

RESOLUTIONS 2016 Training Conference

Resolution #2016-01 Proposed by Gasconade County

Whereas, the Soil and Water Districts Commission has a policy providing up to 75% of the state average cost to assist with conservation practices; and

Whereas, the state average cost has increased annually; however, the acreage limits for the DSP-3.1 (\$95 per acre) and DSP-3.2 (\$85 per acre) have not changed since their inception in FY2010; and

Whereas, based on the averages in our county since FY2011, the State Average Cost for a DSP-3.1 system is \$162 per acre with a 75% rate of \$121 per acre; and

Whereas, based on the averages in our county since FY2011, the State Average Cost for a DSP-3.2 system is \$184 per acre with a 75% rate of \$139 per acre; and

Whereas, the acreage limits in regards to water establishment and distribution have not increased to reflect the increase in the state average costs; and

Whereas, the Missouri Association of Conservation Districts unanimously approved a resolution in November of 2014 requesting that the Commission review the acreage limitations attached to the Grazing System Program;

Therefore, be it resolved: that MASWCD urge the Missouri Soil and Water Program Office and Commission to immediately address the DSP-3.1 and DSP-3.2 acreage limit maximums to be more reflective of the rising state average costs.

Supported by: Boone and Harrison SWCD's

Passed -- yes – 48 / no – 1 – Submitted to the Soil & Water Commission, they increased the per acre amounts effective July 1, 2017

Resolution #2016-02 Proposed by Lafayette County

Supervisor Training Conference Funding Resolution

Whereas, The Program Office decided to eliminate the reimbursement funds for Supervisor Training Conference expenses and to use the current 04 Administrative Fund for those expenses without increasing the same 04 Administrative Fund for said Supervisor Training Conference expenses (see Memo 2017-001); and

Whereas, this decision is adverse to our mission and budget. The Lafayette County SWCD is losing approximately \$1300 to \$1700 per year in State funds (20% of our 04 Fund) for Supervisor participation at the Training Conference; and

Whereas, Historically Lafayette SWCD has sent three to four Supervisors to the Training Conference each year and the loss of the Training Conference Reimbursement Funds will require choosing between: eliminating projects the District has always supported such as: the landowner newsletter, the 4th & 5th grade poster contest, our open house luncheon and activities, our landowner informational meetings, the yearly contractors meeting, participation by Lafayette County Schools in the Kansas City Regional Envirothon, the regional Grassland Contest and other projects supported by the Lafayette SWCD, or requiring Supervisors to pay their own expenses for the Training Conference, or Lafayette County Supervisors will no longer attend the Training Conference; and

Whereas, The Lafayette County Supervisors see this elimination of Training Conference Funds as having a major impact not only our county's budgeting process, but to every county budget in the State of Missouri that sends Supervisors to the Training Conference. Also, this raises the question: What has "happened" to the Training Conference Funds which were formerly used to pay for Supervisor's conference fees and room reservations, an estimated \$40,000 to \$50,000 (if each county in Missouri sent one supervisor to the Training Conference)? Why not add these funds to the 04 Administrative Funds for Supervisor Training Conference expenses?

Therefore, be it Resolved: The Lafayette County Supervisors value the information and the participation in the yearly Training Conference and ask that the 04 Administrative Funds be increased to pay the expenses of Supervisors Conference fees and room reservations for the annual Training Conference.

Supported by: Camden and Carter SWCD's

Passed -- yes – 45 / no – 4 – Submitted to the Soil & Water Commission, funding was restructured effective July 1, 2017 with Supervisor attendance at the conference coming from the 04 Administrative funds.

Resolution #2016-03
Proposed by Osage County

Whereas, Missouri Soil and Water District Commission shall formulate policies and general programs for the saving of Missouri soil and water by the soil and water conservation districts, and shall give consideration to the districts' needs based on their character; it shall receive and allocate or otherwise expend for the use or benefit of the soil and water conservation districts cost share or rental equipment.

Whereas, in consultation with local landowners streambank erosion has been identified as the major cause of soil erosion in Central and South Missouri,

Whereas, the Missouri Soil and Water District Commission acknowledges the severity of streambank erosion and its utmost importance to stream and river environmental qualities in Central and South Missouri,

Whereas, pursuant to Soil and Water policy guidelines districts provide financial and technical assistance to landowners to improve water quality, and to reduce sediment by means of the best management practices.

Whereas, the Soil and Water Conservation District Commission can identify the austerities of streambank erosion thru the account of aerial photography, landowner input, farm visits and stream tours.

Therefore, be it resolved: that MASWCD urge the Missouri Soil and Water Commission to identify the character of erosion in Missouri Counties and assess the areas in which they are experiencing the greatest amount of soil erosion and depositing of sediment directly into the waters of the state through severe streambank erosion

Therefore further be it resolved: that the Missouri Soil and Water District Commission allocate its funds toward efforts to prevent and to alleviate the escalating issue of soil erosion in each County on the basis of Research and Evaluation on which characters of that County best fulfill the goal of saving soil and water

Supported by: Gasconade SWCD

Passed -- yes - 47 / no - 6 - Submitted to the Soil & Water Commission

Resolution #2016-04
Proposed by Carter County

Whereas: the NRCS will be funding fewer CNMPs and,

Whereas: A CNMP is one of the qualifying criteria set forth by the DNR to obtain a beef waste facility, and,

Whereas: These facilities have become one of the most requested practices for the cost share program, and,

Whereas: the cost of obtaining CNMP can be a restrictive requirement for the land-owner to obtain and prevents them from pursuing the practice, and,

Whereas: A beef waste facilities greatly benefits both our conservation efforts and the landowner's production, and,

Whereas: including the CNMP component in the cost-share will ensure continuation of the practice being greatly utilized,

Therefore, Be It Resolved: That the SWCP commissioners approve including the CNMP cost as one of the covered components for the beef waste facilities.

