



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

2010 Final Resolutions		
Number	Status	Resolution
10-01	Passed	Assessment Constitutionality Language Improvement
10-03	Passed	Recognition of Hydropower as a Renewable Resource in Washington State
10-04	Passed	Recognizing Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Standards and Specifications as AKART
10-05	Passed	Grazing as a Management Option
10-06	Passed	CSP and the 2012 Farm Bill
10-07	Passed	Restore NRCS funding to drainage maintenance
10-08	Passed	Capricorn CREP – Site Preparation and Maintenance with Sheep and Goats
10-09	Passed	Power to the People (Farmers)
10-10	Passed	Support of NRCS Cultural Resource <i>Washington Bulletin</i> WA 190-10-3
10-11	Passed	Building Relationships with Washington Natural Resource and Regulatory Agencies
10-12	Passed	Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC) Cost-Share Ratios for In-Stream and Riparian Area Enhancement Practices
10-13	Passed	Keep the Washington State Conservation Commission Independent.
10-14	Passed	Maintain the Independence of the Washington State Conservation Commission and Conservation Districts
10-18	Passed	Developing an Organization Flow Chart for WACD
10-19	Passed	Amending WACD By-laws to Authorize Hiring of Employees by WACD
10-22	Passed	Tying Dues to Maintaining a WACD Annual and Long Range Plan of Work
10-24	Passed	Opposing Ecology's "Water Smart Washington" Proposed Legislation
10-25	Passed	BMPs
10-26	Passed	Potential Legislation
10-27	Passed	Memorandum of Agreement
10-28	Passed	Conservation Districts' Representation on the Washington State Department of Ecology's Water Quality Financial Assistance Council
10-29	Passed	Irrigation Efficiencies
10-30	Passed	Opposing Water Right Fees
10-31	Passed	Water for Rural Road Maintenance



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

2010 Final Resolutions		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
10-32	Passed	Referral of Cooperators Farming Adjacent to Lakes or Streams to Conservation District Prior to Regulatory Action Being Taken
10-34	Passed	Funding For Lands Acquisition by Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-01**

**Title: Assessment Constitutionality Language Improvement**

**Problem:**

Recent challenges to conservation district assessments point out the need to improve assessment authorization language in Chapter 89.08.400. The basis of these challenges is that conservation district assessments confer no special benefit to any particular parcel within the boundaries of the assessment.

Better language can be written and adopted to make conservation district assessments more clearly a “fee” rather than a special benefit assessment. Making this change would reduce or remove the need to show special benefit to parcels within the assessment area and make it clear that general benefits to all residents and jurisdictions within the assessment area is the conferred benefit.

A very experienced law firm is currently working on this language, which will be distributed at the WACD Annual Meeting.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD leadership and legislative liaison personnel will work to have improved conservation district assessment language adopted by the legislature.

**Presented by:** Pierce Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-03**

**Title: Recognition of Hydropower as a Renewable Resource in Washington State**

**Problem:**

This problem was addressed as a recommended resolution for the 2009 NCW area meeting and is presented here again to emphasize the importance of recognizing hydropower as a renewable resource.

When Initiative 937 was passed in 2006, it required electric utilities with 25,000 or more customers to meet targets for the use of renewable energy and energy conservation. The initiative did not include hydropower, which makes up nearly 75 percent of energy generated in the State. Wind, solar, biomass, or tidal power was included as renewable resources. Wind turbines, however, do not generate power on the hottest or coldest days, when no wind generally blows. Wind turbines only work about 25% of the time according to the Franklin County PUD. The other sources are still in the development stage.

Chelan, Douglas, and Grant PUDs have invested hundreds of millions to improve fish passage on the upper Columbia. The results of these efforts have been higher returns than before the dams were built only to be penalized for their efforts.

Investing in hydropower would reduce the cost of wind power by involving a second renewable resource. The use of hydropower and dams is vital to the economy of many Eastern Washington agricultural communities. Forty-nine other states recognize hydropower as a renewable resource.

In addition to providing clean, affordable, domestic electricity, hydropower also helps foster the growth of other renewable energy resources. By providing load firming and energy storage, hydropower helps maximize the benefits of solar and wind resources, too.

**Recommendation:**

WACD shall support the Washington State legislature's amendment to Initiative 937 to include hydropower as a renewable resource in Washington State.

