



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-01

Title: Revision to WCC procedures regarding certification of local supervisor elections.

Status:

There is no deadline for notifications of election by the WCC to local CDs. Thereby certification of election by the WCC is done at the convenience of the WCC.

Problem:

As there is no deadline for Certification of election, the process drags on. This lack of timely response by the WCC to local districts reduces the efficiency and credibility of the local district and the WCC.

Recommendation:

Upon filing of required paperwork to the WCC by the local district the WCC shall take action in a timely way but no later than 60 days.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Len Engel, Whidbey Island

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Whidbey Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-02

Title: Supervisor Election Process.

Problem:

Passage in 1999 of legislation changes the term “landowner” to registered voter in the elections section of RCW 89.08. According to the Assistant Attorney General, this has placed district elections under Title 29 of the elections law, thus making supervisor elections appear on the general ballot.

Recommendation:

- 1) WACD pursues legislation that changes the district election procedure and which insures funding for the election process.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Motion died to lack of a 2nd.

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by WACD Board of Directors



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-03

Title: Supervisor Elections Process

Problem:

Passage in 1999 of legislation changes the term “landowner” to registered voter in the elections section of RCW 89.08. According to the Assistant Attorney General, this has placed district elections under Title 29 of the elections law, thus making supervisor elections appear on the general ballot.

Recommendation:

- 1) WACD pursues legislation that changes the districts election procedure. As portrayed in election legislative changes during area meetings by Conservation Commission.
- 2) WACD ask the Conservation Commission and legislature for assistance in finding to secure funding to pay for the new election procedure of conservation district supervisors on the general ballot; funding that does not take funds from existing or future conservation projects and programs.
- 3) ~~WACD support the concept of the elected supervisors being on the general ballot, provided that there be no financial burden on the districts.~~
- 4) WACD and WCC shall work actively with Washington legislature to find a back up alternative to general elections should acceptable funding not be available for the general elections cost.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Paul Nee, Pierce
Amended by Monte Marti, Snohomish/Seconded by Skip Mead, Columbia

RECOMMENDED DO PASS AS AMENDED



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-04

Title: Supervisor Elections Process

Problem:

Passage in 1999 of legislation changes the term “landowner” to registered voter in the elections section of RCW 89.08. According to the Assistant Attorney General, this has placed district elections under Title 29 of the elections law, thus making supervisor elections appear on the general ballot.

Recommendation:

- 5) WACD pursues legislation that changes the districts election procedure.
- 6) WACD ask the Conservation Commission for assistance in finding funding to pay for the new election procedure.

*



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-05

Title: Supervisor Elections Process

Problem:

Passage in 1999 of legislation changes the term “landowner” to registered voter in the elections section of RCW 89.08. According to the Assistant Attorney General, this has placed district elections under Title 29 of the elections law, thus making supervisor elections appear on the general ballot.

Recommendation:

- 7) WACD pursues legislation that changes the districts election procedure.
- 8) WACD ask the Conservation Commission for assistance in finding funding to pay for the new election procedure.

*



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-06

Title: Supervisor Elections Process

Problem:

Passage in 1999 of legislation changes the term “landowner” to registered voter in the elections section of RCW 89.08. According to the Assistant Attorney General, this has placed district elections under Title 29 of the elections law, thus making supervisor elections appear on the general ballot.

Recommendation:

- 9) WACD pursues legislation that changes the districts election procedure.
- 10) WACD ask the Conservation Commission for assistance in finding funding to pay for the new election procedure.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Motion died due to lack of a 2nd.

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by WACD Board of Directors



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-07

Title: General Ballot Elections for Supervisors

Problem:

The cost of placing the District Supervisor positions on a general ballot would be quite high and in many cases, could not be accommodated by the Districts. In most Districts, it would severely cut into operating budgets enough to reduce the effectiveness and quality of conservation programs.

Recommendation:

WACD work hard to insure that any plan to put District Supervisors on a general ballot includes state funding for all such elections. Further, 89.08.400 R.C.W. currently places the burden of authorization of the District Special Assessments on the local County Legislative Authority. If Supervisors are to be elected by general ballot, 89.08.400 shall be revised to place the burden of authorization for the special assessments on the Supervisors instead of the County Legislative Authority.

Motion made by Larry Cochran, Whitman/Seconded by Butch Ogden, Cowlitz

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by Spokane Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-08

Title: General Election Funding for Conservation Districts and Compensation for Conservation District Supervisors.

Problem:

The 1999 legislative change to the definition of “district elector” fundamentally altered the way district elections could be run. We now have a law that is in conflict with itself. Because of the unintended consequence of the legislative change, conservation districts are no longer exempted from RCW Title 29; thus, RCW 89.08, has election procedures that, in the Commission’s Assistant Attorney General’s opinion, are invalid. The new definition of “district elector” probably places district elections under RCW Title 29, not RCW 89.08.

The increased costs associated with placing a CD Supervisor on the General Election Ballot are substantial. Diverting existing funds to the election process will mean decreased resources targeted to natural resource protection.

An effect of the 1999 legislative change probably requires CD Supervisors to provide a Personal Financial Affairs Statement. This effect will greatly reduce, if not eliminate, the pool of willing individuals who would choose to become CD Supervisors. Without CD Supervisors, CD’s will no longer be able to function or provide the effective natural resource protection programs currently being implemented.

Recommendation:

That WCC and WACD sponsor legislation to increase the basic funding level for CD’s to \$100,000 annually and to seek full basic funding to off-set the increased costs of conducting general ballot elections.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Merrill Camp, Walla Walla

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-09

Title: Alternative to general election ballot

Problem:

Due to the change in RCW 89.08, which removed the landowner requirement for voters of a Conservation District election, state law now presumably requires district elections to be placed on the general ballot. This requirement brings with it the costs associated with such an election process. These costs are not insignificant and presently not financially feasible for Conservation Districts to absorb into their currently funded budgets. Conservation Districts are the local conservation assistance mechanism in the state, formed to provide on-the-ground conservation and technical assistance for landowners and operators. The political value, of district elections being placed on the general ballot, is acknowledged and understood. But does this political value outweigh the value of conservation being performed in the field? The cost of Conservation District elections should not be pulled from existing grant funding or conservation on-the-ground will be negatively affected in the state.

Recommendation:

The Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD) and Washington Conservation Commission (WCC) ~~should~~ shall work actively with the legislature to ~~find a politically acceptable~~ an alternative to general election ballots for Conservation District supervisors. If funds are available to pay for Conservation District elections wouldn't those funds be better utilized funding conservation in the field?

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by George Mahoney, Clark

Amended by Paul Nee, Pierce/Seconded by Ken , Othello

Amended by Scott Barr, Pend Oreille/Seconded by Paul Nee, Pierce

Amended by Scott Barr, Pend Oreille/Seconded by Sharon Call, Kitsap

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Othello Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-10

Title: Conservation District Election Costs

Problem:

Changes in conservation district law require elections to be conducted according to RCW Title 29. Many districts do not have the ability to pay for costs associated with a general election. There are also problems with incorporating conservation district boundaries with those already established for general elections. This will further increase election costs and there is some questions that it can even be accomplished. If conservation districts are required to follow Title 29, the State of Washington should bear the cost of elections because many districts are not able to. Districts' limited funds should be used to implement conservation practices.

