

RESOLUTIONS

November 2006 Training Conference

Resolution # 1

Livingston County

Whereas, the Livingston County SWCD believes all terrace practices should require topsoiling, regardless of soil type;

Therefore, be it resolved: that the MASWCD urge NRCS and the Commission to approve cost-share assistance for topsoiling the practice for all terraces.

***DNR NOTE:** In November 2005, the commission approved cost-share for topsoiling in those instances where topsoiling is required by NRCS to meet the terrace practice standard. The rule, 10 CSR70-5.030 (1), states that the specifications for soil and water conservation practices set forth in the FOTG are to be used as the basis for determining need and practicability. Where required, topsoiling is noted on the plans. The need for topsoiling is based on soil type and the amount of topsoil still remaining. It is the commission's policy to provide cost-share for topsoiling on terraces where NRCS has determined it appropriate to require the landowner to topsoil in order for the practice to be certified as meeting standard.*

Resolution Failed

Resolution # 2

Jackson County

Whereas, urban and suburban development is accelerating on land surrounding metropolitan areas throughout Missouri, and

Whereas, soil erosion, sedimentation, and degradation of water quality are increased by development and construction activities on urban and suburban land, and

Whereas, soil erosion that occurs during development and construction on unprotected urban land is often more severe than on agricultural land, and

Whereas, properly installed urban conservation practices can reduce the extent and severity of soil erosion, sedimentation, and water quality degradation just as they do on agricultural land;

Therefore, be it resolved: that the Missouri Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts urge the State Soil and Water District Commission to explore avenues that will enable cost-share funding for appropriate urban conservation practices to control erosion, sedimentation, and water quality degradation on urban and suburban land.

***DNR NOTE:** The Missouri Constitution states that the Parks and Soils Sales Tax is for the purpose saving of the soil and water of this state for the conservation of the productive power of Missouri agricultural land. An additional funding source would need to be identified to support this effort.*

Resolution Withdrawn

Resolution # 3

Johnson County

Whereas, the Johnson County SWCD believes that the District's should not have to write a letter to use an item off of the State Cost-Share Docket each time, and

Whereas, the items are already approved by DNR;

Therefore, be it resolved: that MASWCD urge the Commission to approve use of the cost-share items from the State Cost-Share Docket without a signed request for each item to be used.

***DNR NOTE:** It is the commission's policy to require districts to submit a letter with a board and NRCS signature when requesting to take a component off of the State List. County average costs are submitted to the NRCS State Office and approved by NRCS and FSA, not the Department of Natural Resources. A letter identifying the component being requested and the cost helps to insure that the landowner is being offered the correct component and cost prior to an application being signed by the landowner. Frequently, the submittal letter identifies incorrect costs and staff review reduces the opportunity that landowners will be over or under paid.*

Resolution Passed

Resolution # 4

Boone County

Whereas, Soil and Water Districts Commission policy requires that to compute the estimated cost-share practice cost districts must use county average costs that are jointly developed and agreed to by the local NRCS, FSA and SWCD district board, and

Whereas, the NRCS state office has discontinued allowing the use of any vendor quotes to establish the true county average cost for cost-share components, and only allows the use of cost data from recent claims to establish county average costs and,

Whereas, districts are forced to use component costs from the state average cost list when cost data from recent claims is not available, and

Whereas, district boards of supervisors feel that landowners are not fairly reimbursed for implementation of conservation practices when the use of state average costs is required;

Therefore, be it resolved: That the MASWCD petitions the soil and Water Districts Commission, asking that the Commission intercede on behalf of the landowners of this great state, by requesting the state NRCS office to amend their policy on development of county average cost lists, and once again allow the use of vendor quotes to establish the true county average cost of cost-share components.

***DNR NOTE:** It is commission policy that the state cost-share program uses the same county average costs for a specific component that is used in the federal programs. NRCS no longer allows vendor quotes to establish county average cost because they believe that actual costs will provide more accurate figures.*

Resolution Failed

Resolution # 5

Wright County

Whereas, the Code of State Regulations for the State Funded Cost-Share Program states that to be eligible for assistance from the Cost-Share Program, a landowner must make application on forms provided by the Commission, and

Whereas, all of the Soil and Water Conservation Districts currently use the DCS software program for this purpose, and

Whereas, the current DCS program fully meets the management needs of the districts and is in no immediate need of being replaced, and

Whereas, the Soil and Water Conservation Program Office is in the process of developing a new MoSwims program to replace the DCS software program, and

Whereas, the MoSwims program has yet to be furnished to the district for testing to determine if it will meet all of the needs of the districts;

Therefore, be it resolved: That the MASWCD petitions the Soil and Water Districts Commission asking that the Commission not require use of the MoSwims software program until such time as the complete program has been fully tested by ten districts and seven of those ten districts certify to the Commission that the MoSwims program fully meets their management needs and expectations.

***DNR NOTE:** A department directive was issued in 2002 that the department move from Microsoft Access (the current DCS software format) which is not capable of meeting future application development needs. When completed, MoSWIMS will be a single on-line web-based integrated system and database. This new system will ensure data integrity for all districts, allow data reuse, and prevent the loss of data.*

Nine districts have agreed to be pilot districts during the development and implementation of this new system. The pilot districts will play a very important role in the development and implementation of this new system. The pilot districts have already been involved with the testing of the tool used to prepare the data to be converted into the new system to be able to maintain the historical data. The pilots will also be involved with the testing of the new system to insure the functionality of the system.

