

RESOLUTIONS

November 2011 Training Conference

Resolution # 1 Lawrence County SWCD

Whereas, under §278.080 of the Missouri Revised Statutes the Missouri Soil and Water District Commission has the duty of formulating policy and general programs for the saving of Missouri soil and water by the soil and water conservation districts, and

Whereas, under §278.080 of the Missouri Revised Statutes the Missouri Soil and Water District Commission shall receive and allocate or otherwise expend for the use or benefit of the soil and water conservation districts any funds appropriated by the general assembly for the use or benefit of such districts;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Missouri Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts make an assertive effort to get legislation passed which would require appointees to the Soil and Water Districts Commission to have, or have had, experience serving on a local soil and water conservation district board of supervisors.

Passed – Yes – 33 / No - 16

Resolution # 2 Livingston County SWCD

Let it be known: that Livingston, Howard and Marion County SWCD's are supportive of the two Missouri State statute changes regarding the Type II funding and the Requirements of Being a Commissioner.

Failed – Yes – 16 / No - 17

Resolution # 3 Livingston County SWCD

Whereas, cost-share paid to landowners is money already allocated to their county, and

Whereas, the District is not at fault if a landowner fails to properly maintain their practice, and

Whereas, money paid back to DNR fails to stay within the county;

Therefore, be it resolved: that the Missouri Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts urge the Commission to allow money paid back from a landowner for failing to properly maintain their practice be put back into that district's current year allocations to be reissued for cost-share in that county.

Passed – Yes – 53 / No - 0

Resolution # 4 **Carter County SWCD**

Whereas, current policy states that to qualify for the DSL-2 practice there must be cross fencing in place to comply with the Prescribed Grazing (528) guidelines contained in the Field Office Technical Guide, and resources must be available before a grazing system can be applied, and

Whereas, this policy disqualifies many landowners who meet all other requirements but must have cross fencing for their grazing operation, and

Whereas, it would be more practical and efficient to lime, fertilize, and seed before installing a water system and fences, and

Whereas, a sufficient grass stand resource needs to be in place for a rotational system to adequately meet the qualifications;

Therefore, be it resolved: that the Missouri Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts urge provisions be implemented into the policy to take into consideration that landowners not have to meet the Prescribed Grazing (528) guidelines contained in the Field Office Technical Guide if all other qualifications are met to qualify to install the DSL 2 practice.

Passed – Yes – 31 / No - 10

Resolution # 5
Mercer County SWCD

Whereas, it is difficult to predict changing landowner resource concerns from year to year, and

Whereas, local Soil and Water Conservation Districts desire to make available a large number of different types of practices to landowners, and

Whereas, allocated funds for some practices may go unused and yet unless they are allocated the type of practice would be unavailable to the landowner, and

Whereas, these unused funds could be put to use later in the year if another need arises, and

Whereas, if districts were allowed to transfer funds within the year this would lead to a greater diversity of resource types when planning each year;

Therefore be it resolved: that the MASWCD requests that the local districts be allowed to transfer funds from one resource concern to another if funds are all claimed in one area, but have funds in another area not being used.

Supported by: Grundy, Daviess & Worth SWCD's

No Board member from Mercer SWCD was present to speak on the resolution, according to the by-laws it could not be discussed or voted on.

Resolution # 6
Mercer County SWCD

Whereas, rental equipment helps to fulfill the mission of the Soil and Water Conservation Districts of Missouri by providing the type of equipment needed to conserve soil and water, and

Whereas, local Soil and Water Conservation Districts offer this equipment for landowners to rent which often is not available locally from other sources, and

Whereas, Soil and Water Conservation Districts no longer have matching grant opportunities to purchase new equipment;

Therefore be it resolved: that the MASWCD requests that a small percentage of our cost-share money that we are allocated each year be used toward the maintenance and upgrades of rental equipment.

Supported by Grundy & Worth SWCD's

No Board member from Mercer SWCD was present to speak on the resolution, according to the by-laws it could not be discussed or voted on.

Resolution # 7 **Gasconade County SWCD**

Whereas, the Soil and Water Districts Commission has made streambank stabilization a viable part of the Sensitive Resource Concern throughout the state in order to address water quality as well as soil loss. The main purpose is to prevent the loss of land or damage to land uses and to improve water quality. Millions of tons of soil and gravel are being poured into the rivers and streams each year, thereby creating water quality issues with excessive suspended sediment, chemical and nutrient contamination, and turbidity in surface water, 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 for all landowners of the state of Missouri. A major non-point source pollutant entering Missouri's waters is sediment, and

Whereas, the current Natural Resources Conservation Service Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI), *Stabilizing Streambank Erosion Issues Within the Bourbeuse Watershed in Gasconade County, Missouri*, has provided insight into the financial cost that could be incurred to address these issues not only based on technical design but on the stream order size and current amounts of soil already lost, and

Whereas, the cost to stabilize most stream banks is cost-prohibitive to landowners, and a larger cost-share incentive would be advantageous;

Therefore, be it resolved: that the MASWCD urge the Missouri Soil and Water Commission to review the current Streambank Stabilization practice to increase the landowner cost-share maximum to be more cost-effective and to review the technical authority to include NRCS.

Supported by Osage and Warren SWCD's

Failed – Yes – 15 / No - 32

Resolution #8
MASWCD

Whereas, the Missouri soil and water conservation districts are required yearly to provide a detailed and itemized financial report for all expenditures of the district;

Therefore, be it resolved: That MASWCD requests a detailed and itemized financial report yearly of the Program Office administration costs.

Passed – Yes – 50 / No - 0

Resolution #9
MASWCD

Whereas, the Missouri soil and water conservation districts are required to follow Commission intent and policy on various activities and programs;

Therefore, be it resolved: That MASWCD requests a written copy of the current Soil and Water Commission policies that govern the operation of the Missouri SWCD's as per sections 278.060 to 278.300 RSMo.

Passed – Yes – 52 / No - 0

Resolution # 10
Marion County SWCD

Whereas, if the State of Missouri employees receive a cost of living or salary increase;

Therefore be it resolved: that the Missouri Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts request the Soil and Water Commission to allow the Missouri SWCD employees to receive the same percentage of cost of living or salary increase.

Passed – Yes – 53 / No - 0

Resolution # 11
Clark County SWCD

Whereas, ponds are known to last for many years. If they are maintained they will last many years past their current stated service life;

Whereas, the service life of a pond is one part of the calculation used to figure the cost of soil saved per acre, and

Whereas, if the service life of a pond was increased to 20 years instead of the present 10 years, the cost per ton of soil saved would be half of what it presently is on each pond;

Therefore be it resolved: that the Missouri Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts believes the Soil and Water Program Commission should change the service life of a pond to 20 years. This surely would look better to the tax payers of Missouri.

Passed – Yes – 26 / No - 24

Resolution # 12
Worth County SWCD

Whereas, it is difficult to predict changing landowner resource concerns from year to year, and

Whereas, local Soil and Water Conservation Districts desire to make available a large number of different types of practices to landowners, and

Whereas, allocated funds for some practices may go unused and yet unless they are allocated the type of practice would be unavailable to the landowner, and

Whereas, these unused funds could be put to use later in the year if another need arises, and

Whereas, if districts were allowed to transfer funds within the year this would lead to a greater diversity of resource types when planning each year;

Therefore be it resolved: that the MASWCD requests that the local districts be allowed to transfer funds from one resource concern to another if funds are all claimed in one area, but have funds in another area not being used.

Passed – Yes – 50 / No – 0