Recommendation:

If conservation districts are required to use the general election process as stated in RCW Title 29, WACD should request that the State of Washington be responsible for the cost of these elections.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Motion failed due to lack of 2nd.
RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by Chelan Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-11

Title: District Financial Policies and Accounting Procedures

Status:

In 1999, the State Auditor revised the BARS Manual. In the new version, the State Auditor lays out several new policies and procedures Districts should have in place.

Problem:

Conservation Districts do not have the expertise nor the time to develop procedures spelled out in the new BARS Manual. There is little formal training available for District Administrators and Accountants on these policies and procedures.

Recommendation:

The Conservation Commission develop a model financial and administrative procedures manual that Districts can adopt and implement. The Commission would also develop and implement statewide training sessions for District Administrators and Accountants.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Sharon Call, Kitsap

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Pierce Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-12

Title: A Standard On-Line Accounting System of Washington State Conservation Districts.

Status:

Currently, the Washington State Conservation Commission provides minimum requirements and guidelines for financial management to Conservation Districts. Each district must develop an accounting and management system to meet the requirements.

Problem:

Washington State Conservation Districts do not have a standard accounting system available for their use. If the accounting system developed by a District is not adequate, it may face liability from the Washington State Auditors office and/or potential loss of financial support from its funding sources. Many Districts do not have the financial resources or the technical support to develop adequate systems.

Analysis:

A standard accounting and management system would assure the Districts that they were compliant with the requirements of the Washington State Conservation Commission and the State Auditor. It would assure the Districts meet the accounting and reporting needs of their funding sources. A standardized approach would assure consistency among Districts and allow the Commission to provide technical help.

If a centralized system were available on-line the cost to Districts would be minimized. With a centralized on-line system the Commission could summarize data helpful to the Districts and Commission in reporting accomplishments and attracting funding. Also changes in guidelines and requirements could be made easily and consistently across all Districts.

Recommendation:

- 1) Be it resolved that the Washington Association of Conservation Districts work with the Conservation Commission to provide Conservation Districts with an on-line standard accounting and management system.
- 2) WACD support with the legislature, funding to support this system

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Everett Glover, Snohomish

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Thurston Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-13

Title: Wildlife Steward of the Year

Status:

The “Wildlife Farmer of the Year” award presents one award to a farmer who has shown dedication to promoting wildlife on his/her property.

Problem:

The current format of judging makes it difficult to compare large or commercial farms on an equal basis with small or non-commercial farms. Judging is generally based upon acres of land reserved for habitat, total cost to the landowner, and species targeted. For example, a landowner in an urban setting with 5 acres will reserve 2 acres for wildlife habitat, while another farmer who has 1,000 acres will reserve 50 acres for habitat. Percentage wise, the small farmer has taken more land out of production than the large, but the other landowner has created more acreage for habitat.

Recommendation:

~~That the award be renamed “Wildlife Steward of the Year” and that two awards be given: one to landowners under 50 acres and one to landowners above 50 acres.~~

That two awards be given. One award would be the “Wildlife Steward of the Year” for landowners under 50 acres. The other award would remain “Wildlife Farmer of the Year” for landowners above 50 acres.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Paul Nee, Pierce
Amended by Paul Nee, Pierce/Seconded by Richard Zones, South Douglas

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Pierce Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-14

Title: WACD Annual Dues

Problem:

The Articles and By-Laws of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts call for the WACD President to establish a task force during 2000 to address WACD dues prior to the 2000 Area meetings. These district dues must be reviewed during the 2000 Annual Meeting. Therefore, this resolution is a result of that action.

Recommendation:

Make the following changes to Article V of the Articles of Association of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD) and Article II, Section 1 of the By-Laws of the WACD:

Every conservation district whose dues are current at the time of the WACD Annual Meeting shall be deemed to be a member of this Association, unless membership is expressly declined. WACD shall, by March 30, provide each district with the annual dues assessment calculation based upon the Basic Funding Match Program Application on file with the Washington Conservation Commission on January 30.

The Articles of Association and the By-Laws should also be revised as follows:

The WACD President must establish a task force during 2003 to address WACD dues prior to the 2003 Area meetings. These district dues must be reviewed during the 2003 Annual Meeting. If there is no action taken at the 2003 Annual Meeting, WACD dues will follow the existing structure.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Monte Marti, Snohomish

RECOMMEND TO PASS*

* Submitted by WACD Board of Directors



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-15

Title: WACD Annual Dues

Problem:

The Articles and By-Laws of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts call for the WACD President to establish a task force during 2000 to address WACD dues prior to the 2000 Area meetings. These district dues must be reviewed during the 2000 Annual Meeting. Therefore, this resolution is a result of that action.

Recommendation:

Make the following changes to Article V of the Articles of Association of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD) and Article II, Section 1 of the By-Laws of the WACD:

Every conservation district whose dues are current at the time of the WACD Annual Meeting shall be deemed to be a member of this Association, unless membership is expressly declined. WACD shall, by March 30, provide each district with the annual dues assessment calculation based upon the Basic Funding Match Program Application on file with the Washington Conservation Commission on January 30.

The Articles of Association and the By-Laws should also be revised as follows:

The WACD President must establish a task force during 2003 to address WACD dues prior to the 2003 Area meetings. These district dues must be reviewed during the 2003 Annual Meeting. If there is no action taken at the 2003 Annual Meeting, WACD dues will follow the existing structure.

Motion made by Paul Nee, Pierce/Seconded by Sharon Call, Kitsap to combine Resolution 14 & 15 and delete resolution 14.

RECOMMEND TO PASS*

* Submitted by WACD Board of Directors



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-16

Title: Recognition of 50 years of “Washington State Grange News” Conservation Issues

WHEREAS, The Washington State Grange has published a special ‘Conservation in Washington’ supplement to the Grange News for the past 50 years; and further

WHEREAS, the Grange has supported the grass-roots efforts of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts in promoting the conservation of natural resources; therefore be it

Recommendation:

That the WACD invite representatives of the Washington State Granges and present them with an award at the WACD Annual Convention to acknowledge and commend them for highlighting conservation efforts in Washington State for 50 years, 1950 – 2000.

RESOLUTION 16 WAS COMBINED WITH RESOLUTION 17*

* Submitted by Snohomish Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-17

Title: Recognition to the State Grange News for Conservation Education.

Problem:

The Washington State Grange News has been in publication for 50 years. Each year they publish a Conservation Supplement as an educational service to conservation districts. The State Grange News should receive some sort of recognition for the service they have provided to conservation districts for the past 50 years.

Recommendation:

The Washington Association of Conservation Districts should forward a letter of thanks to the State Grange News for submission in their annual Conservation Supplement together with a special plaque for 'Fifty Years of Outstanding Conservation Education' to be awarded at the 2001 annual meeting or State Grange Convention at the President's discretion.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Ron Juris, East Klickitat

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED *

* Submitted by Central and Eastern Klickitat Conservation Districts



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-18

Title: Agricultural Principles Incorporated into Washington State School System

Problem:

Agriculture is responsible for sustaining our nation's growing population and our strong economy, yet an alarming number of adults lack a basic understanding and appreciation of farming and other agricultural concepts. Urbanization of our population has created a physical and mental separation of people from the land. To compound the problem, there seems to be little if any information regarding agriculture (other than from the environmental side) being taught to the next generation in our schools. All children, not just those in FFA and 4H, must have an opportunity to learn about agricultural concepts while they are in school, so as adults they will know that their food doesn't just come from the grocery store.

