



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

2012 Resolutions		
Number	Status	Resolution
12-01	Passed	Beaver Control in CREP Buffers and Problem Areas
12-02	Passed	The formation of a Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC) subcommittee to develop and update WSCC cost-share policy
12-04	Passed	Agricultural Stormwater Runoff Resolution
12-06	Passed	WACD work with the Washington State Legislature and Washington State Conservation Commission to extend most grants to conservation districts to multi-year funding
12-09 Substitute	Passed	WACD emphasis of the Farmland Preservation Program and the Office of Farmland Preservation
12-10	Passed	Regional Delisting of the Gray Wolf
12-11	Passed	Support flood control measures to protect farm ground and capital assets
12-12	Passed	The 329 Residue Management Practice for Direct Seed Cropping Systems for USDA Programs
12-15	Passed	Changes in Washington State's Cultural Resources Policy to facilitate more efficient use of state program funds
12-16	Passed	Agricultural Burn Permit Fee
12-17	Passed	Grazing as a Management Option
12-18	Passed	CRP Takeout Transition Options
12-19	Passed	National Leadership Support for State Field Office of the Future Efforts



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-01

Title: Beaver Control in CREP Buffers and Problem Areas

Problem:

Beaver are infiltrating CREP and Restoration Buffers – CREP buffer habitat on certain sections of streams in Jefferson County, and no doubt in other Conservation Districts statewide, have introduced beaver populations to the degree where CREP and other restoration plantings are negatively impacted. Beaver are known to be industrious, and by creating dams, they can negatively impact homes, outbuildings and other infrastructure (by flooding) and agricultural activities and production (flooding fields and access to fields), destroy CREP plantings by felling and utilizing the trees and shrubs listed as CREP buffer species, and at times actually create barriers to salmon migration during spawning.

In some instances the beaver population increase, through the creation of dams and ponds, has been, and continues to be beneficial to the increase of habitat for juvenile salmonid and other listed species, as well as providing habitat for non-listed indigenous species.

The diversity of beliefs of landowners who have entered into CREP or other restoration programs are leading to a wide range of opinions, from complete eradication of beaver populations on their lands, to allowing beaver populations complete control of their newly created habitat.

While it is well known that beaver populations can have identified positive impacts to habitat, and that state and federal programs that enhance buffers on streams have helped to create habitat that increase beaver populations, that population increase can also have a severe detrimental effect to neighboring agricultural and non-agricultural properties.

Control options for CREP buffers are limited to landowner rights to beaver control, or enlisting a trapper or nuisance animal control company, licensed by WDFW. Other less effective options include beaver deceivers, or beaver pond levelers, which, depending on the situation, prove to have limited effect.

Recommendation:

WACD and WSCC, in collaboration with other agencies such as WDFW and USDA –ADC work together to provide protocol and streamlined service to counties, CDs, and other agencies prescribed, that have areas known to be perpetually and increasingly populated with beaver colonies, and where detrimental effects are occurring, to develop strategies to control and maintain beaver populations.

Presented by: Jefferson County Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-02

Title: The formation of a Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC) subcommittee to develop and update WSCC cost-share policy.

Problem:

The current WSCC grants policy manual includes cost-share policies and procedures that may not have included broad policy level contributions from Washington conservation districts. Some of the changes included in the current grants policy manual have resulted in programmatic impacts that limit the ability of individual conservation districts to address local natural resource management priorities included in conservation district long range/strategic plans.

It is presumed that a WSCC cost-share program should be predicated upon administrative procedures that afford the highest level of opportunity to support individual conservation districts in addressing local resource management priorities; and that success in this arena depends upon formulating cost-share policy to effectively anticipate cost-share needs and responsively deploy cost-share funding throughout the conservation district system.

The WSCC Commissioners are valued as integral to formulating effective and responsive cost-share policy. The question at hand is what mechanism(s) would be the most productive to employ to include cost-share policy contributions from local conservation districts.

A number of options were discussed and considered by the presenting conservation district. Of these, the preferred alternative is to request that the WSCC form a WSCC Cost-share Policy Subcommittee comprised of conservation district Board and Staff representatives in addition to WSCC Commissioners and WSCC and Washington Association of Conservation Districts (WACD) staff.