Supported by: Oregon SWCD

Withdrawn due to recent approval of CNMP as a cost-share component

Resolution #2016-05
Proposed by Andrew County

Whereas, the recent NWMO Grazing School highlighted the benefits of portable shade used in intensive grazing systems and rotational grazing where shade isn't available. It has been proven that shade is a valuable asset when grazing in summer heat and especially on endophyte-infected fescue pastures in Missouri, and

Whereas, portable shades improve manure distribution, animal health, and water quality. Most of the time shade trees are located near creeks, rivers, or drainage areas. Cattle stand in shade areas when not grazing, depositing manure and trampling out grass around shade trees. This allows manure to be washed from these bare, unprotected areas by heavy rains. Eventually the manure and nutrients make their way into streams and waterways, degrading water quality, and

Whereas, portable shade structures can be placed on higher ground in the paddock to catch wind for cooling livestock. Manure will be deposited in the pasture closer to the shade structures, making it less likely manure and nutrients will get into streams. Portable shades can be easily moved to prevent killing out vegetation in the pasture and moved to areas where soil is less productive to help build the soil with additional manure near the shade, and

Whereas, we believe portable shade is an overlooked tool that can be used by grazers in Missouri. Portable shades provide many benefits for livestock producers. This is a sustainable practice that will protect and improve Missouri's pastures, water, and natural resources;

Therefore, be it resolved: that the Andrew County SWCD Supervisors propose that MASWCD request the Missouri Soil and Water Program Office and Missouri Soil and Water Commission make portable livestock shades eligible for cost share funding when used as a component of a proposed or existing managed grazing system.

Supported by: Harrison SWCD

Passed -- yes -- 31 / no -- 16 -- Submitted to the Soil & Water Commission

2016 Floor Resolutions

Resolution #2016-06
Proposed by Livingston County

Whereas, MASWCD counties are requesting to discontinue Area Meetings due to lack of attendance as well as lack of beneficial information and training and,

Whereas, If DNR calls an Area Meeting to be held, DNR shall supplement the counties funds for attending the Area Meeting due to the financial stress of the districts' 04 funding.

Therefore be it resolved: The funds DNR uses for Area Meetings be redirected and used for costs of the Annual Training Conference.

Supported by: Andrew, Caldwell, Clay & Linn County SWCD's

Failed to get 2/3 vote to bring from the floor

Resolution #2016-07
Proposed by Livingston County

Whereas, all Missouri Soil & Water Conservation Districts are considered members of the MASWCD and,

Whereas, the voting for MASWCD Area Directors is currently done at Area Meetings held across the state only by those attending the Area Meetings.

Therefore be it resolved: That MASWCD change their bylaws regarding Area Director Elections, stating that all Area Director elections be handled by ballot by either US mail or email to all paid members of the MASWCD. This would give equal representation to all paid members of MASWCD

Supported by: Andrew, Caldwell, Clay, Daviess & Linn County SWCD's

Failed to get 2/3 vote to bring from the floor

Resolution #2016-08
Proposed by Livingston County

Whereas, all counties Soil & Water Conservation Districts are affected by the monthly shutdown of MoSWIMS and,

Whereas, changing the MoSWIMS maintenance hours it would not affect the workload of the 114 Soil & Water Conservation Districts;

Therefore be it resolved: That that DNR maintain MoSWIMS during hours in which the Soil & Water Conservation Districts are not affected.

Supported by: Andrew, Caldwell & Linn County SWCD's
Failed to get 2/3 vote to bring from the floor

Resolution #2016-09
Proposed by Chariton County

Whereas, grassland is frequently being converted to cropland and,

Whereas, an increased number of cropland acres are needed to be converted back to grassland to improve soil health and,

Whereas, the rising cost of installing perimeter fencing has prevented numerous landowners from converting cropland to grassland;

Therefore be it resolved: that the cost-share list for DSP-3 Grazing Systems be updated to include perimeter fencing as an eligible component of this practice.

Failed to get 2/3 vote to bring from the floor

Resolution #2016-10
Proposed by Boone County

Whereas, the 19 Info/Ed Grant was removed and now Info/Ed expenses are to be taken from the 04 Administrative Grant, and

Whereas, previously the funding amount in the 19 Info/Ed Grant was based on the number of students within each county; and

Whereas, the funding for 04 Administrative Grant is now less for several counties than what was received in the past for 04 Administrative Grant and 19 Info/Ed Grant combined; and

Whereas, many districts implement, or are trying to implement more, Info/Ed activities, but are limited by the amount of funding received in the 04 Administrative Grant

Therefore, be it resolved: that MASWCD urge the Missouri Soil and Water Program Office and Commission to implement a supplemental disbursement program to increase 04 Administrative Grant funds for districts which request additional funds to continue and/or expand their Info/Ed activities.

Passed – yes – 49 / no – 1 – Submitted to the Soil & Water Commission