Because of a necessary emphasis on core subjects such as Reading, Writing, Math and Science, there is no room for adding Agriculture as a core subject into the current Washington State school curriculum. An alternate means of educating children on agriculture must be found.

Recommendation:

The Palouse Conservation District proposes that WACD lobby the governor and legislature to require schools (K-12) to incorporate agricultural principles and examples into daily classroom exercises with a special emphasis during National Agriculture Week (March 18th-24th). This could easily be accomplished by utilizing existing programs such as "AG in the Classroom" or by consulting with local conservation districts, NRCS and ag extension staff to obtain information to use in their classrooms.

Motion made by Jim Druffel, Palouse/Seconded by Mark Whitmore, Palouse

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by the Palouse Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-19

Title: Annual Meeting Start Day.

Problem:

There has been a noticeable decrease in attendance during the Monday morning sessions at our annual convention. This is most likely a result of having the annual meeting begin on the Monday following Thanksgiving. Many people who would like to attend are prevented from doing so due to family obligations and difficult, busy holiday travel. People are forced to use Monday mornings as a travel period instead of attending the opening ceremonies and morning meetings.

Recommendation:

Change the days of the annual convention so that the opening ceremonies begin on the Tuesday morning following Thanksgiving. This will allow attendee's to use Monday as a travel day.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Barbara Panke, Pend Oreille

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by Spokane Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-20

Title: Re-authorization of District Special Assessments

Problem:

Initiative 695 specifically included pre-authorization of special assessments along with simple fee for service increases as being required to go before a vote of the people. Even though that portion of I695 has been struck down, there are members of the Legislature that are considering new legislation that would mirror those elements of the initiative. This could have a devastating effect on Conservation Districts by not allowing us to recover full costs for services rendered. If re-authorization of the assessments were made to go on the general ballot, the cost of that would unnecessarily reduce the amount of funds the Legislature and the local County Legislative Authority have mandated to go to putting conservation on the ground. This would reduce the effectiveness of the Districts and also reduce the amount of monies available for matching funds for grants and SRF loans. Our service to the citizens of our districts would have to be reduced and with continued technical assistance cutbacks by the NRCS and other agencies, conservation of natural resources in Washington State would be cut dramatically.

Recommendation:

WACD and individual districts work closely with Legislators to keep special assessment reauthorization and simple fee increases out of any contemplated tax reform legislation.

Motion made by Ed Kuhn, Spokane/Seconded by Dave Stadelman, Upper Grant

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Spokane Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-21

Title: Conservation District Law

Problem:

The scope of work, complexity and funding avenues for conservation districts have changed dramatically since 89.08 was first written. Even though there have been several revisions and updates over the years, the basic structure of the law remains in its' original form, necessitating constant revisions. This is a very time consuming and costly process for WACD, the Conservation Commission and the Legislature.

Recommendation:

~~The Officers and Directors~~ President of the WACD ~~work closely with the Washington State Legislature~~ form a task force to do a complete modernization and revision of 89.08 for adoption at the WACD annual meeting in November, 2001 and Legislative action in 2002. The finished product shall still reflect the original intent of the law and maintain the grass roots structure of conservation districts.

Motion made by Ed Kuhn, Spokane/Seconded by Bob Haberman, Kittitas
Amended by Ed Kuhn, Spokane/Seconded by Jerry Henderson, Asotin/

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Spokane Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-22

Title: Medical/Dental/Vision Insurance for elected and appointed conservation district supervisors

Problem:

RCW 89.08 does not allow for appointed and elected conservation district supervisors to be included on medical/dental/vision group insurance plans. Since it is not specifically allowed in this RCW, it is considered disallowed. As the health insurance market narrows, the provision for individual coverage is less and less available at affordable cost. As a small benefit for the hours of volunteer time contributed, RCW 89.08 should be changed to enable elected and appointed district supervisors to join group health plans provided to each district. The supervisor would be required to prepay the monthly cost of the coverage.

Recommendation:

~~WACD negotiate or lobby Washington legislators to change RCW 89.08 to allow appointed and elected conservation district supervisors to be included on medical/dental/vision group insurance plans provided through the districts they serve.~~

That a WACD Task Force be established to review RCW 89.08 to consider change to allow conservation district supervisors and associate supervisors to be included on medical, dental, vision group insurance plans, provided through the district they serve and premiums to be paid for by those supervisors. Supervisors and associates are eligible as of the date of inception of the insurance plan.

Motion made by Nick Somero, Pacific/Seconded by Colin Bennett, Central Klickitat
Amendment made by Monte Marti, Snohomish/Seconded by Paul Nee, Pierce

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED *

* Submitted by Upper Grant Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-23

Title: Youth Camperships

Problem:

Because one of our responsibilities is education, the elimination by the Washington State Auditors Office of being able to award scholarships or camperships to Natural Resource Youth Camps seems to be directly opposed to one of the Conservation District goals.

Recommendation:

~~WACD negotiate or lobby Washington legislators to change RCW 89.08 to allow Conservation Districts to advertise to the general public and offer campership or scholarships to~~ investigates a method for providing scholarships to Natural Resource Youth Camps and other similar activities that educate general public regarding natural resource conservation.

Motion made by Nick Somero, Pacific/Seconded by Ollie Call, Kitsap
Amended by Ron Juris, East Klickitat/Seconded by Lynn Brown, Kittitas

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Upper Grant Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-24

Title: WACD Annual Report

Problem:

Washington Association of Conservation Districts' Annual Report is not easily read by the rank and file members. The accounting and reporting system currently used is not clear to casual users of the financial statements without explanations of what different accounts do or do not represent.

Recommendation:

The Washington Association of Conservation Districts establish a committee to develop and implement an accounting system that fits all applications of WACD and generates reports appropriate and understandable, without modifications, to its membership.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Richard Zones, So. Douglas

RECOMMEND TO PASS*

* Submitted by South Douglas Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-25

Title: Conservation District Name Change

Problem:

Washington State Conservation Districts historically were local governmental entities that promoted conservation through education and assistance to landowners and interested public. Increasingly, state and federal authorities are imposing on the Conservation Districts to police conservation practices to determine if the landowners are conforming to the established requirements regardless whether an actual practice is beneficial to a particular piece of land or not.

With the shrinking NRCS staff and increased regulations, the duty of regulating conservation practices is falling to the Washington State Conservation Districts. The Districts have great appreciation to the grant funding available to the districts for their work, and realize the paperwork that is involved to account for the projects completed. The political “hand-shaking”, “hoop-jumping” and policing, however, is hindering the recruitment of qualified supervisors and employees. The local control the Conservation Districts possessed in the past has been replaced by governmental policies and regulations.

Recommendation:

The Washington Conservation Districts be renamed to Washington Political Conservation Districts as part of the Washington Association of Political Conservation Districts, now known as the Washington Association of Conservation Districts.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Richard Zones, So. Douglas

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by South Douglas Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-26

Title: District Eligibility for Resolution Participation

Whereas Conservation Districts are required by WACD Bylaws to be paid-up members in order to vote at the WACD convention, and

Whereas business transacted at the WACD convention requires voting member participation.