Recommendation:

The WACD, on behalf of its conservation district membership, work with the WSCC to update the WSCC cost-share policy manual. to authorize local conservation district boards to establish by resolution cost-share ratios up to 100% in association with all WSCC grant cost-share funding except CREP & Irrigation Efficiencies and other programmatically prescribed cost-share limitations.

Presented by: King Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-04

Title: Agricultural Stormwater Runoff Resolution

Problem:

Stormwater runoff from urban and suburban lands, often threatens surface water quality of ponds, streams, lakes, and Puget Sound through delivery of high levels of sediment, nutrients, and other pollutants.

Stormwater runoff from cropland, hayland, and pastureland also often threatens surface water quality of ponds, streams, lakes, and Puget Sound through delivery of high levels of sediment, nutrients, and other pollutants.

Properly designed and installed stormwater retention ponds may be used to slow stormwater movement, remove pollutants, and contribute to groundwater recharge.

Stormwater retention ponds could provide an additional function of providing some needed irrigation water.

Installation of surface water retention ponds is generally not cost effective for agricultural producers in that the costs greatly exceed the economic benefits.

Improvement of water quality of ponds, streams, lakes, and Puget Sound is a public benefit.

Recommendation:

WACD recommends to NRCS, the Washington State Conservation Commission, and other agencies and entities that provide funding for conservation practice implementation, that they elevate the importance of multiuse storm water retention ponds as a cost shareable practice.

Presented by: Whidbey Island Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-06

Title: WACD work with the Washington State Legislature and Washington State Conservation Commission to extend most grants to conservation districts to multi-year funding.

Problem:

The Washington State Conservation Commission provides multiple grant sources to conservation districts. Many of these grant sources require funds to be expended within the state fiscal year in which they are granted. Spending funds on some projects within the state fiscal year can be very difficult for some districts and for some projects. While Districts have a long proven track record of implementing high quality conservation projects in a short period of time, there are other factors that are out of the control of the District, cooperator, and others that delay projects.

Factors, such as permitting, weather, contractor schedules, and cooperator schedules do not always line up to allow for implementation within the grant schedule. When one or more of these factors cause delays in implementation, the project may need to be canceled and funding returned to the Conservation Commission, or moved to another project. District's then must look for other funding to implement priority projects and cooperators can, and have, become disenfranchised with the District and public support of projects.

Recommendation:

WACD work with the Washington State Legislature and the Washington State Conservation Commission to seek ways for funding to Districts be extended to a full biennium for project implementation.

Submitted by: Okanogan Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-09
Substitute

Title: WACD emphasis of the Farmland Preservation Program and the Office of Farmland Preservation.

Problem:

In 1990, the legislature created the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP). The WWRP, currently administered by the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), was envisioned as a way for the state to accomplish two goals: acquire valuable recreation and habitat lands before they were developed and to develop recreation areas for the public.

Since WWRP has been funded, over \$654 million has been dedicated to this program to fund a multitude of priorities.

A total of \$189 million of that funding has been spent on state and local parks, yet the state and local counties continue to close many parks which beg the question “Is this still a priority of the state when these entities can’t manage those that they have”?

Any government funded activity (grant or otherwise) should have a primary function/goal as well as other benefits, such is the nature of good financial stewardship of public funds – Conservation Districts understand this. However, many of the programs funded by the WWRP have only singular purpose such as “critical habitat” program (\$137 million) as compared to other WWRP programs like farmland preservation (\$13 million) that has an evaluation of farm and /or ranch function (economic production, viability and importance) but also includes habitat values and community values thus providing multiple / prioritized benefits for the expenditure of public funds.

Recommendation:

WACD in concert with WSCC and RCO shall initiate discussions to look at opportunities to emphasize the Farmland Preservation Program of RCO and the Office of Farmland Preservation at WSCC.

Presented by: North Yakima Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-10

Title: Regional Delisting of the Gray Wolf

Problem:

This past summer wolf and livestock interaction has escalated. There have been confirmed livestock losses, ten dead eight injured from one ranch alone. These losses are too high for the Gray Wolf to remain a protected species and the livestock operator not be allowed to protect his assets. Landowners and livestock producers will suffer too many losses before the states' wolf management plan allows for delisting.