**Presented by: South Douglas Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-04**

**Title: Recognizing Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Standards and Specifications as AKART**

**Problem:**

There has been much discussion regarding the efficacy of using NRCS Standards and Specifications for conservation planning and implementation by conservation districts. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) has stated that the use of these standards will not result in meeting clean water standards throughout the State. Therefore, Ecology has developed a Water Quality Manual for Livestock Grazing to “minimize confusion about clean water practices that prevent pollution and comply with state law.” In addition, Ecology would require that a producer must demonstrate to Ecology that other practices (including NRCS Standards and Specifications) will prevent pollution.

Ecology cites authority under RCW 90.48.10, which requires all citizens of the State to utilize AKART (All Known and Reasonable Technologies) to prevent pollution, and they do not recognize NRCS Standards and Specifications as such.

**Recommendation:**

WACD work with the Washington State legislature to enact an amendment to RCW 90.48.010 that would read: “In the case of agricultural conservation planning and implementation, the State recognizes NRCS Standards and Specifications as AKART.”

**Presented by:** Skagit Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-05**

**Title: Grazing as a Management Option**

**Problem:**

Nearly 1.5 million acres of cropland in Washington State are currently enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). The purpose of CRP is to help agricultural producers safeguard environmentally sensitive lands by planting long-term, resource-conserving covers that land in CRP for terms of 10 – 15 years. Over these long contract periods, the idled land typically becomes thatch-bound with old vegetative growth and infested with invasive weeds – carefully managed grazing can improve the quality of CRP grassland and reduce noxious weed pressure while also benefitting wildlife. As now structured, the Conservation Reserve Program allows the use of other management tools (i.e., mowing, herbicides, and periodic burning, which are federally cost shared), while grazing – a more natural approach – is accessed a 25% reduction in CRP rental payments for grazed acreages. This “penalty” and restriction in the program deter many landowners from using managed grazing as a conservation practice. This represents an enormous untapped resource and opportunity for agricultural producers to step-up conservation practices and revitalizes currently unproductive land.

**Recommendation:**

WACD should support legislative action to change policy to allow dormant-season grazing as a management option for grassland enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) without payment reduction for lands that are properly managed.

**Presented by:** Whitman Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-06**

**Title: CSP and the 2012 Farm Bill**

**Problem:**

The current CSP program has gone beyond what was envisioned. It was supposed to fund producers for what they had already done for conservation, not how much more they would be willing to do. That's what EQIP should do.

**Recommendation:**

WACD and NACD work to include the following in the '12 Farm Bill.

1. The CSP program returns to the idea of "Rewarding the best" and
2. States and LWGs have a section included in the ranking application that pertains to local and state issues.

**Presented by: Okanogan Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-07**

**Title: Restore NRCS Funding to Drainage Maintenance.**

**Problem:**

In rural/urban counties much of the remaining farmland is located in floodplains and other areas that are too wet for other uses. For many years, NRCS provided funding to farmers to keep those areas productive. The listing of salmon as endangered has greatly increased the cost of maintaining drainage structures. Additionally, as adjacent lands have been converted to other uses, the amount of water those structures need to transport has increased exponentially.

Urban county governments are busily writing standards that surpass farmers' abilities to pay for maintenance. Fish removal, post-construction sediment control, dewatering, buffer plantings, and maintenance can run more than \$40 per lineal foot. Costs also exist for permitting and knowing which agencies to contact, creating the need to seek professional assistance in laying out a project.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD work with NRCS to revisit their priorities and to restore funding to farmers for drainage maintenance expenses. Secondly, that WACD work with all interested government entities to establish affordable best management practices for drainage maintenance, which integrates the needs of habitat into the agricultural landscape.

**Presented by: King Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-08**

**Title: Capricorn CREP – Site Preparation with Sheep & Goats (Reviving WACD Resolution No: 08-021)**

**Problem:**

Adopted at the 2008 Annual Convention, this resolution has languished without the conviction of WACD Officers and Directors leadership to move it forward. The problem identified then persists today.

