

TAB 6

2013 WACD Passed Resolutions Relating to WSCC

Resolution Number	Resolution	WSCC Action
WACD Resolutions Relating to Agency Partnerships and Coordination		
2013-04	Buffer Width Compliance *Motion by Commissioner Brown to accept WACD resolution 2013-04 and pursue it in spirit. Seconded by Commissioner Bahrych. Commissioner Brown moved for previous question. Commissioner O’Keefe seconded. Motion passed. Main motion passed. One abstention.	Discussed at the March 2014 meeting (see motion to left)
2013-013	Request that WACD and WSCC include Resolution no. 08-003 in their discussions with Department of Ecology *Motion by Commissioner Brown to accept the recommendation found in WACD resolution 2013-13. Seconded by Commissioner Stromberger. Motion passed.	Discussed at the March 2014 meeting (see motion to left)
2013-19	State Conservation Commission Agency Partnership Agreements to Expand Existing Sources of Funding for Conservation *Motion by Commissioner O’Keefe to accept WACD resolution 2013-19. Commissioner Brown seconded. Motion passed.	Discussed at the March 2014 meeting (see motion to left)
2013-21	Collaborative Agency Program Agreements for Natural Resources Management: EPA 319 Non-Point Source Pollution Plan for the State of Washington	
2013-22	Collaborative Agency Program Agreements for Natural Resources Management: Irrigation Efficiencies Grant Program as a model for interagency program agreement for natural resources Management	
2013-23	Conditioned Practices	Discussed at December 2013 meeting

2013 WACD passed resolutions relating to WSCC

WACD Resolutions Relating to Agriculture and Water Quality		
2013-01	Lemire case on agricultural operations	
2013-11	Recommendations Addressing Ecology Letters to Producers	
WACD Resolutions Relating to Budget		
2013-08	Utilizing Category 3 Funds to Pool Cost Share Dollars for Providing Financial Assistance to Numerous Cooperators When Completing the Same Practice *Motion by Commissioner Brown to work on a way to implement the recommendation of the WACD resolution 2013-08. Commissioner Stromberger seconded. Motion passed*	Discussed at January Commission Meeting (see motion to left)
2013-12	Request That WSCC Reallocate Category 1 Funding to Districts in Multiple District Counties That Are Efficient and Practicing Administrative Efficiencies	
2013-15	Conservation Budget Development and Allocation Process Improvements *Motion by Commissioner Davis that the WSCC establish a budget development process that has a clear linkage between the bullets identified within the recommendations of the WACD resolution 2013-15. Seconded by Commissioner Brown. Motion passed*	Discussed at January Commission Meeting (see motion to left)
2013-16	Conservation Budget Development Strategy *Motion by Commissioner Brown to pursue the spirit of WACD resolution 2013-16 in the budget and allocation process. Commissioner O’Keefe seconded. Motion passed. Four yes and three nay vote*	Discussed at January Commission Meeting (see motion to left)
2013-17	Consolidation and Budget Issue Separation	
2013-18	Long-Term Conservation Funding Opportunities	
2013-20	Harmonizing Local and State Natural Resource Priorities (with special consideration to connection to budget development process) * Motion by Commissioner O’Keefe to pursue the spirit of the recommendations of WACD Resolution 2013-20. Seconded by Commissioner Brown. Motion passed*	Discussed at January Commission Meeting (see motion to left)

2013 WACD passed resolutions relating to WSCC

WACD Resolutions Relating to Consolidation		
2013-02	WACD and WSCC work with the Washington State Legislature, the Washington State Conservation Commission and the Office of Financial Management to ensure that District Consolidation remains a voluntary action of the boards involved.	
2013-07	WACD Consolidation Policy	
WACD Resolutions Relating to District Communication		
2013-06	Communicating the Work of Conservation Districts with the General Public	



Washington State Conservation Commission

May 7, 2014

TO: Conservation Commission Members
Mark Clark, Executive Director

FROM: WSCC Staff

SUBJECT: WACD Resolution 2013-12 - Reallocation of Category 1 Funding for Multi-District Counties.