Therefore be it resolved that a Conservation Districts must be a paid-up member before submitting resolutions to the annual WACD convention.

Recommendation:

Amend WACD policy to require that a conservation district be a “paid-up” member before they are eligible to submit resolutions to the annual area meetings for consideration at the WACD convention.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Butch Ogden, Cowlitz
Amended by Paul Nee, Pierce/Howard Jaeger, Cowlitz (failed)

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by Cowlitz Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-27

Title: Lower Snake River Dams

Problem:

There is growing public debate over the impacts of the four lower Snake River dams on ESA listed runs of salmon and steelhead. WACD Officers and Directors, employees of the WACD, and persons authorized to speak on behalf of WACD will more and more frequently be involved in conversations where WACD's position on the matter may be asked of them. Therefore, our position must be developed.

Recommendation:

In the event that a WACD Officer and/or Director, employee of WACD, or any person authorized to speak in behalf of WACD is questioned as to the associations stance on dam breaching, the reply should imply the following:

WACD believes that healthy salmon and steelhead runs can coexist with the four lower Snake River dams. ~~The thought that dam breaching can be the silver bullet of salmon recovery is unconscionable.~~ Reducing harvest, proper hatchery management with the ever improving habitat that we promote, will allow us to realize our goal of salmon and steelhead recovery.

Motion made by Paul Stoker, Othello/Seconded by David Carlton, Columbia
Amended by Monte Marti, Snohomish/Seconded by Rosie Winters, Benton

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Columbia Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-28

Title: Amendment to the CRP 51% “rule”

Problem:

Under current rules, in order to qualify for CRP, when there is an existing stand of grass, in order to maximize points, 50% must be “improved” in order to improve chances of getting reaccepted into the program. Once a producer is accepted, he or she must destroy what is sometimes a good stand of grass and reseed to the “improved” varieties. These varieties are native grasses with the addition of a legume or forb. The “theory” is native grasses are better for wildlife. We have seen no discernible difference in wildlife’s preference or native vs. non-native CRP stands. Reseeding leaves the ground open for wind and water erosion and destroys wildlife habitat, sometimes for several years before a new stand can be established. The new stand may not be as good as the old established stand. It also costs the producer and taxpayer extra money to re-do what he or she has already done.

Recommendation:

WACD work with FSA and WDFW to modify this rule to enable stands of non-native species that have already been established to qualify in lieu of the “enhanced” stand. Take these results to NACD to work with national FSA, NRCS, and US F&W to change recommendations.

Motion made by Jerry Peterson, Whitman/Seconded by John Aeschliman, Whitman
Amended by Skip Mead, Columbia/Seconded by Gary Luft, Whitman

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Whitman Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-29

Title: Establishing a Carbon Sequestration Market and/or USDA Program in Washington State.

Problem:

Greenhouse gas emissions including carbon dioxide (CO₂) have been reported to contribute to global warming. Soil conservation practices not only reduce soil erosion but also increase organic matter content of the soil and thus sequester carbon. Managing our agricultural and forests lands will buy valuable time to address the challenge of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Recommendation:

1. WACD seek to be involved in the Carbon Sequestration issue, ~~with all parties and organizations.~~
2. WACD work with NACD to establish Policy and Procedures which will encourage individuals, groups, agencies at all levels to involve local Conservation Districts when developing baselines and models for carbon credits. Work should begin to determine the correlation between locally developed conservation plans and the amount of carbon sequestered by the implementation of these conservation plans.
3. WACD should pursue, along with state agencies like Washington State Department of Agriculture, hiring a state coordinator for Carbon Sequestering. The coordinator will help districts explain this concept to their landowners and organize a program those landowners can utilize.

Motion made by Paul Stoker, Othello/Seconded by Jerry Peterson, Whitman
Amended by Ron Juris, East Klickitat/Seconded by Howard Jaeger, Cowlitz

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Franklin Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-30

Title: Carbon Credits

Problem:

In recent years there has been a lot of interest in carbon credits or carbon sequestration. Most of the activity to date has been with the National, Regional, and State Level Agencies. While some of this activity has been technical in nature, other efforts have been posturing to get a share of the money. Conservation Districts and their cooperators are properly positioned to ensure important local input is considered during program development.

Our concern is that the carbon base lines and prediction models will be established without enough grower input; this can be prevented by involving Conservation Districts, the most local form of representation for Resource Issues. Conservation Districts work with growers on a daily basis. When working with growers, District and local NRCS staff, use a conservation plan and other local resource information. These conservation plans are locally developed and are often used for program contracts.

Recommendation:

WACD work with NACD to establish Policy and Procedures which will encourage individuals, groups, agencies at all levels to involve local Conservation Districts when developing baselines and models for carbon credits. Work should begin to determine the correlation between locally developed conservation plans and the amount of carbon sequestered by the implementation of these conservation plans.

RESOLUTION 30 COMBINED WITH RESOLUTION 29*

* Submitted by Whitman, Palouse Rock Lake, & Pine Creek Conservation Districts



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-31

Title: Carbon Sequestering

Problem:

Carbon Sequestering is a new concept that can be applied to many different areas of conservation. It is currently being used in forestry and reforestation. It may also be applied to land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and production agriculture.

There is so much information out about this concept, and most of it is very unorganized. This program involves funding from the private sector. It will take a lot of time to sift through all of the information about carbon sequestering and how conservation district landowners can apply carbon credits to conservation practices they may already be using.

Those who are purchasing carbon credits are interested in working with large tonnage of carbon. It makes sense to approach this on a statewide or at least a region wide basis.

Recommendation:

WACD should pursue, along with state agencies like Washington State Department of Agriculture, hiring a state coordinator for Carbon Sequestering. The coordinator will help districts explain this concept to their landowners and organize a program those landowners can utilize.

RESOLUTION 31 COMBINED WITH RESOLUTION 29*

* Submitted by Lincoln Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-32

Title: Equitable Pesticide Labels

Problem:

In today's global economy Washington farmers are not just competing with growers from Idaho and Oregon. They also compete with the Canadian producers who have fewer restrictions and buy cheaper pesticides yet sell to the same market. Unfair pricing practices on reduced tillage chemicals have resulted in less acceptance across National and State borders. This places an undue burden on some producers. This has a legal impact on these no-till conservation practices.

Recommendation:

~~Bring U.S. and Canadian pesticide laws into harmony and work for joint labeling in North America crop production products. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the governments of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico formed a technical working group in 1996 regarding pesticides. Allow this group to set standards. To establish the use of pesticides registered in this country and pest control products registered in Canada that have substantially similar ingredients to be used in both countries at a similar cost. The WACD and NACD will work with the appropriate agencies to accomplish this task.~~

WACD take issue of pesticide pricing - labeling regulations inside and outside the U.S. through NACD to Federal legislatures to resolve all issues.

Motion made by Paul Stoker, Othello/Seconded by Jerry Peterson, Whitman
Amended by Paul Stoker, Othello/Seconded by Tracy Ericksen, PRLCSD

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED *

* Submitted by Palouse Rock Lake Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-33

Title: Benefits for District Employees

Problem:

While District employees are eligible for many of the state sponsored benefit programs, such as Washington Health Care Authority and Deferred Compensation Program, they are not eligible for the Dependent Care Assistance Program because of District's political subdivision status.