There is evidence that there could be significant economic and environmental benefit to using sheep or goats for site preparation of CREP projects. Pesticides are increasingly expensive due to the increase in the cost of fossil fuel. The US Department of Fish & Wildlife and NOAA Fisheries limit what and where they can be used due to the potential hazard to listed species. Conservation districts are admonished by the US Department of Fish and Wildlife to use the least toxic weed control methods as a first choice. More and more CREP participants also wish to limit the use of chemicals on their projects. This makes it difficult to establish and maintain the projects. Current USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) rules prohibit grazing on CRP except in very, very limited circumstances such as a serious drought. This is because program participants have been compensated to idle the property. It is thought to be double dipping to be able to make use of the fodder on the site. However, there is a rational distinction to be drawn regarding grazing to prepare or maintain a CREP project versus grazing done merely to provide feed (profit) to the program participant. Individuals involved in providing sheep and goats for clearing activities are small business owners comparable to those that are hired to clear vegetation using herbicide and mechanical mowing. There are some potential resource concerns when sheep or goats graze in sensitive areas. These can be adequately addressed through the application of NRCS FOTG practices. There is also a potential biosecurity hazard, i.e., the transmission of worms to wildlife. This can be addressed through good animal husbandry.

**Recommendation:**

WACD's representative will introduce and support a resolution before NACD to remove the limitation on grazing of land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program when:

1. The grazing would be implemented for research purposes to assess this as an alternate method of site preparation and pursuant to a conservation plan following NRCS FOTG practices to ensure protection of sensitive areas and the project's native trees and shrubs.
2. The CREP program participant could not provide the sheep or goatherd or receive any remuneration whatsoever.
3. The goats and sheep are examined for infectious diseases on the farm of origin by an accredited veterinarian and approved for transport because none are evident.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-08, continued**

4. Researchers would monitor the grazing closely and halt it if necessary to avoid any substantial negative impacts. They would prepare a report to FSA and NRCS as to their findings and recommendations.

**Presented by:** Whatcom Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-09**

**Title: Power to the People (Farmers) - (Reviving WACD Resolution 2008-020)**

**Problem:**

Adopted at the 2008 Annual Convention, this resolution has languished without the conviction of WACD Officers and Directors leadership to move it forward. The problem identified then persists today. Additions to the adopted resolution are underlined.

The biggest impediment to converting from diesel to electric motors is the high cost of installing power lines. There is an absence of incentive programs to help bring power lines to farmers. Diesel exhaust contains tiny particles that pose a significant health risk and contribute to haze, which restricts visibility. Diesel exhaust also contributes to ozone formation (a component of smog), acid rain, and global climate change. Older stationary diesel engines used for farm pumping or power generation have the highest level of these emissions. In comparison, electric motors are cheaper and more efficient to operate and do not have these harmful effects on humans and the environment.

**Recommendation:**

WACD will work with WSCC to create an incentive program to convert stationary diesel engines to electric motors through a cost share incentive program that reimburses farmers for a portion of the cost of installing power lines where none exist.

Introduce and support a resolution before NACD to make this practice eligible for cost share assistance through the NRCS EQIP Program.

**Presented by: Whatcom Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-10**

**Title:** Support of NRCS Cultural Resource *Washington Bulletin WA 190-10-3*

**Problem:**

Cultural resource reviews for the implementation of planned conservation practices have been too slow. These delays in reviews and installation have cost landowners money and delayed improvements and protection of the natural resources and have discouraged participants in both NRCS and conservation district programs and planning. There are multiple landowners within Stevens County who have signed implementation contracts waiting over 7 years to get approval to install practices. During this time period cost of materials and labor increased while allowable cost-share has not. Sometimes landowners and the resources cannot wait that long for implementation, and landowners are discouraged with our programs and agencies.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD appreciate and support *NRCS Washington Bulletin WA 190-10-3* and recommend each individual conservation district board do likewise. That WACD encourage the NRCS State Conservationist to continue streamlining the cultural resource process with emphasis on forestry and wildlife practices.

**Presented by:** Stevens County Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-11**

**Title: Building Relationships with Washington Natural Resource and Regulatory Agencies**

**Problem:**

As budgets decline and pressures increase to get improvements in natural resources and water quality conditions, regulatory agencies are less able to take the time to build internal knowledge and understanding of agricultural activities, practices, and tools and how those are or can be used to obtain environmental gains. There is an expanding gap between what staff in regulatory agencies understands about agricultural practices and tools and the realities and possibilities of those practices and tools known and understood by agricultural growers and technicians.

For more effective long-term progress in addressing Washington's environmental issues related to agricultural landscapes, regulatory agency technical and policy staff need targeted education and facilitated discussions. This can improve communication among parties and expand the effective tools in the toolbox that can be available to the regulatory programs. Current economic conditions reduce, but do not preclude opportunities to address this.