Summary: The Conservation Commission (SCC) is reviewing resolutions passed by WACD that request action by the SCC.

Resolution 2013-12 addresses the allocation of Category 1 funding to districts in counties with multiple conservation districts. The resolution asks the SCC to re-instate full Category 1 funding.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the Commission provide funding for the next fiscal year to those districts identified below that have been negatively impacted by the decision to fund per county. This funding should bring those districts up to a “zero impact” level. This increased funding level should be considered the maintenance level for these districts in the 2015-17 budget development process.

Description:

Category 1 funding was established by the SCC to provide basic funding for conservation districts. In the first iteration of Category 1 distribution, each district received \$25,000 for functional activities at the discretion of the district. These funds have few strings attached to allow flexibility for districts to fund their highest priority. In 2013, the SCC passed a motion to allocate \$25,000 *per county* rather than per conservation district. This resulted in a proportional reduction in basic funding for conservation districts in counties with more than one district for the FY 14 allocation, as follows:

	<u>Category 1</u>	<u>Total Cat 1 & 2</u>	<u>Percent Change from FY 2013</u>
Central Klickitat	\$12,500	66,033	-7.88%
Eastern Klickitat	12,500	66,663 ¹	-10%
Foster Creek	12,500	67,125	8.94%
South Douglas	12,500	64,940	79.10%
North Yakima	12,500	94,476 ¹	-10%
South Yakima	12,500	67,125	4.55%
Palouse Rock Lake	6,250	60,875	-0.74%
Palouse	6,250	77,720 ¹	-10%
Pine Creek	6,250	60,875	-0.07%
Whitman	6,250	60,875	-1.73%

At the time the SCC passed the motion to fund Category 1 at the county level, the rationale included a desire to address what was seen as an unfair situation where a conservation district in a single county received less funding on a per county basis while multi-district counties received more funding. In a single district/single county scenario a district was required to address countywide issues versus a district covering only a portion of a county.

Also, since most districts use Category 1 funding for administrative purposes, the Commission also hoped moving to a single county approach would encourage administrative efficiencies.

WACD Resolution and Requested Action

WACD Resolution 2013-12 requests:

The Washington State Conservation Commission re-instate full Category 1 funding to Tier 1 districts in multiple district counties that are practicing administrative efficiencies and do not rely entirely on Commission funding for their operations – are leveraging other funding sources with their Commission funds.

The resolution cites the following reasons for this recommendation:

1. Districts in a county with multiple CDs are fiscally harmed by budget reductions due to this SCC policy.
2. Contend the SCC policy is an effort to push multi-district counties to consolidate to one district per county.

¹ The original allocation had E. Klickitat with a (12.74%) decrease; North Yakima with a (12.86%); and, Palouse with a (21.41%) decrease. SCC members voted in September 2013 to increase their allocation so that no district experienced a greater than (10%) decrease. These three districts received the following amounts: E. Klickitat \$5,000; North Yakima \$9,750, and Palouse \$8,900

3. Fund reductions are a disincentive to efficiencies.
4. Resource needs remain the same despite the funding reduction.
5. Negatively impacts the ability of districts to leverage funding from other sources since CDs use Category 1 funding to leverage other fund sources.



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No. 2013-12

Title: Request That WSCC Reallocate Category 1 Funding to Districts in Multiple District Counties That Are Efficient and Practicing Administrative Efficiencies

Problem:

Conservation districts were established using stakeholder developed boundaries with an emphasis on grassroots implementation of conservation practices. The boundaries established at the time indicated the stakeholder's belief that there were different resource concerns within each boundary.

Districts that are located in counties with more than one conservation district within its boundaries have had damaging reductions by the Commission in FY14 funding allocations. Category 1 funding for those districts was cut by as much as 75%, depending on the number of districts in the county. While the Commission maintains they will not force districts to consolidate, this reduction of funds indicates an inclination to do just that. There are districts that share staff and office space which is the efficiency the Commission has indicated they desire, but the funding cuts are a disincentive to administrative efficiencies. The resource needs remain the same with or without Category 1 funding for these districts. What is lost is the ability of the districts to act on those concerns.

