

# KING CONSERVATION DISTRICT

## Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes – Special Board Retreat

September 7, 2006

1 **Supervisors Present:** Matt Livengood, Chair, Scott Wallace, Vice Chair, Bill Knutsen, Member,  
2 Bobbi Lindemulder, Member

3 **Associate Supervisors Present:** Bob Vos, David Irons, Max Prinsen

4 **Guests Present:** Gerry Cormack, facilitator, Eric Frimodt (afternoon), attorney

5 **Staff Present:** None

6 **NRCS Staff Present:** None

7 Vice Chair Wallace called the meeting to order at 8:30 am. Chair Livengood arrived late at 9:15.

8 There were no changes to the published agenda.

9 The particular focus of the Retreat was a discussion of the current environment within which the  
10 District fulfills its mission and how that environment has changed and is continuing to change  
11 from that which existed 30 years ago. The format of the retreat was an open discussion that  
12 revolved around the District's traditional role and position with respect to natural resources  
13 management, and how that role has and continues to change. We also reviewed and discussed  
14 various organizations that we work with or should work with as well as how we might better  
15 partner with them. Finally we discussed what success might look like for the district in the  
16 changing environment (physical, jurisdictional, political, etc.) of King County and the Puget  
17 Sound region.

18 The following outline and notes reflect the general discussion during the course of the full day  
19 retreat. No motions and no decisions were made at the retreat.

### 20 **I. KCD's Unique Strengths**

- 21 • Expertise in understanding and implementing regulatory environment
- 22 • Local and farmer focused
- 23 • Reputation for solutions that work
- 24 • Advocate for agriculture and for keeping land in production
- 25 • Source of funding
- 26 • coordination
- 27 • ability to work in an inter-jurisdictional environment
- 28 • has the connections to overcome the "wedge" between rural and urban interests?
- 29 • We were below the radar (but are not any longer?)

### 30 **II. Main Challenges Faced by the District**

- 31 • Funding uncertainties

*"Promoting sustainable uses of natural resources  
through responsible stewardship"*

- 32 • Greater engagement with other “players”
- 33 • Structure and resources to meet changing demands
- 34 • Being seen as “just a banker” -- pass through funds
- 35 • Lack of awareness of scope and impact of KCD’s work

36

37 **III. Organizations that affect the District’s ability to accomplish its mission**

38 1. Governments and agencies:

- 39 • Agricultural Commission
- 40 • State Agencies (WDFG, DNR, DOE, etc.) (regulatory and funding link)
- 41 • Federal Agencies (NOAA/NMFS, Dept. of Agriculture, etc.) (regulatory and funding
- 42 link)
- 43 • King County (DNR, DEES) (both management and political relationships)
- 44 ○ It was noted that apparent role conflict might be addressed by KCD
- 45 focusing on smaller, on-the-ground projects that are difficult for DNR
- 46 to respond to)
- 47 • WSU Extension
- 48 • Conservation Districts in Puget Sound area (CDTF)
- 49 • Cities

50 2. Private Landowners

51 3. Special purpose bodies and groups (it was noted that these bodies may provide special

52 opportunities for partnerships and for maximizing “bang-for-the-buck” in investments and

53 getting projects done)

54

- 55 • WRIAs 7, 8, 9 and 10
- 56 • Shared/Puget Sound Strategy
- 57 • Mid Sound Fisheries
- 58 • Cascade Conservancy
- 59 • Ducks Unlimited

60 4. Interest and advocacy groups

- 61 • Farm Bureau
- 62 • Environmental organizations
- 63 • Property rights organizations.

64 **IV. Key Elements for Future Success**

65 There was much discussion around the proposed assessment and the ability of the KCD to control

66 our own budget and program of work. There was unanimous agreement/concurrence that our

67 proposed assessment is appropriate and that we should stand firm with the assessment package as

68 submitted to the county.

69 1. **Reputation:** how we would like to be viewed:

- 70 • Partners, not competitors
- 71 • Accessible and transparent, not a “secret society”
- 72 • Diverse, not “good old boys”
- 73 • Engaged, not “standoffish”
- 74 • Not just a “banker” that passes out money, but a source of funds
  - 75 ○ Where it is clear that the funds “belong to” and are the responsibility of
  - 76 KCD
  - 77 ○ Where the funds are available for projects that fit KCD’s mission and goals
  - 78 ○ Where there are clear expectations regarding performance and that
  - 79 performance is monitored and confirmed
  - 80 ○ Can hold, accumulate and combine funds

81 2. **Service delivery:** key characteristics:

- 82 • More joint/partnership efforts
- 83 • Timely response (to both inquiries and to service requests)
- 84 • Employees that are empowered to act (as we believe they are now)
- 85 • Current and up-to-date on both regulations and ideas and techniques
- 86 • The place to turn for clear explanation of regulatory requirements and options
- 87 • An advocate for reasonable and practical application of regulations

88 3. Potential **new focus** areas

- 89 • Forestry
- 90 • Urban shorelines
- 91 • Septic and storm-water management
- 92 • Fire suppression
- 93 • Specialize in services to small cities
  - 94 ○ KCD as a more cost-effective option
- 95 • Specialize in inter-jurisdiction projects
  - 96 ○ Capitalize on unique ability of KCD to work in the inter-jurisdictional area

97 4. **Partnerships** as a key focus for the future. Goal should be for KCD to be viewed as the  
98 “best partner” in the County. Key elements of being the “best partner” include:

- 99 • A partner in creating solutions that are credible
- 100 • A partner that can be relied on
- 101 • A partner that does high quality work
- 102 • A partner that has high expectations for itself and its partners
- 103 • A partner that is visible (not enough to do good – must be seen to be doing good)

104 There was also a discussion of a particular **niche** in which partnerships could be pursued:

- 105 • Small projects
- 106 • Involving private ownership

- 107           • Working with multiple jurisdictions

108   **V. Some Specific Ideas**

- 109           • Obtain lists of potential projects from local jurisdictions (and others?) to show more  
110           specific scope of potential work to be done with proposed budget.  
111           • More follow-up and documentation on status and success of projects funded.  
112           • Clarify capacity to contract with private land owners on a cost-share basis

113   No motions and no decisions were made at this special meeting of the board.

114   **The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.**

115

116

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

117   Authorized Signature

Date