

KING CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Minutes – Special Session

December 6, 2005

Supervisors Present: Max Prinsen, Chair; Scott Wallace, Vice- Chair; Matt Livengood, Secretary/Treasurer; Richard Gelb, Member.

Associate Supervisors Present: Bill Knutsen, Doug Dobkins

Guests Present: Eric Frimodt, Sara Hemphill

Staff Present: Geoff Reed, Brandy Reed, Marla Hamilton Lucas

NRCS Staff Present: none

Chairman Prinsen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Wallace distributed a resolution from the WACD annual meeting regarding the District's assessments. Discussion ensued about the special benefit issue as it relates to the District's activities.

Prinsen reported to the board that the King County Executive's office has requested the District prepare and submit its 2006 Program of Work based upon a 6-2-2 assessment allocation by mid-December. Discussion ensued regarding the County's request. Knutsen arrived at 6:05

Prinsen gave the board an update of his conversations with Larry Phillips of the County Council regarding the issues surrounding the assessment. Dobkins arrived 6:12. Wallace stated that he believes the District's budget had been hijacked by the council and that the District was being treated as a subsidiary of the county. B. Reed said the County was not promising any additional funding by a contract at this time. The three options available to the Board at this time are:

1) Submit a Program of Work with a 6-2-2 allocation

2) Provide not Program of Work submittal

3) Submit a Program of Work with an allocation other than 6-2-2

A memo written by Larry Phillips was discussed. The memo stated that any workplan that did not show a distribution of 6-2-2 would be rejected. The Board discussed ways to express to the County that the 6-2-2 distribution would not meet the District's needs and that more funding would have to be provided. Discussion ensued regarding the various ways this could be accomplished. Wallace stated that any strategies adopted by the District should take into consideration the recommendations of the District's legal counsel. Knutsen and Dobkins asked when the District would dig in and not let the County determine the District's budget. Discussion ensued.

Hemphill said that there are a lot of questions out there about the District's position with regards to the County and if we acquiesce to their demands, we'll lose our credibility with landowners.

It was mentioned that a 12-0 vote at the council to double the current assessment was a win. Discussion ensued about submitting a program of work that used the 5-3-2 distribution, or 6-2-2 distribution.

Prinsen recapped the discussion so far, and mentioned that WACD is in the position to lobby in Olympia on assessment related issue. He asked if Phillips should be requested to call each Board member to explain his point of view to them. More discussion ensued on the council vote.

Frimodt arrived at 7:40. He stated that although the District was not happy about the process used by the County, the District had learned some things that would be helpful in dealing with the County on future assessments. Frimodt provided the Board with his thoughts relating to the County's view of the special benefit analysis relating to the budget allocation being required by the County. Frimodt mentioned that the District may want to see if the County has documents relating to any special benefit analysis performed because it may be helpful to the District as it works on future assessments issues

The Board went into an executive session with its Legal Counsel at 7:50 for the purpose of discussing potential litigation relating to the assessment process. Prinsen announced that the executive session was estimated to last about 40 minutes. The Board concluded the executive session at approximately 8:34 and returned to the regular meeting.

Staff asked what the Board wished for them to do regarding the program of work. It was decided to submit a 2006 Program of Work that includes a 6-2-2 assessment allocation. The program of work will be submitted with the full 2006 District work plan and budget that identifies all funding needs of the District in 2006, and a cover letter expressing the District's disappointment with how the assessment renewal process was handled this year. Frimodt recommended that the District may want to get information from the Assessor's office regarding the actual cost of collection of the assessment, as the 1% Assessor's fee has not changed, yet the amount of that fee will double in 2006. Frimodt indicated that pursuant to Chapter 89.08 RCW, the assessor is not authorized to collect more than the actual cost of collecting and remitting the assessment to the District.

There being no more business before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30pm

Authorized Signature

Date