,000 CFS flow on the Cedar in January, and we noticed people only show up with a major flood event or to complain about logs (or taxes).
- Carl Scandella asked about the scope of the independent review, the extent to which it applies to WRIA 8, and if there were things we need to fix. David St. John explained that WRIA 8 provided funding, as did the Flood District. Councilmember Scandella inquired if he sees a conflict in presenting information to the public when you're also looking for funding. David said we need to communicate clearly about risk. There may be some tension but it is part of the job.
- Larry Phillips remarked that he's been on both sides of this issue. He said the Expert Panel Report isn't that hard to read, and if affirmed moving away from channelization. He said it wasn't clear when they signaled increased risk, and how DNRP will incorporate that into their work. When we go to site selection, design, and placing LWD, it's not clear it changes our culture so we keep risks in mind. David St. John explained that the Panel recommended when we do a risk assessment, staff would discuss how it's incorporated. The Panel said you need to be sure you identify risks clearly and the mapping processes so you address risks.
- Larry Phillips inquired how we make sure we've incorporated the stakeholder review process, and how we measure how we've reduced risk when you place wood.
- Dick Bonewits commented that some people are concerned about habitat restoration. Everybody knows flooding can be dangerous. It is hard to satisfy someone looking for metrics who wants to be especially critical. He asked how can we make sure our plan addresses that issue, and how we quantify risk.
- Hank Myers remarked that most of the suggestions we've seen are process changes, and the one that involves staffing is recreation. He asked if that is related to the number of deaths on the Green River in recent years, and if the "Office of River Public Use" would be put in a separate organization. David St. John explained that the Panel was aware those deaths happened, but didn't base their recommendations on that. He said the Panel did base it on staffing in other situations. We didn't talk about where to put the Office of River Public Use, but we discussed the need.
- Chris Eggen said the monitoring portion in recommendation #5 is too open ended. He asked how we would identify ecological outcomes for a specific site. We're grappling with whether our program is improving salmon habitat. Our concern is that the monitoring recommendations are not possible and

would cost a lot of money to do. It's a worthwhile goal but it might be a big problem. We could ask proposers to identify measurable goals.

- Bill Knutsen questioned how we know we're having a benefit. He said his own farm and neighbors completed a project that involved virtually recreating a creek that was almost  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile long, and the resulting recovery was pretty fast. We need to spend a lot of money in one place rather than dabbling a little here and there if we want to have outcomes.

Jean White pointed out the draft comment letter in the meeting packet, and said we may want to send a letter to Christie True that will balance the negative comments we know she will receive regarding the independent review panel's findings. Some recommendations say KC should do more comprehensive planning. In the Cedar, what we need to do for flooding is the same as what we need to do for salmon, and we should be at the table to make sure these projects are meeting our objectives. We like what we heard about addressing risk and uncertainty, and we think WRIA 8 should be out there to build public support for habitat restoration. If there's no support for restoration projects, we might as well pack our bags and go home. Cedar Rapids was good for the salmon but bad for public relations, and now we have the Rainbow Bend project approaching. She explained that the draft letter commends the county for doing the Panel review, and it says we're heartened that the county is using the practices that will be good for both flooding and fish. It says many projects in our WRIA 8 Plan are also in the Flood Reduction Plan, and we need to consciously address hazards and warn recreational users. It concludes by saying we look forward to seeing how you respond and want to be at the table.