Recommendation:

WACD, WCC and WADE should research setting up an IRS Section 125 Plan for districts to provide district employees with additional benefits.

Motion made by Nick Somero, Pacific/Seconded by Monte Marti, Snohomish
Amended by Monte Marti, Snohomish/Wade Troutman, Foster Creek

RECOMMEND DO PASS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Asotin Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-34

Title: Contour Buffer Strips

Problem:

Contour Buffer Strips have been a true success story for the Palouse Cropping Area under the CRP Program. This practice has taken the most erosive portions of the field and put them into contour grass strips. The practice requires soil protection to T. From an erosion reduction standpoint, no practice has achieved more for conservation. Natural Resource Conservation Service in Washington has issued a Washington Standard for this practice dated May 1998.

Recommendation:

~~WACD urge the State Partnership to provide a letter of support for this program to the National Partnership (NACD, NRCS & FSA) for continuation of this practice under the CRP program.~~

WACD coordinate with Districts of neighboring states of Idaho and Oregon to collectively resolve inconsistencies in contour buffer strip definition and coordinate with the State partnership.

Motion made by Read Smith, Palouse Rock-Lake/Seconded by Kathy Schneider, Palouse Rock-Lake

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED *

*Submitted by Palouse Rock Lake, Pine Creek & Whitman Conservation Districts



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-35

Title: Establishing an endowment for Wetland Restoration Projects (WRP).

Background:

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is purchasing conservation easements in perpetuity from private landowners for WRP. NRCS will manage and maintain the easements in perpetuity.

Problem:

NRCS does not have an endowment to guarantee the agency the finances and staff to adequately maintain these easements. This may result in private landowners not getting the services agreed to under the WRP agreement.

Recommendation:

WACD shall work with NACD and NRCS to creatively establish and fund an endowment to guarantee the maintenance of WRP easements in perpetuity.

Motion made by Ray O'Neal, Stevens/Seconded by Margaret Tokatch, Stevens

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Stevens Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-36

Title: Fostering Conservation District participation in 2514 Watershed Planning and 2496 Salmon Recovery processes.

Status:

Chapter 90.82 and 77.85 of the Revised Code of Washington direct local governments to initiate local water resource planning and salmon recovery project planning. Both processes are intended to maximize local citizen input. Under 90.82 watershed planning for a Water Resource Inventory Area is initiated with the concurrence of all counties, the largest city, and the water supply utility obtaining the largest quantity of water from the WRIA. Native American tribes within the WRIA are also invited to participate. Under 77.85 counties, cities, and tribal governments designate a lead entity to coordinate local salmon recovery project planning and implementation. The lead entity is directed to establish a committee representing the interests of counties, cities, conservation districts, tribes, environmental groups, business interests, landowners, citizens, volunteer groups, regional fisheries enhancement groups, and other habitat interests to provide a citizen-based evaluation of projects.

Problem:

Chapter 89.08 of the Revised Code of Washington directs conservation districts to prepare and keep current long-range renewable resource conservation plans, yet the involvement of conservation districts in 2514 Watershed Planning and 2496 Salmon Recovery processes is at the invitation and discretion of local governments or lead entity groups. Thus, a conservation district may or may not have a formal, recognized role to play in the local planning processes. These local renewable resource conservation-planning processes may result in a duplication of activities. Furthermore, many conservation districts are not adequately funded to prepare and keep current long-range plans or participate in the watershed planning and salmon recovery planning processes.

Recommendation:

WACD should lobby state legislatures to better integrate the renewable resource conservation planning processes required under Chapter 89.08, 90.82, and 77.85 by requiring the concurrence and participation of local conservation districts and providing funding to conservation districts to participate.

Motion made by Steve Marble, Clallam/Seconded by Walter Forsberg, Clallam

RECOMMEND DO PASS



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-37

Title: Setting a base soil rental rate for the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program to improve program marketability.

Problem:

The current rental rates for the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) are based primarily upon dry cropland soil rental rates. These rental rates sometimes do not effectively represent the value of rental rates for soils that are found in riparian and riverine areas that are the focus of the CREP program.

Raising soil rental rates is controlled by each county's local FSA County Committee and affects the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), including Continuous CRP, and CREP. Therefore, to raise the rates for the CREP program could adversely affect Continuous CRP and General CRP programs by limiting sign-ups.

Additionally, many areas that are eligible for CREP are irrigated crop, hay, or pasture lands and because the rental rates are based upon dryland rental rates, the program suffers from lack of landowner interest. The irrigated land value is much greater than any dry land soil rental rates.

Finally, because of the importance of this program in the Governor's Salmon Recovery Plan a greater emphasis, thus soil rental rates, should be given for those areas that are eligible. For this program to work the economic incentive for landowners has to be there.

Recommendation:

WACD request the Washington Conservation Commission work with the Farm Services Agency to set minimum soil rental rates for the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program by region at a level that will better reflect the importance of this program and improve program marketability. Use WA State CREP money to make up the difference in rental rates.

~~We are suggesting North Central Washington rates should be established in a tiered system so land that irrigated is given a base rental rate of \$100 per acre enrolled and dryland is given a base rental rate of \$75 per acre enrolled.~~

Motion made by Paul Stoker, Othello/Seconded by Skip Mead, Columbia
Amendment made by Paul Nee, Pierce/Seconded by Monte Marti, Snohomish

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Okanogan Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-38

Title: Ensuring CREP Forward Contracting for Plants Meets the Needs of Districts

Status:

The Washington Conservation Commission recently awarded a contract for forward brokering of Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program plant materials to Olympic Nursery of Woodinville. However, the Olympic Nursery is but one of several plant materials sources available to the CREP participant. Some producers are choosing to place their CREP plant orders through districts. Currently, most districts' plant materials needs are supplied by the WACD Plant Materials Center.

Problem:

It is not clear to the districts, nor is there a clearly defined process on how deposits will be made for all plant materials needed for CREP participants, including those plant materials ordered through the districts at the PMC. There is a concern that districts will not have the financial capability to secure plant materials through the PMC, and will not be able to assist landowners in securing the plant materials necessary to implement CREP.

Recommendation:

The WACD work with the Washington Conservation Commission to review the forward contracting agreement with Olympic Nursery. If the contract is not consistent with, or does not fully meet the needs of conservation districts in procuring plant materials to implement the CREP program, that either the contract with Olympic Nursery be amended, or further action from the WACC be instituted.

Motion made by Ray Typola, Skagit/Seconded by Jim Carney, Pend Oreille

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Skagit Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-39

Title: Advancing CREP Participant’s Practice Incentive Payment (PIP) for Fall Site Preparation

Status:

Presently, program participants cannot receive reimbursement from the Farm Service Agency (FSA) for money spent on site prep until after the entire practice (riparian forest buffer 391A) is complete i.e. the entire buffer has been installed and certified as complete by CD.

Problem:

There are sites that need as much as two years of preparation before planting. These include, for example, areas heavily infested with reed canary grass or Himalayan blackberry. The best time to apply herbicides and initiate site preparation is in the fall or to engage in multiple successive treatments.