In addition, most districts use Commission funding to leverage other funding sources by using the Category 1 allocation to pay staff. Without adequate funding for staff under Category 1, the ability to successfully apply for and implement other funding sources is lost.

Recommendation:

The Washington State Conservation Commission re-instate full Category 1 funding to Tier 1 districts in multiple district counties that are practicing administrative efficiencies and do not rely entirely on Commission funding for their operations – are leveraging other funding sources with their Commission funds.

Presented by: Central Klickitat Conservation District & Eastern Klickitat Conservation District

Recommend Do Pass by the District Operations & Education Committee.

RESOLUTION PASSED.



Washington State Conservation Commission

May 7, 2014

TO: Conservation Commission Members
Mark Clark, Executive Director

FROM: Commission Staff

SUBJECT: WACD Resolution 2013-17 Consolidation and Budget Issue Separation

Summary: WACD Resolution 2013-17 requests the Conservation Commission (SCC) communicate to the legislature that district consolidation issues should not be a part of the SCC budget.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission already has an informal policy that the decision to consolidate districts is best left to the local conservation districts. Staff recommends the Commission maintain this position. Staff also recommends the Commission agree the consolidation issue is not a budget issue, however the Commission and districts should recognize policy and political decisions by the legislature or the Governor may bring these issues together. Finally, staff recommends the Commission consider the implications of their future policy and budget decisions by the Commission on local decisions regarding consolidation.

Description:

In recent years, budget reductions at the state operating budget level have provided motivation for budget writers and policy makers at OFM, the Governor's Office, and the Legislature to look at the consolidation of publicly funded agencies as a way to get budget savings. Both OFM budget staff and the Legislature have pressed the idea of consolidating conservation districts particularly where there are multiple districts in one county. These efforts have usually taken the form of provisos to the SCC operating budget directing the Commission to consolidate districts. Although these provisos have been proposed in Governor's budgets and some versions of draft legislative budgets, no specific resolution to consolidate has passed. Typically the furthest these provisos have gone is to recommend the SCC consider consolidation as a way to save money.

At the July 2012 SCC meeting, the Commission considered a new policy on consolidation of conservation districts. The policy addressed the approach to consolidating districts once districts have made the decision to consolidate. The policy did not address, require, or recommend district consolidation. The policy was distributed to all CDs for comment and the Commission adopted the final policy at the September 2012 meeting.

The Conservation Commission has not taken a formal position on whether conservation districts should consolidate. The Commission has generally preferred to leave that decision to the districts themselves. The Commission has not sought a budget proviso relating to district consolidation.

In the 2013-15 biennial operating budget there was a proviso relating to conservation district efficiencies that included a reference to district consolidation:

Within the amounts appropriated in this section, the conservation commission, in consultation with conservation districts, must submit to the office of financial management and legislative fiscal committees by December 10, 2013, a report outlining opportunities to minimize districts' overhead costs, ***including consolidation of conservation districts within counties in which there is more than one district.*** The report must include details on the anticipated future savings that could be expected from implementing these efficiencies starting on July 1, 2014. (emphasis added)

The final report approved by the Commission in December 2013 had this to say about consolidations:

The Conservation Commission provides assistance to Conservation Districts considering or engaging in consolidation. The Commission has requested that staff identify and reduce and/or eliminate policy disincentives to consolidations led by the local Supervisors of Conservation District Boards. As an example, the Conservation Commission now splits the \$25,000 allocated for Category 1 funding within a county where more than one Conservation District is operating. The Commission staff has prepared an informational guide for consolidation of Conservation Districts which is made available to Districts that are candidates for consolidation.

The Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD), a non-profit, non-governmental association organized by conservation districts under statute and representing and advocating for conservation districts, has considered the pros and cons and basis for consolidation by conservation districts. WACD has adopted a member-approved policy that recognizes conservation districts' self-determination in making decisions about their governance (consolidation), and that supports local districts' efforts to consolidate where boards of district supervisors have initiated the process themselves.

Despite successes illustrated by examples of increasing administrative efficiencies included in this report, the continuing questions about consolidation of districts are the most controversial among the potentially affected districts. District supervisors who volunteer their time to serve on the boards in multi-district counties often feel "overlooked", or "underappreciated" when their local governance structure is criticized when the issue of consolidation is raised. Nonetheless, districts are still willing to discuss consolidation.

WACD Resolution 2013-17

The resolution identifies the problem that the issue of district consolidation has come up in budget discussions, typically as a way to push district efficiencies. The resolution suggests budgets are not appropriate as the vehicle to drive consolidation discussions and recommends these two issues (budget and consolidation) be separated.

The resolution recommends:

WACD and WSCC will communicate to the Legislature and other decision makers:

- The locally-led basis for the foundational governance structure of districts, and
- That while district efficiency efforts are linked to the budget, governance should be a separate issue.

WACD and WSCC should align their existing policies on district consolidation, and should incorporate those aligned existing policies into this communication.



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No. 2013-17

Title: Consolidation and Budget Issue Separation

Problem:

District Governance and structure are currently linked with the budget in the minds of some decision makers. This manifests itself mainly in the discussion surrounding consolidation of districts. This tends to misrepresent the founding principles of locally led conservation and a district's own governance and sovereignty. While district efficiency efforts are linked to the budget, governance should be a separate issue. This is a current issue related to a 2013 budget proviso, but should be a standing position of WACD and WSCC.

Recommendation:

WACD and WSCC will communicate to the Legislature and other decision makers:

- The locally-led basis for the foundational governance structure of districts, and
- That while district efficiency efforts are linked to the budget, governance should be a separate issue.

WACD and WSCC should align their existing policies on district consolidation, and should incorporate those aligned existing policies into this communication.

Presented by: WACD Legislative Committee, September 12, 2013.

Recommend Do Pass by the Legislative Committee

RESOLUTION PASSED.



Washington State
Conservation Commission

May 5, 2014

TO: Conservation Commission Members
Mark Clark, Executive Director

FROM: Commission Staff

SUBJECT: WACD Resolution 2013-18 Long Term Conservation Funding
Opportunities

Summary: WACD Resolution 2013-18 requests the SCC engage with WACD to evaluate and identify long term funding opportunities for conservation activities. The resolution requests:

1. WACD and WSCC will collaborate to evaluate the proposed long-term funding sources and to develop a campaign to secure needed conservation funding. This evaluation will include those long-term funding options identified by the WACD PPTF (Past Presidents Task Force) in 2012 and in the 2013 20/21 process.
2. WACD and WSCC will employ appropriate WACD committee(s) and task force(s), member conservation districts (including interested conservation district supervisors and employees) and other interested parties and partners to thoroughly analyze and consider the funding options.
3. The WACD and the WSCC will express their joint support for the proposed funding campaign prior to its enactment.
4. The WACD and WSCC will report on progress at the 2014 WACD annual meeting.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission continues support for their identified strategic plan goal of identifying long-term sustainable funding for conservation work and for conservation districts. Staff further recommends the Commission engage with WACD on identifying funding opportunities giving consideration to the options identified by the WACD PPTF and the 20/21 SCC/CD process. Finally, staff recommends the Commission identify a process to work with various stakeholder groups and agencies to build support for any long-term funding proposal.

Description:

Since the beginning of the 2008 recession, the Commission and conservation districts have seen a reduction in funding and funding opportunities for conservation activities. Although the recent state biennial budget was an increase for the Commission, demands for funding in the K-12 education priority will cause further constraints on funding in the next biennia. Budget constraints at the federal level have also created budget reductions at NRCS that impact conservation districts.