**Recommendation:**

WACD should continue to support the recent work of the Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC) to bring regulatory and agricultural experts together to build better knowledge and improve the potential to work together. In addition, WACD should urge the WSCC to identify and develop by September 2011 long-term opportunities to build and expand the regulatory and agricultural understanding and needed partnerships to more effectively address common environmental resource problems.

**Presented by:** Thurston Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-12**

**Title: Washington State Conservation Commission (WACC) Cost-Share Ratios for In-Stream and Riparian Area Enhancement Practices**

**Problem:**

The cost-share ratios for in-stream and riparian area enhancement practices implemented on non-CREP properties have been changed from 75% to 50%. The practices affected by the change in policy include Hedgerow Planting (NRCS Standard No. 422), Riparian Forest Buffer (NRCS Standard No. 391), Wetland Enhancement (NRCS Standard No. 659), riparian buffer exclusion fencing for livestock (NRCS Standard No. 382), and off-stream watering for livestock (NRCS Standard No. 614).

The 2004 version of the Washington State Conservation Commission Procedure Manual states the following with regard to cost-share ratios:

Location of Practice	Maximum Cost-Share from CC	Total CS from all including CC
In-Stream	75 percent	100 percent
Riparian	75 percent	100 percent
Upland	50 percent	75 percent

The manual further states that the limits in the table above were to be set separately by individual conservation district boards.

In contrast, the 2009-2011 Washington State Conservation Commission Procedure Manual states the following with regard to cost-share ratios:

- *The Conservation Commission establishes the limit for cost share each fiscal year for each grant program.*
- *75% reimbursement of total costs for Livestock Cost Share.*
- *50% reimbursement for all other programs, NO EXCEPTIONS.*
- *Excludes CREP and Irrigation Efficiencies.*

The change in cost-share ratio policy for in-stream and riparian area enhancement practices reflected in the current Washington State Conservation Commission Procedure Manual limits the ability of conservation districts to provide landowners with sufficient incentive to implement in-stream and riparian area enhancement practices. The decreased incentive in the form of reduced compensation results in reduced implementation of a suite of Best Management Practices essential to protecting and enhancing water quality as well as protecting and enhancing fish and wildlife habitat.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-12, continued**

The King Conservation District (CD), San Juan Island CD, Skagit CD, and Whidbey Island CD have found that due to the state of the economy, 50% cost-share is not adequate incentive to entice landowner implementation of in-stream and riparian area enhancement practices, and the result of this diminished incentive is that projects are not moving forward and are not being implemented.

Furthermore, the King CD, San Juan Island CD, Skagit CD, and Whidbey Island CD feels that our collective efforts to balance individual responsibility and community benefit, as well as negotiate the transition from established land use practices, such as pasture, to riparian enhancement would be better served by making available higher levels of cost-share support to landowners for the implementation of in-stream and riparian area enhancement practices.

**Recommendation:**

The WSCC return to the cost-share ratios identified in the 2004 version of the Washington State Conservation Commission Procedure Manual, and that the return to these cost-share ratios is implemented in the upcoming biennium.

**Presented by:** King, San Juan Islands, Skagit, and Whidbey Island Conservation Districts

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-13**

**Title: Keep the Washington State Conservation Commission Independent**

**Problem:**

The Washington State Legislature, for budgetary purposes, is considering integrating the WSCC with another state agency or agencies. Unlike other state agencies, the WSCC is non-regulatory and has the ability, through conservation districts, to provide financial and technical assistance to private landowners without the threat of regulatory action or discipline. The aspects that make the WSCC successful at getting conservation on the ground would be at great risk if combined with another agency.

**Recommendation:**

WACD should work with legislators and the governor to keep the WSCC independent from other state agencies.

**Presented by: Clark Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-14**

**Title: Maintain the Independence of the Washington State Conservation Commission and Conservation Districts**

**Problem:**

Given the current budget shortfall at the state level, there may be discussions of merging the WSCC and conservation districts into another agency. This type of proposal is usually made in the name of financial savings and efficiency of government. However, other agencies are regulatory in nature and being located with such an agency would undermine the trust conservation districts have with landowners. Furthermore, there would be little cost savings in such a move and could create confusion and delays in the work of conservation districts.

**Recommendation:**

The WSCC should remain an independent state agency and the conservation districts should remain independent of any regulatory agency.

**Presented by:** Skagit Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-18**

**Title: Developing an Organization Flow Chart for WACD**

**Problem:**

Interpretation of WACD by-laws in regards to the exact WACD organizational structure and chain of command can be difficult, and differences in interpretation can/have occurred.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD Officers and Directors develop and adopt an organizational chart in 2011.