Under present FSA regulations, program participants must either forego needed site preparation or advance the costs of site preparation and wait for reimbursement until the entire buffer has been completed and certified. Most program participants are not financially in a position to do this. Here is an example of the problem:

Site Preparation done in the fall	\$15,000.00
Trees ordered in fall for Spring Planting	\$ 3,750.00
Total	\$18,750.00
Cost Share (60%)	\$11,250.00
Owner Carries	\$ 7,500.00

The program participant will not receive reimbursement for the \$7,500.00 until the buffer has been completed and certified. Normally, landowners enter agreements with outside contractors for the installation of a buffer. Typically, these agreements require payment within 30 days that the services are performed. Few program participants are able and willing to carry \$7,500.00 for many months or years. Consequently, site prep and tree planting are crowded into a short time frame that is less than optimal.

Recommendation:

WCC will advance the owner’s 40% PIP when a portion of the practice component is complete and has been certified. This advance would be secured by an assignment by the program participant’s PIP payment by FSA after the entire buffer has been completed and certified.

Motion made by Ray Taipale, Skagit/Seconded by Kathy Schneider, PRLCD

RECOMMEND DO PASS* *

* Submitted by Whatcom Conservation District
* Submitted by Kitsap Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-40

Title: Adequate resources to Districts to fulfill responsibilities under Substitute Senate Bill No: 6161, The Dairy Nutrient Management Act.

Status:

Section 6 of the Act provides, in part, that “the conservation commission, in conjunction with conservation districts, shall develop a state wide schedule of plan development and approval to ensure adequate resources are available to have all plans approved by July 1, 2002”. By December 31, 2003, all approved plans shall be certified by a conservation district and a dairy producer when the elements necessary to implement the plan have been constructed or otherwise put in place and are being used as designed and intended.

Problem:

Not all Districts charged with providing dairy nutrient management plans under the Act have received adequate funds to attract, train and retain qualified resource technicians in numbers that will ensure meeting the statutory deadlines.

Recommendation:

WACD should encourage the WCC to take the following action: by December 15, 2000 the conservation commission will solicit from each District a budget to provide the technical assistance necessary to approve and certify plans within the statutory deadline. Districts will, in turn, provide their respective budgets by December 31, 2000. The Commission will prepare a program funding request based upon its needs in order to administer the dairy nutrient management program and the needs of the respective districts and present a consolidated budget with the individual district budget requests attached as exhibits. The funding request shall explain clearly that conservation districts will be unable to perform their duties under the Act if this budget request is not met. This program funding request shall be presented to the Chairs of the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Rural Economic Development, House Standing Committee on Agriculture and Ecology and the Governor as soon as possible but in no event later than January 31, 2001.

Furthermore, we urge to recommend the Technical Advisory Committee under RCW 90.64 to review the minimum elements of a dairy nutrient management plan.

Motion made by Veronica , Whatcom/Seconded by Lynn Brown, Kittitas
Amended by Fred Colvin, Thurston/Seconded by Larry Cochran, Palouse

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Whatcom Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-41

Title: Raising Cost-Sharing Limit for Dairy Producers to \$50,000 per operation.

Status:

A district may reimburse the dairy operator 75% of actual costs of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that meet NRCS standards and which are needed to solve a water quality program. Grant guidelines further provide that the maximum cost-sharing limit for Dairy Nutrient Management Grants is \$25,000 per operation, per year. A district may request a variance to the cost-sharing limit for a good reason.

Problem:

A dairy producer must certify that all the elements necessary to implement the plan have been constructed or otherwise put in place on or before December 31, 2003. As of August 31, 2000, just 5% of the dairies have so certified. Only 39 months remain for producers to install the needed BMPs. For the past year prices that producers have received for their milk are at or below the cost of production. The cost of installing all the needed BMPs is much, much more than 75% of the current cost-sharing limitation. Good reason exists for the Commission to programmatically raise the current payment limitation to \$50,000. This matches the cost-sharing limitation of the Federal Government for its programs such as EQIP.

Recommendation:

WACD should encourage the Conservation Commission to raise its cost-sharing limit for dairy producers to \$50,000 per operation.

Motion made by Veronica Wisniewski, Whatcom/Seconded by Bas Scholten

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Whatcom Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-42

Title: Conservation Commission Voting Rights

Problem:

The Washington Conservation Commission is comprised of ten members three who are elected by conservation districts, two appointed by the governor and five ex officio members. The five ex officio represent four state agencies (Ag., DOE, DNR, WSU Extension) and WACD. We believe the writers of the conservation district law (RCW 89.08) set it up this way so that there would be direction of the Commission provided by the people it was to help and oversee. Then they setup the ex officio members to provide input and advice as to what other state agencies were doing. This is fine as long as the agencies representatives do not out number the members who are elected or appointed. Due to having very active people elected or appointed to the Commission there have been times that a Commission decision has been made when the ex officio members have out numbered the elected or appointed members.

Recommendation:

Therefore it be resolved that WACD ask the Washington Conservation Commission to have only the members holding elected or appointed positions be able to vote on motions presented before the Commission. If the Commission ignores this suggestion, then WACD work with legislators to amend RCW 89.08.030 while we are amending RCW 89.08 on how district supervisors are elected.

Motion made by Nick Somero, Pacific/Seconded by Ollie Call, Kitsap

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by Kittitas Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-43

Title: Commission Quarterly Activity Report

Status:

The Conservation Commission Grant Program has developed a “Grant News You Can Use” newsletter. This contains very useful information and aids Districts in keeping informed about Commission grant programs. The Commission has also developed an extensive web site that is a very useful resource for Conservation Districts. The Conservation Commission also provides past Commission Meeting minutes.

Problem:

Despite the newsletter, web site, and Commission Meeting Minutes, Districts lack a comprehensive understanding of Conservation Commission activities. In addition, there is no mechanism for collecting and reporting information about District programs and activities on a statewide level.

Recommendation:

- 1) Conservation Commission staff write and submit a quarterly report of accomplishments on the Commission web site.
- 2) Expand “Grant News You Can Use” newsletter to become “Commission News You Can Use”. This newsletter would include updates on legislative news, Commission staff activity reports, including field representative’s report, program accomplishments on a statewide level (Implementation, Limiting Factors update, Engineering, Dairy, Engineering, CREP), and any other information pertinent to Districts.

Motion made by Linda Arcuri, Pierce/Seconded by R.E. Cornelius, North Yakima

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Pierce Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-44

Title: Conservation Commission define role to Districts

Status:

RCW 89.08.070 outlines the duties and responsibilities of the Conservation Commission. On 7/20/2000, the Conservation Commission adopted a strategic plan.

Problem:

RCW 89.08.070 and the Commission Strategic Plan provide Districts a broad picture of the WCC duties and responsibilities. While this is useful, it does not provide enough information to define specific WCC roles and responsibilities.

The WCC needs to more clearly define their duties and responsibilities in regard to the oversight and guidance they provide districts under the provisions outlined in RCW 89.08.070, items 1-b, 3, and 10. For example, districts are required to send documents such as personnel policies, safety plans, and inter-agency agreements to the WCC for review and approval. However, such documents are too often given only a cursory review and lack a seal of official approval supported by the authority of the WCC. The WCC should be able to provide definitive and legally correct advice on such documents and agreements and should be the entity to coordinate with other sources if outside advice is required.