SCC Strategic Plan identifies the need for long term funding for conservation activities:

Stable and Diverse Funding – Seek sources of funding for the commission and districts outside of the state’s general fund. Multi-year funding for projects listed as a high- priority. Funding that remains reliable and ongoing.

In 2012, the Conservation Commission held their strategic planning session in Clarkston and developed ideas for implementing this strategic item:

Stable and Diverse Funding

Fund sources outside general fund; known amount of funding, reliable, ongoing, multi-year to fund high priority projects; reassurance to districts on where we are on assessments and rules for rates and charges;

Ideas:

- fee for services and legislation
- agency by agency discussion of why not and what it would look like
- private company NGO mix
- teach / assist districts on how to additional funding (grants, etc);
- grant writer; develop plan for going after NGO funding;
- organized effort on helping districts with assessment and / or rates and charges
- develop a plan for statewide assessment and/or initiative working with other groups do education and outreach to potential funders and receive information and eligibility from potential funders
- develop a investment portfolio
- assist WACD with legislative efforts and support campaign;

Measurement of success:

- Amount of funding in system
- Diversity of funding
- Capacity built in the system as a result diversity of funding

During the 20 /21 meetings with conservation districts, adequate funding was also identified as a key need. The conservation districts and SCC staff developed a list of actions to work toward addressing this need:

1. Support flexibility in legislative appropriations to ensure funding can be made available
2. Investigate alternate/new stable funding (statewide assessment)
3. Continue work to strengthen confidence in WSCC & CDs to implement projects and programs that address priority resource concerns
4. Make implementing the path forward a high priority
5. Partner with conservation/natural resource groups to implement projects/programs using CDs as a funding conduit

In 2012, WACD convened a group of their past presidents to discuss issues relating to elections and long term sustainable funding for conservation districts and conservation work. A result of this effort was a list of actions the group recommended be pursued, including:

1. WACD and WSCC should explore potential to collaborate with a broad coalition of interests and new partners in conservation, to push against considerable resistance by many interest groups to any new statewide funding proposal.
2. WACD should organize a strategy for interim period work with legislators to deliver our message about our strengths and our selling point in advance of any funding proposal to the 2013 Legislature.
3. WACD and WSCC should fully explore increasing funding opportunities via expansion or re-direction of existing state funding sources, and should make efforts with legislators and gubernatorial candidates (and the future-elected Governor) to help support agency collaboration where more can be done.
4. WACD should consider legislation or other options to establish WSCC as state lead agency for agricultural nonpoint-source water quality management, and to establish procedures for agreements needed with state agencies to focus conservation funding through the WSCC as the state lead agency in dealing with private working landowners in non-regulatory programs and services to protect natural resources.
5. WACD should consider legislation and/or agency agreements that establish a WSCC/agency contract system that promotes the ability for any state agency to accomplish conservation goals through WSCC and conservation districts.

WACD Resolution

The resolution recommends the following:

1. WACD and WSCC will collaborate to evaluate the proposed long-term funding sources and to develop a campaign to secure needed conservation funding. This

evaluation will include those long-term funding options identified by the WACD PPTF (Past Presidents Task Force) in 2012 and in the 2013 20/21 process.

2. WACD and WSCC will employ appropriate WACD committee(s) and task force(s), member conservation districts (including interested conservation district supervisors and employees) and other interested parties and partners to thoroughly analyze and consider the funding options.
3. The WACD and the WSCC will express their joint support for the proposed funding campaign prior to its enactment.
4. The WACD and WSCC will report on progress at the 2014 WACD annual meeting.



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No. 2013-18

Title: Long-Term Conservation Funding Opportunities

Problem:

In 2012, the WACD and WSCC recognized the need to evaluate and develop opportunities to secure long-term, stable funding for conservation districts and the Conservation Commission in its role in support of conservation districts. Recent state budgets have illustrated the long-term need to find suitable and reliable sources of funding to support conservation. There is a need to develop and implement a campaign for long-term conservation funding to supplement basic state infrastructure support.