**Presented by: Benton Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-19**

**Title: Amending WACD By-laws to Authorize Hiring of Employees by WACD**

**Problem:**

WACD by-laws do not explicitly allow hiring staff or consultants to carry out the business of WACD.

**Recommendation:**

WACD Officers and Directors conduct a thorough review of the By-laws to be presented by May 2011.

**Presented by: Benton Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-22**

**Title: Tying Dues to Maintaining a WACD Annual and Long Range Plan of Work**

**Problem:**

Both the Washington State Conservation Commission and WACD leadership have impressed upon conservation districts the importance of having and following annual and long-range plans. Practice has demonstrated the value of building for and staying on track to deliver programs and services to meet current and anticipated community needs. Similarly, WACD could greatly benefit from developing, implementing, and maintaining an annual and long range plan. Fundamental to such an effective long-range plan is the identification of the level of service desired by the membership, the financial resources necessary, and the potential sources to meet this objective.

The current dues structure is dated, having been adopted when the Association did not enjoy a significant income stream from the Plant Materials Center (PMC). The PMC has since become so successful that there is nearly \$1,000,000 in reserve. It is unknown whether the current level of dues from membership and manner of apportionment remains fair and necessary.

These are uncertain and challenging financial times for conservation districts. Things are likely to get worse before they get better. In light of these factors, it makes sense to replace the current dues structure with a new structure tied to a WACD long range plan adopted by membership.

Membership should approve the long-range plans of work that may include a requirement for dues. Once the dues decision is made, the Officers and Directors should be empowered to set the level of dues and method of calculation based upon anticipated needs of the annual plans developed to implement the WACD long-range plan.

**Recommendation:**

The WACD Officers and Directors shall establish a task force that examines district dues structure, options for use of PMC funds within WACD and the use of annual and long-range plans in the process and present to the 2011 annual meeting recommendations for any changes in the By-laws pertaining to this part of them.

**Presented by:** Whatcom Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-24**

**Title: Opposing Ecology's "Water Smart Washington" Proposed Legislation**

**Problem:**

The Washington Department of Ecology has prepared draft legislation that would significantly alter a number of laws regarding the management of water rights, water right application processing, and water resource management. The legislation was developed without input from many of the stakeholder groups it would ultimately regulate.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD actively oppose the proposed "Water Smart Washington" legislation in its entirety.

**Presented by:** Franklin Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-25**

**Title:** BMP's

**Problem:**

Recognition by the Department of Ecology of both old and new local conservation districts' BMP's and NRCS technical guidelines.

**Recommendation:**

Lincoln County Conservation District, Washington Association of Conservation Districts, Washington State Conservation Commission, NRCS, will work with all agricultural organizations to educate the DOE and work to adopt local BMP's, farm management plans, NRCS technical guidelines that will result in the protection of the natural resources and water quality.

**Presented by:** Lincoln County Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-26**

**Title: Potential Legislation**

**Problem:**

The Department of Ecology (DOE) has the power under existing Washington Administration Code to issue potential violations by visual citation for non- point pollution without sound science or recognition of a farm management plan.

**Recommendation:**

Lincoln County Conservation District, Washington Association of Conservation Districts, Washington State Conservation Commission, work with the State legislature and agricultural organizations to explore rewriting, under the auspices of the applicable RCW, the Washington Administrative Code and/or RCW, propose new legislation that improves the non-point potential visual citation process, and improve the working relationship with landowners and managers of our natural resources.

**Presented by:** Lincoln County Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-27**

**Title:** Memorandum of Agreement

**Problem:**

Communication breakdown between Local Conservation Districts MOA with the Department of Ecology (DOE).

**Recommendation:**

Lincoln County Conservation District requests that WACD, the Washington State Conservation Commission continue to support an MOA between the DOE and local conservation districts.

**Presented by:** Lincoln County Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-28**

**Title: Conservation Districts' Representation on the Washington State Department of Ecology's Water Quality Financial Assistance Council**

**Problem:**

Washington State Department of Ecology's (DOE) Water Quality Financial Council provides DOE with advice and guidance for the effective and efficient administration of its state and federal grants and loans programs. This council is not mandated in state law, but was formed by DOE to help ensure that the process of administering state and federal grants and loans is transparent and is supported by DOE's clients and stake holders.