RCW 89.08.070 General duties of commission.

In addition to the duties and powers hereinafter conferred upon the commission, it shall have the following duties and powers:

1. To offer such assistance as may be appropriate to the supervisors of conservation districts organized under the provisions of *this 1973 amendatory act, in the carrying out of any of their powers and programs:
 - a) to assist and guide districts in the preparation and carrying out of programs for resource conservation authorized under *this act;
 - b) to review district programs;
 - c) to coordinate the programs of the several districts and resolve any conflicts in such programs;
 - d) to facilitate, promote, assist, harmonize, coordinate, and guide the resource conservation programs and activities of districts as they relate to other special purpose districts, counties, and other public agencies.
2. To keep the supervisors of each of the several conservation districts organized under the provisions of *this 1973 amendatory act informed of the activities and experience of all other districts organized hereunder, and to facilitate an interchange of advice and experience between such districts and cooperation between them.



3. To review agreements, or forms of agreements, proposed to be entered into by districts with other districts or with any state, federal, interstate, or other public or private agency, organization, or individual, and advise the districts concerning such agreements or forms of agreements.
4. To secure the cooperation and assistance of the United States and any of its agencies, and of agencies of this state in the work of such districts.
5. To recommend the inclusion in annual and longer term budgets and appropriation legislation of the state of Washington of funds necessary for appropriation by the legislature to finance the activities of the commission and the conservation districts; to administer the provisions of any law hereinafter enacted by the legislature appropriating funds for expenditure in connection with the activities of conservation districts; to distribute to conservation districts funds, equipment, supplies and services received by the commission for that purpose from any source, subject to such conditions as shall be made applicable thereto in any state or federal statute or local ordinance making available such funds, property or services; to issue regulations establishing guidelines and suitable controls to govern the use by conservation districts of such funds, property and services; and to review all budgets, administrative procedures and operations of such districts and advise the districts concerning their conformance with applicable laws and regulations.
6. To encourage the cooperation and collaboration of state, federal, regional, interstate and local public and private agencies with the conservation districts, and facilitate arrangements under which the conservation districts may serve county governing bodies and other agencies as their local operating agencies in the administration of any activity concerned with the conservation of renewable natural resources.
7. To disseminate information throughout the state concerning the activities and programs of the conservation districts organized hereunder, and to encourage the formation of such districts in areas where their organization is desirable; to make available information concerning the needs and the work of the conservation district and the commission to the governor, the legislature, executive agencies of the government of this state, political subdivisions of this state, cooperating federal agencies, and the general public.
8. Pursuant to procedures developed mutually by the commission and other state and local agencies that are authorized to plan or administer activities significantly affecting the conservation of renewable natural resources, to receive from such agencies for review and comment suitable descriptions of their plans, programs and activities for purposes of coordination with district conservation programs; to arrange for and participate in conferences necessary to avoid conflict among such plans and programs, to call attention to omissions, and to avoid duplication of effort.
9. To compile information and make studies, summaries and analysis of district programs in relation to each other and to other resource conservation programs on a state-wide basis.



10. To assist conservation districts in obtaining legal services from state and local legal officers.
11. To require annual reports from conservation districts, the form and content of which shall be developed by the commission.
12. To establish by regulations, with the assistance and advice of the state auditor's office, adequate and reasonably uniform accounting and auditing procedures which shall be used by conservation districts.

Revisions: [1973 125 ex.s.c 184 8; 1961 c 240 6; 1955 c 304 7. Prior: 1949 c 106 1, part: 1939 c 187 4, part: Rem. Supp. 1949 10726-4, part.]

Recommendation:

First, the WCC detail in its strategic plan the duties and responsibilities required by RCW 89.08.070. This would provide clarification for Districts on the duties and responsibilities of the Commission. Secondly, the Conservation Commission will follow up on its strategic plan by developing a detailed annual plan that has specific objectives and tasks regarding funding, accounting procedures, district employee and supervisor training, Commission program development, outreach strategy to Districts, communications, legislative activity, etc. The WCC will also use the annual plan to outline field representatives' roles and responsibilities regarding their support to districts.

Motion made by Linda Arcuri, Pierce/Seconded by Dave Stadelman, Upper Grant

RECOMMEND DO NOT PASS*

* Submitted by Pierce Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-45

Title: District Financial Accounting Training

Status:

District Administrators and Accountants need a process for learning District accounting procedures and policies. Section 340 of the procedures manual– Use and Record of Funds- was last updated in 1995.

Problem:

Currently, there is little coordinated training opportunity for District Administrators and Accountants. Increased budgets, additional requirements by the state auditor, and a heavier workload have placed additional burden on District Administrators and Accountants. The procedures manual that guides District Administrators and Accountants is outdated and does not cover these new requirements.

Recommendation:

WACD recommends that the Conservation Commission dedicate funding immediately for a comprehensive statewide District Accounting training program. The Conservation Commission should immediately embark on updating the Section 340 of the procedures manual. That WACD assist in providing lobbying efforts to assist the WA Conservation Commission in this effort.

Motion made by Wade Troutman, Foster Creek/Seconded by Sharon Call, Kitsap
Amended by Butch Ogden, Cowlitz/Seconded by Paul Nee, Pierce

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Pierce Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-46

Title: Financial and Technical Assistance for Small and/or Noncommercial Farms

Status:

There is currently no dedicated funding from the Washington State legislature through the Washington Conservation Commission to support on-going, comprehensive programs for financial and technical assistance to small and/or noncommercial farms.

Problem:

There is an increase in the number of small and noncommercial farms throughout Washington State. These may be as diverse as a landowner with a few cattle for personal use, or a small producer supplying high value crops for a niche market. Although all types of agriculture support the infrastructure of a healthy agrarian economy, this segment of the agricultural population is underserved by conservation districts due to lack of financial resources. As a result, these landowners have a higher potential to cause negative impacts to natural resources.

Recommendation:

That WACD work with WA Conservation Commission to obtain dedicated funding for financial and technical assistance for small and/or noncommercial farms.

Motion made by Ollie Call, Kitsap/Seconded by Dave Stadelman, Upper Grant

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Skagit Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-47

Title: Exempting Dairy Nutrient Plans (DNMP) from Public Disclosure

Background:

Every dairy in the state of Washington must have an approved DNMP by July 2002 and fully implemented by December 31, 2003. Conservation Districts are the only entities that can approve DNMP's. A DNMP contains proprietary information specific to individual dairies. Districts must keep a copy of every DNMP they approve. With few exceptions, Districts records are subject to public disclosure laws. Upon request, a District will have to provide a copy of the DNMP.

Problem:

The current public disclosure law damages District/Landowner relationships. Once dairy producers become aware of this issue, their reluctance to work with districts will increase.

Recommendation:

WACD shall encourage legislation that will give Districts copies of DNMP's exempt status from public disclosure.