Recent work by the WACD Past Presidents Task Force (PPTF) and conservation district supervisors and employees under the 2013 “20/21 series” of meetings held by Commission staff has identified a number of potential candidate sources of funding for conservation. Each potential source requires thorough evaluation and consideration related to feasibility, reliability and stability prior to launching the funding campaign.

WACD and the WSCC will need to help build the required unity across conservation districts with regard to any funding source(s) (together with their associated natural resource priorities) selected for the funding campaign. Also, considerable work will be required to develop and maintain the new partnerships required to help secure selected funding option(s). Additional work is needed to prepare most promising candidate funding options for inclusion in a campaign that can be developed and implemented over the course of future biennial state budgets.

Recommendation:

WACD and WSCC will collaborate to evaluate the proposed long-term funding sources and to develop a campaign to secure needed conservation funding. This evaluation will include those long-term funding options identified by the WACD PPTF in 2012 and in the 2013 20/21 process.

WACD and WSCC will employ appropriate WACD committee(s) and task force(s), member conservation districts (including interested conservation district supervisors and employees) and other interested parties and partners to thoroughly analyze and consider the funding options.

The WACD and the WSCC will express their joint support for the proposed funding campaign prior to its enactment.

The WACD and WSCC will report on progress at the 2014 WACD annual meeting.

Submitted by: WACD Legislative Committee, September 12, 2013.



Strategic Planning Summary

May 14, 2014

Who We Are

MISSION (revised 5.14.14)

The mission of the Washington State Conservation Commission is to lead the wise stewardship of soil, water, and related natural resources for and with the citizens of the state.

VISION

Washington State shall have healthy soils, water, air, and ecosystems, with sustainable human interaction with these resources.

The Conservation Commission is recognized as the independent and trusted agency of choice that implements stewardship in the state of Washington through support of and partnership with conservation districts and through partnership with other agencies and organizations.

Conservation districts are recognized as the leaders and implementers of actions in local areas to accomplish natural resource conservation goals.

VALUES

The Conservation Commission values all Washington lands, both private and public, the state's natural resources, and the people who own and use them. We demonstrate this by valuing:

- Healthy, diverse landscapes that reflect sustainable economic use of natural resources;

(Continued on page 2)

- Voluntary application of conservation systems on working lands that reflect state, local, and community priorities;
- Partnerships in resource management that involve local, state, federal and tribal agencies and organizations;
- The highest standards of ethics and personal and institutional integrity for Conservation Commission members and staff, and the conservation districts supervisors and staff;
- The economic contributions of natural resource-based industries, operating to achieve sustainability;
- Accountability for the effective and efficient use of public funds;
- Policies and governance procedures that assure the effective and efficient use of public resources;
- Open communications and transparency of operations that create trust;
- Diverse cultures and ideas; and,
- Education for current and future generations.
- Locally led conservation.

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

- Communication and Outreach
- Coordination and Leadership with Other Entities (groups, agencies, tribes, other)
- Impact on Natural Resource Concerns
- Conservation District Governance, Operations, Technical Capacity, and Funding
- Commission Operations (to make this happen)

CONSERVATION COMMISSION'S FUTURE "PLACE"

Member discussion of the Conservation Commission's place in the natural resource work in Washington State:

Group A

- The industry has gone through movements that really push them into the future if WSCC is positioned correctly in a stewardship movement.
- Look at how staff resources could best be used for marketing and outreach... helping conservation districts market themselves...would help the public be more engaged...show the conservation is being practiced and get the neighborhood effect...need to market the services.
- Really focusing efforts in areas of the state where an impact can be done...strategic monitoring on what we are doing in a watershed, show cost and effect...took a region of the state then announce where we are going to work...have discussion of what it was going to take to effect change...what would be needed eg take water body off of 303d listing...have all agencies and entities talking about what would be done and what would it take...WSCC would not have house the technical expertise...utilize watershed plans...have Commission agree on picking an area...the next one...the next one...outline the conversations that need to happen and bring the entities together with the districts to have a thought provoking discussion...need to get beyond the plans...Commission leadership.