We feel there is a danger of not having equal and transparent representation on this council if the majority of conservation districts that operate without an assessment are not represented.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD and the Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC) work together to ensure that conservation districts are fully represented on this **Water Quality Financial Assistance Council**. There should be at least one representative from a non-assessment conservation district to represent conservation districts that depend upon these grants for their existence and as a major source of implementation funding for their landowners on non-point source and agriculture water quality issues. WACD and WSCC will attempt to develop a funding source to ensure that conservation district representatives can attend the meetings and have productive input.

**Presented by:** Stevens County Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-29**

**Title: Moving the Irrigation Efficiencies Program from Ecology to the WSCC and Expanding the Program**

**Problem:**

The Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC) and 47 conservation districts in the State are dedicated to working with landowners to conserve water. One of the most effective tools for accomplishing this is the Irrigation Efficiencies Grants Program (IEGP). Under this program, private landowners partner with local conservation districts on voluntary projects that increase the efficiency of on-farm water application and conveyance delivery systems. The water saved is converted into beneficial instream or out-of-stream uses.

The IEGP began in 2001 as an appropriation to the Department of Ecology (DOE) directing their Water Resource Program "... to provide grants to conservation districts to assist the agricultural community to implement water conservation measures and irrigation efficiencies ..." within 16 drought critical basins. Currently, the WSCC administers the IEGP through an interagency partnership with DOE.

This arrangement of a pass-through of program funding from the legislature to DOE then to the WSCC and conservation districts is inefficient and has led to a potential diminished focus on the implementation of program projects at the funding level needed.

Also, the limitation of the program to drought critical basins excludes many other potential landowners and water efficiency opportunities. The program should be expanded to include non-critical basins.

**Recommendation:**

In order to improve program effectiveness and efficiency and increase the focus and emphasis of the program, WACD shall work with DOE and the WSCC to move the IEGP from the DOE to the WSCC. Also, work to expand the scope of the IEGP to include all irrigation efficiency opportunities throughout the state.

**Presented by:** South Central Area Districts

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-30**

**Title: Opposing Water Right Fees**

**Problem:**

The Washington Department of Ecology has prepared draft legislation that would increase water right application fees and charge an annual water management services fee on many water right claims, permits, and certificates. The annual estimated tax/fee generation is \$24 million.

**Recommendation:**

That WACD actively oppose an increase in water right application fees and oppose instituting an annual water management services fee.

**Presented by: Franklin Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-31**

**Title: Water for Rural Road Maintenance**

**Problem:**

Rural roads owned and maintained by municipalities and other jurisdictions are often gravel, dirt, or other unconsolidated materials that must be maintained through annual grading and watering. Rulings by the Department of Ecology have restricted many rural jurisdictions from withdrawing water from streams near the roads. The result is jurisdictions must truck water much longer distances or forgo water application making the road surface more susceptible to rutting and erosion risk.

**Recommendation:**

WACD work with the Washington Department of Ecology and the Washington Association of Counties to develop a solution that will allow rural unimproved roads to undergo reasonable maintenance.

**Presented by:** Okanogan Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-32**

**Title: Referral of Cooperators Farming Adjacent to Lakes or Streams to Conservation District Prior to Regulatory Action Being Taken**

**Problem:**

Cooperators with agricultural operations adjacent to lakes or streams are under increasing pressure to discontinue the use of herbicides and pesticides as they may migrate from fields into these water bodies through surface water flows. Large mandatory buffers may be required that could take significant amounts of productive farm ground out of cultivation. With every situation being unique, some buffers may be far larger in some cases or not adequate in others to address the natural resource concern.

**Recommendation:**

WACD, NACD, and the WSCC work with state and federal regulatory agencies to enact agreements that would refer any landowner and/or land manager that is under scrutiny for ineffective buffering of sensitive lakes and/or streams adjacent to their operations first to their local conservation district for consultation prior to any regulatory action being taken.

**Presented by:** Foster Creek Conservation District

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**



Washington Association of Conservation Districts  
2010 Final Resolutions

**Resolution No: 10-34**

**Title: Funding For Lands Acquisition by Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)**

**Problem:**

Due to the WA State budget deficit and the need to fund highest priorities.

**Recommendation:**

WACD support the removal of uncommitted and unspent funds of this biennium for WWRP or any other state funds and appropriate no funds for the next biennium for acquisition of private farm and forest lands.

**Presented by: John Keatley, Cowlitz Conservation District**

**RESOLUTION PASSED.**