Motion made by Fred Colvin, Thurston/Seconded by Ray O'Neal, Stevens



RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Stevens Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-48

Title: Revision to Public Disclosure Act RCW 42.17.310 (1)(h)

Status:

Districts are a public agency subject to liberal disclosure of records. RCW section 42.17.310 (1)(h) exempts “Valuable formulae, designs, drawings, and research data obtained by any agency within five years of the request for disclosure when disclosure would produce private gain and public loss.” This exemption has been narrowly construed by the courts “to prevent private persons from using the act to appropriate potentially valuable intellectual property for private gain.” (PAWS v. UW, 125 Wn.2d 243, 255 1994)

Problem:

Nitrate contamination of groundwater is a growing concern in a great many aquifers of our State. Landowners are reluctant to engage in or provide results of soil and water sampling to Districts because they must be disclosed to the public. The landowners fear that this would, in turn, subject them to enforcement actions by the Washington State Department of Ecology or suits by third parties. There is a great need to quantify the nitrate contamination problem and to monitor effectiveness of conservation practice implementation. The availability of this research data would also greatly aid Districts in convincing farmers to adopt and maintain conservation practices.

Recommendation:

WACD should lobby state legislatures to expand the exemption found in 42.17.310 (1)(h) to protect disclosure of research data obtained by Districts ~~to assess and monitor nitrate in soil or groundwater.~~

Motion made by Fred Colvin, Thurston/Seconded by Ollie Call, Kitsap
Amended by Fred Colvin, Thurston/Seconded by George Mahoney, Clark

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-49

Title: Deposits on tree sale orders, legal or not?

Problem:

The Washington State Auditors Office has indicated that it may not be legal for Conservation Districts to make cash deposits on trees ordered for re-sale from the PMC, RC&D and other wholesale suppliers. The cash flow generated by these deposits is vital to the PMC and the RC&D's and their continued ability to supply nursery stock to the Districts.

Recommendation:

WACD work with the State Auditor's Office and the State Legislature to get an official determination and if necessary, a policy/ruling change to allow the continuation of making cash deposits for trees ordered for re-sale from the PMC and RC&D's.

Motion made by Paul Nee, Pierce/Seconded by George Mahoney, Clark

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Spokane Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-50

Title: Coordinated resource management

Problem:

By accepting full membership in Washington State's Coordinated Resource Management Executive Group in 1998 and passing Resolution 99-18 at last year's annual meeting, the Washington Association of Conservation Districts has assumed a position of vigorous advocacy and support for the Coordinated Resource Management approach to renewable resource planning and management.

Resolution 99-18 called for action that will further empower conservation districts to embrace Coordinated Resource Management as a core feature of their strategy for delivery service to their constituents.

At the Year 2000 Coordinated Resource Management Executive Group meeting and tour in Olympia and Cowlitz Conservation District, very positive responses were elicited from Governor Locke's Salmon Recovery Team Legislative Committee and staff, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Ecology. Executive Group members unanimously supported the establishment of a statewide Coordinated Resource Management Coordinator position with full funding by the legislature.

Senate Natural Resource Committee staff recognized the need for increased and stable funding of conservation district program staff that are providing leadership for community-based Coordinated Resource Management planning groups.

Members of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Team have expressed keen interest in the current level of accomplishments through Coordinated Resource Management and have requested a briefing of the Governor's staff.

Recommendation:

That the Washington Association of Conservation Districts respond to the significant new opportunities and expressions of interest by making full implementation of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts Resolution 99-18 a priority component of the Washington Association of Conservation Districts' Year 2001 legislative agenda.

Motion made by Norm McClure, Okanogan/Seconded by Dave Stadelman, Upper Grant

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Okanogan Conservation District



WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-51

Title: Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) New Shoreline Management Rule

Problem:

The DOE is attempting to amend the shoreline master program. However, the state budget does not include funds to compensate local governments who will need to amend their shoreline master programs to respond to any adopted guidelines. The proposed guidelines, if adopted, will create an unfunded mandate for local governments.

The new Shoreline Management Rule is not subject to review by our elected legislative body. It creates additional regulations for rural landowners and exempts past practices for urbanized areas. DOE is stretching the shoreline rule to include restoration. On timberland, the new rule prevents any development within 200 feet of any size stream that is converted to any other land use. On agricultural land, the new rule mandates the county to evaluate farmer practices on each farm. Existing and ongoing agricultural activity is exempt. But any change in an agricultural practice requires the county to evaluate whether the practice is allowable under a restoration mandate. This creates a county regulatory presence on every farm that alters a current land-use practice.

Recommendation:

DOE should stop trying to amend the existing Shoreline Rule until the language in the new rule fully explains what the regulatory impacts are to agricultural and forested landowners.

The Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD) should work with the Washington State Legislature and Governors office to ensure adequate funding is made available to local governments to develop, adopt, and administer any revisions to the shoreline master program by DOE.

Motion made by Nick Somero, Pacific/Seconded by Sharon Call, Kitsap

RECOMMEND DO PASS*

* Submitted by Pacific Conservation District





WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Resolution No: 00-52

Title: NRCS support and assistance in construction processes for Conservation District projects.

Background: Currently there are ten District Engineer positions authorized to service the Conservation Districts in Washington. The need for these engineering positions was to alleviate the bottleneck in project design normally handled by the NRCS engineers. The District Engineers have shortened the time needed to implement district projects.

Problem: We are presently experiencing an inefficient use of the District Engineers time. Many district clusters cover several counties. This results in some construction projects occurring several hours from where the District engineers are based. At times, projects are occurring simultaneously at opposite ends of the area they are serving. In the past, construction support, such as construction staking and construction inspection, for Conservation District projects was conducted by District or NRCS technicians who had practice approval authority. This has not been a problem in the past because all projects had received NRCS review and approval. District Engineers, being registered professional engineers, do not need NRCS approval for projects that they begin.

Often NRCS employees, with appropriate practice approval authority, are available within the local Conservation District to provide construction support activities. However, because many projects designed by District Engineers have not received NRCS review and approval, NRCS employees are, as a matter of NRCS policy, not allowed to perform support functions on those projects. This is requiring the District Engineers to be the sole provider of all design and construction support services. Often this can result in the District Engineer driving several hours each way to perform a 20 minute inspection. This is obviously not an efficient utilization of their time and the taxpayers dollars.

The referenced policy, no doubt appropriate for the needs of NRCS (SCS) at the time it was adopted, is becoming an increasing source of frustration for District and NRCS employees as they work to strengthen their abilities to work as a mutually supportive team to provide maximum service to our clients. The change in the needs of both NRCS and the Conservation Districts in this area of responsibility makes the review of this policy apparent.

Recommendations:

1. ~~Clark Conservation District recommends and requests the appropriate authorities within the WACD~~ requests WSCC, NRCS Washington State Conservationist, and NRCS Washington State Engineering Team Leader address and resolve the policy prohibiting appropriately trained and approved NRCS employees from providing construction support services, such as inspection and staking, for projects prepared by Conservation District Engineers. It is



recognized that, if necessary, this may need to be elevated to national levels for resolution, and

2. The authorities cited above must recognize, and keep foremost in their deliberations, that NRCS and the Conservation Districts of the State of the Washington are committed to developing and reinforcing their abilities to work as a mutually supportive team with the primary goals and objectives of providing maximum service to our clients.

Motion made by Nick Somero, Pacific/Seconded by George Mahoney, Clark

RECOMMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED*

* Submitted by Clark Conservation District