#### Discussion:

- Don Davidson commented that change will get a negative response. There is no reason why recreation and ecosystem can't live hand in hand. We get the public aware of change by way of a good vision, good communications, and enough time to not surprise stakeholders. He said you still get NIMBY (Not In My Backyard), but at least you've taken the time to do these things right.
- Denise DiSanto said she liked the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the draft letter. The public needs to understand that LWD aren't meant to be museum pieces but are designed to fail in certain situations. We need to make sure we communicate that this is a dynamic system and there will always be inherent risk.
- Dick Bonewits remarked that the response needs to be tailored to the extent of the problem. He said he thinks KC has done a good job in flood hazard management and habitat restoration. When you look at the "How do residents recreate?" slide in the 2011 River Management Survey (the next presentation) you observe that the noise is sometimes worse than the problem. There is an availability of information and it needs to be pointed out.
- Peter Donaldson commended the Independent Panel's review saying it was a model for how to go through the discipline of asking questions and coming up with recommendations. He noted that hipsters in Portland, including the mayor, have a 2030 vision about bikes as if it's already happened, and their vision is simple and easy to read. We are not just talking to ourselves but need GIS maps and periodic mailings. We need a comprehensive theatrical marketing mechanism so we're not just reaching the three to five people who complain, but get ahead of the debate and provide the narrative about why we're doing this. Peter reported that Paul Allen has asked our nonprofit to submit an RFQ for \$250,000 to \$700,000 for professional development for teachers. He said the rich hotspot is the Tahoma School District along the Cedar. He inquired how we can embed communications in school curriculum.
- Larry Phillips commented that the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the letter says we are reducing risks of extinction of salmon and reducing flooding, which are all good things. The problem is when we are expecting taxpayer dollars on projects that are intended to fail and will present risks to public safety. It puts our efforts at risk, and I don't think our letter says enough about reducing both risk and hazard. The worst thing that can happen is to have a tragedy that is traced back to one of our projects, and have it become a KING 5 expose. Jean White responded that she will work on edits to address Larry's concern and send the letter back out for review by the full council.
- Mike O'Brien mentioned that he thinks there are two things going on here. We want to address public safety in the letter, and there may be projects moving forward that are critical for habitat but may pose

risks to public safety in some effects. He said he doesn't want to say those projects are off the list, but he agreed that we don't want KING 5 expose. Larry Phillips explained that he doesn't want the public hazards to be glossed over. There are things that can be done for flood reduction and fish that don't pose a risk.

Jean White reported that she will try to address Larry Phillips' point in the letter, which Christie True knows is in process. Jean said she thinks she has a few days to work on the letter.

### **King County River Management Survey (Information Item)**

Saffa Bardaro, King County, reported on the results of the 2011 River Management Public Opinion Survey done last October. The purpose of the survey was to get data to measure the effectiveness of current outreach efforts so that we can improve our outreach and make our programs more effective. She said the good news is that people think rivers are very important. We wanted to know in-river vs. near-river recreation, and how much people know about our work. Saffa said we spoke with a random sample of 700 people by phone, asking if they agreed with our top river management priorities, and how they feel about our river management strategies, and how they feel about recreational safety on rivers. 60% of the respondents said people should be required to wear life jackets.

Saffa said we also did an online survey, which went to a self-selected group. There was a lot of similarity in responses, with the online people living near rivers and doing more in-river activities. We wanted to know what people's perceptions about the biggest risks to recreational safety, and we will work with the Sheriff on outreach programs.

Opportunities and recommendations for river management are:

- Continue to confirm we're on track with our top three goals for river management (reduce flood risks, protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat, keep rivers available for recreational activities);
- Improve outreach about what we do in each river basin; and
- Improve education of river users regarding personal responsibility for safety.

Saffa reported that the full report is at [www.kingcounty.gov/rivers](http://www.kingcounty.gov/rivers). In the online survey 75% of respondents indicated they are aware there has been a shift toward more natural management of rivers.

Hank Myers noted that the two reports have come to slightly different conclusions. Saffa responded that they talked to different people.

### **Success Story: Lake Sammamish State Park Restoration**

This presentation was delayed to the next meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Don Davidson said he was concerned if two hours is enough time for the meeting. If we're just here to get lectured at and don't have time for discussion, he cautioned people might lose interest. He said when we get into discussions, they're meaty, and this group has been excellent.

Mike O'Brien suggested we may need to limit presentations to half the time scheduled because he knows we will have questions and discussion. He said maybe we need another half-hour added to the meeting time, and we may need to be aware of that.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next meeting is May 17, 2012, 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., Bellevue City Hall.