Resolution Passed

Resolution # 6

Gasconade County

Whereas, the Soil and Water Districts Commission has a pilot project to address streambank erosion using cedar tree revetments and rock revetments, and

Whereas, gravel accretion and vegetation growing in the stream channel is an extreme problem in Missouri streams and causes the erosion of stream banks, and

Whereas, streambank erosion was identified as the top priority in Gasconade County in the town hall meetings in 1996 and is a continuing concern;

Therefore, be it resolved: That the MASWCD urge the Missouri Soil and Water Commission to add the streambank stabilization practice to the list of eligible Missouri State Cost-Share practices available to all counties; and that

the Missouri Soil and Water Commission and the Missouri Department of Conservation to add to their streambank erosion guidelines the removal of gravel and obstructions from the existing stream channel to prevent stream bank erosion. Further, this material can be used to repair the eroded streambanks greatly reducing the material costs of those projects.

***DNR NOTE:** Missouri Statutes, MoRS 278.070 (4), define the soil and water conservation cost-share program as "a state-funded incentive program designed for the purpose of saving the soil of the state through erosion control and abatement". The rule, 10 CSR 70-5.020 (2), requires land on which the practice is to be implemented must be eroding at rates greater than tolerable soil loss limits or be experiencing active gully erosion. While this practice is currently an eligible water quality practice in the AgNPS SALT Program, to be eligible in the regular cost-share program it would require a rule change.*

Resolution Passed

Resolution # 7

Linn County

Whereas, Soil and Water Districts Commission policy allows that pelletized lime or agricultural lime may be used to provide necessary ENM (effective neutralizing material) for a practice, and

Whereas, Soil and Water District Commission policy states that cost share assistance on pelletized lime will only be paid at the county average cost of agricultural lime, and

Whereas, the district board of supervisors feel that landowners are not fairly reimbursed for the cost of pelletized lime, and

Whereas, there is a lack of vendors in our area to apply agricultural lime on small acres and pelletized lime is readily available and easier for landowners to apply themselves, and

Whereas, pelletized lime is a component on the NRCS State Average Cost List;

Therefore, be it resolved: That the MASWCD petitions the Soil & Water Commission to amend their policy of allowing landowners to use pelletized lime but only paying them on the county average cost of the agricultural lime but to allow pelletized lime to be cost shared at a county average pelletized lime cost on practices that do not exceed five acres in size.

DNR NOTE: It is the commission's policy to allow the use of pelletized lime; however, cost-share is based on what the estimated cost would have been if the landowner had used Ag lime since the cost of pelletized lime is significantly higher. Generally, pelletized lime is only used in critical area seedings and these are usually one acre or less.

Resolution Passed

Resolution # 8

Cape Girardeau County

Whereas, many of the districts with a high percentage of forest land currently use less than 25% of initial funds;

Therefore, be it resolved: That MASWCD recommend that forest cost share practices be added to the Soil and Water Docket for landowners and conservation incentives. This would allow districts with a high percentage of forestland to utilize cost-share allocations, and result in a more equal distribution of funds and conservation encouragement to all landowners.

DNR NOTE: Missouri Statutes, MoRS 278.070 (4), define the soil and water conservation cost-share program as "a state-funded incentive program designed for the purpose of saving the soil of the state through erosion control and abatement". The rule, 10 CSR 70-5.020 (2), requires land on which the practice is to be implemented must be eroding at rates greater than tolerable soil loss limits or be experiencing active gully erosion. This would require a rule change and may also require a statute change. [Note: In FY 2006, only 9 districts used less than 25% of their cost-share allocation. In FY05, there were 8.]

Resolution Failed

Resolution # 9

Cape Girardeau County

Therefore, be it resolved: that MASWCD recommend that land leveling, subsurface drainage and subsurface drainage management as per the pilot "Comprehensive Cropland Water Quality Management" be added to the docket of available practices for cost-share on AgNPS SALT projects. This would make many watersheds projects successful and has proven to reduce sedimentation, nutrient transportation and improve utilization of applied nutrients by the crop and improve water quality.

DNR NOTE: The Soil and Water Districts Commission approved the Hubble Creek AgNPS SALT Project for a Pilot Practice "Comprehensive Cropland Water Quality Management". Some components of this practice include land leveling, subsurface drainage and subsurface drainage management for the appropriate soils. Through piloting the practice in Hubble Creek, the commission is eager to identify the

water quality benefits derived and the associated costs of installation of the practice. As of October 10, 2006, the project treated a total of 167 acres with an average state cost share reimbursement of \$601 dollars per acre.

Resolution Failed

Resolution # 10

Buchanan County

Whereas, currently land in the Conservation Reserve Program is not eligible for Cost Share funds;

Therefore, be it resolved: that MASWCD urge the Commission to allow Landowners to use Cost Share funding on land coming out of Conservation Reserve Program. Landowners should not have to wait on an erosion problem to be evident. This would apply to land that was eroding above "T" before the land was enrolled into CRP.

DNR NOTE: The rule, 10 CSR 70-5.020 (2), requires land on which the practice is to be implemented must be eroding at rates greater than tolerable soil loss limits or be experiencing active gully erosion. For land to immediately be eligible for state cost-share when it comes out of CRP, a rule change would be required if there were no gully erosion or excessive soil loss.

Resolution Failed