Group B

- 2021 Commission seen as problem solving, convening players to get things addressed.
- Be a key player in building capacity of conservation districts.
- Commission seen as the agency...first agency that land owners would see as where they want to come for services.
- As districts build capacity other agencies and organizations seek us out to provide services.
- Set up a forum where land owners understand regulations.

Group C

- A year, two or three down the road have the Commission be better and effective... envision working together...less about their own agenda...how the Commission should function.
- Leadership role for the group. Know what we want to accomplish; do what matters.

Future Accomplishments in Next Three Years

COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

- Messaging...Commission's voice and role is elevated as a key to getting more resources through telling our story.
- Coordinating outreach and advertising about what conservation districts can do.
- Will have more customers in the door at our conservation districts...because people know what we are and do.

COORDINATION AND LEADERSHIP WITH OTHER ENTITIES (GROUPS, AGENCIES, TRIBES, OTHER)

- Coordinate with other natural resource agencies...eg more working on projects.
- Achieve understanding of WSCC, WACD, NRCS roles and less competition and bickering.
- Understand, respect and support the role of other organizations and agencies... develop an understanding, respect, and support among conservation districts about these roles.
- More of an effort to bring in outside expertise...eg other entities addressing the same natural resource concern...WSCC as a venue to host discussions about what they are doing and how we coordinate

IMPACT ON NATURAL RESOURCE CONCERNS

- Show that we are moving to meet water quality and habitat needs.
- Show accomplishments with data and real needs so that the legislature and public see what they are getting for the money.
- Coordinate efforts among conservation districts and other natural resource agencies to address non-point nutrient issues.

CONSERVATION DISTRICT GOVERNANCE, OPERATIONS, TECHNICAL CAPACITY, AND FUNDING

- Explore marrying the Good Governance model with an accreditation model... responsibility / accountability with consequences.

(Continued on page 5)

- Good direction to the districts regarding what the Commission is expecting... overcome confusion.
- Fair, same, transparent election process.

COMMISSION OPERATIONS (TO MAKE THIS HAPPEN)

- Important to note the makeup of Commission and take advantage of that...keep improving our image with legislature to build credibility...eg budget.
- Have forums at meetings for land owners to talk with the Commission about benefits of services provided.

FY15 Strategic Actions

1. Communication and Outreach activities at state and county fairs and job fairs... information booths on natural resource issues, jobs, and education needed.
 2. Build targeted marketing (legislators, public at large, specific audiences).
 3. Implementation activities related to the tribal treaty rights at risk letter.
 4. New budget and allocation process completed and implemented for transparency.
 5. Coordination with other agencies using the model area concept for getting together on an area-wide project(s) to address an area-wide resource concern.
 6. Meeting on long term sustainable funding and action plan developed
 7. Good Governance, administration efficiencies need to be focused for accountability with legislation
 8. Impact on natural resources demonstrated with data, monitoring and Discovery Farms concept
 9. Technical capacity built through certification, training on technical proficiencies needed
 10. Commission is a leader in facilitating change in culture to be a positive, results oriented conservation district family by involving partners an opportunities
-

Appendix A: Working Together as a Commission

RCW 89.08 RELATED TO COMMISSION MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

See presentation slides

ROLE AS A COMMISSION MEMBER

Alan – as a board, charged with allocating dollars, accountability to the districts on how money is spent...accomplish what the voters elected the board members to do...oversee

Lynn – represent the interests of all conservation districts at the state level...even if elected through an area system...lead to integrity and responsibilities of districts, coordinate with and among districts and the other entities in the state...look at a higher level...not just one or a portion of districts, but all districts

George – to provide perspective...from agencies point of view...at as a conduit among districts and other parts of my agency...make new connections...bring information to and from Commission...raising concerns...participation and engaged...read materials and be prepared for the meeting and discuss issues...serve on working groups

Clinton – allocation of state funding to districts...bring forward districts issues and concerns...bring information to districts regarding what the Commission is doing...promote conservation throughout the state...promote cooperation between districts and agencies

Jim – funding issues, communications...give a tribal perspective on issues and at times when needed, forward initiatives from Governor's office...support and implement the WSCC approved actions

Larry – champion the cause of conservation...champion conservation districts as the on the ground agencies...communicate with the west districts...get to know fellow Commission members on a personal level

Todd – make sure we ensure communications and expectations to districts are clear...address the elephant in the room...support the overall good of the WSCC and conservation districts, not biased by agency policy...champion the districts with legislature and others

Past Commission Member...see Boyum letter...needs to know and appreciate what the conservation districts are and do

NOTES:

- Good list that we would share with the Governor regarding new appointments.

(Continued on page 7)

- Distinction between the role of a member and the Commission itself...not run districts but assure they are well run.
 - Envision the needs, services and programs for the future.
 - Hold people accountable to meet the needs, services and programs.
 - Advocate for the Commission.
 - Organize coordination of entities on resource concerns and needs...statewide.
 - Power in knowing who we are...
 - Understanding, respecting and supporting the role of other agencies...interagency communications important...interchange of information...eg Centennial Accord example.
 - Messaging that comes from the Commission is non-regulatory...ability to advocate for natural resources as a non-regulatory agency.
-

MEMBER WORKING RELATIONS

- Basic agreement to a common charge...supporting conservation districts getting working on the ground.
- Learn about each member...personal and professional...look for opportunities to get to know one another...eg tour, interaction dinner, social opportunities.
- Make sure we have member bios shared.
- Identifying knowledge gaps...each member with a different level of understanding of issues operations.
- Orientation sessions with follow-up on questions on roles and;
- Have a code of ethics or ground rules...agreed to items.
- Host an informal retreat for Commission members and be able to talk among each other...off record discussion.
- Respect each other viewpoints...acknowledge viewpoint.
- Have opportunities for discussion among the members.
- When a member disagrees with a decision...they should not message against a decision.
- More person to person communication among members...welcome to call each other with questions...facilitate...freedom to call each other to explore an idea or concept.
- Personal obligation to let the Executive Director know as professional courtesy.
- If decision is against the statute or policy of an agency...must be able to abstain from a vote...however...should have responsibility to be a Commission member.
- If a commission member is going to make a motion for action at Commission meeting there would be a 'heads up' in case the agency director needs contacted.
- Agency member responsibility to communicate within their agency in advance of a meeting on issue or action would be done (no surprises).
- If voting as a member of Commission...take titles away.
- Vote as needed as a member...healthy to vote the way they need to vote...pause if needed to check direction.
- If a member is not participating well...add in code of conduct or written policy... chair of the Commission, vice-chair if needed.

Action: Member Code of Conduct developed by Lynn Bayrich, Jim Peters, Lynn Brown

(Continued on page 9)

MEMBER TURNOVER

- Orientations by Executive Director.
 - A new member would have a mentor with some years of experience.
 - Role description shared with Director for appointment.
 - A shadow for situations if you know you will be leaving in a few months...eg WACD President, agency, Gov appointment.
 - On agency appointments...to extent possible request continuity for a period of time.
 - Commission member first...agency representative next when serving.
 - Request that agency represented make this work a priority for the agency.
-

COMMUNICATIONS TO AND WITHIN COMMISSION MEMBERS

- Friday Update...need to consider a two-way communication , with more on the issues.
 - Work completed is related to the broad categories of our work plan is tied back in our communication with members...Friday Update change.
 - Explore other ways to encourage internal communication...eg net-meetings or webinars for Commission members.
 - Move from the how many meetings folks attend...should release the burden on staff...focus on issues.
 - Anything that can be shared two weeks ahead of time will help members prepare for a meeting...post as completed.
 - After Commission meeting is over we have sent staff notes...some feedback that that the notes are enough...no suggested change...formal minutes only after approved.
 - As soon as possible, take what we have done today and share with a new member.
-