Recommendation:

WACD will present the Wolf Task Force position paper to the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission.

Presented by: Stevens County Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-11

Title: Support flood control measures to protect farm ground and capital assets.

Problem:

There has been and dramatic increase in flooding, loss of farm ground and damage to structures during the past couple of spring runoffs. This is due to the lack dredging and channel maintenance which has been part of land management from the 1940's through the late 1990's. Some of the reasons for this lack of maintenance are lack of funding and permitting agencies discouraging common flood control practices.

Recommendation:

WACD recognizes that past practices of strategic dredging and channel maintenance is still needed as a Best Management Practice to protect property and developed ground.

WACD recommends that the Conservations Commission develop a policy to support legislation for funding and permit approvals to make it easier for the landowner to control natural waterways to protect private and governmental capital assets. This resolution will not be brought to the legislature in the 2013 session.

Presented by: Stevens County Conservation District

Eddie Johnson, Lincoln CD moved to bring the resolution to the floor. Brad Bailie, Franklin CD seconded.

Eddie Johnson, Lincoln CD moved to amend the resolution so that it will not be brought to the legislature in the 2013 session. Jayne Uerling, Whatcom CD seconded.

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-12

Title: The 329 Residue Management Practice for Direct Seed Cropping Systems for USDA Programs.

Problem:

Growers have not qualified for Conservation Cost-share under a Direct Seed System due to the interpretation of the NRCS Standard for the 329 Residue Management Practice.

The Standard has two umbrella requirements: one asks for a Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) Stir value of 30 or less; the other requirement is does not allow “full width tillage.” The STIR value at 30 or less is very workable and protects the resource. RUSLE 2 runs reflect this protection.

Loss of program cost-share comes from varied interpretations of “full width tillage.” Growers have lost Direct Seed payments from the use of a harrow or use of a roller (packer) on standing stubble; use of these tools on standing stubble will meet a Stir Value under 30. These operations are used to manage the residue rather than tillage of the soil. Additional these operations have much less soil surface disturbance than approved Direct Seed Strip Tillage.

It is our position that the “no full width tillage” statement should be taken out of the Standard. This would simplify the Standard and not penalize growers who can achieve resource protection with the use of various types of full width equipment that have limited soil disturbance. The proper use of RUSLE 2 can sort out the operations that have disturbance beyond the level needed for protection.

It is important to realize that growers with a high level of conservation treatment with various versions of “Direct Seed” do not want to be classified as “Mulch Farmers” by NRCS just because they use a harrow on standing stubble.

Recommendation:

WACD, Conservation Districts, Pacific Northwest Direct Seed Association work with NRCS at the State and NACD at the National level to remove the “no full width tillage” statement from the 329 Practice Standard and rely on a RUSLE Stir Value at 30 and less. This will allow the choices and evaluation of equipment with the grower and local NRCS staff.

Presented by: Spokane Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution 12-15

Title: Changes in Washington State's Cultural Resources Policy to facilitate more efficient use of state program funds.

Problem:

In the last several years, state agencies' policies have become increasingly more restrictive in the area of cultural resources surveys. Current policies require a cultural resources survey for any practice that involves any excavation. This includes tree/shrub planting and setting fence posts. This adds considerable expense to projects for which the potential for damage to historic artifacts or cultural resources is minimal. For example, conducting a cultural resources survey on something as small as a one-quarter (1/4) mile fencing project, can double the cost for the project.

We recognize the sanctity of cultural resources, and we accept our responsibilities to help preserve and protect those resources. We also recognize our responsibilities to spend those state funds that are allocated to us as efficiently as possible. We find ourselves in the middle of a conflict between the needs of our land owners and state regulations.

Recommendations:

WACD and NACD should work with WSCC and other relevant federal and state agencies to streamline federal and state and tribal cultural resources policy. Through Director Talks and other means, the Commission should be able to share our concerns, and to persuade the other participants that a more reasonable path to cultural resource preservation might be taken.

Also, we would ask WACD and NACD to also present our concerns to federal and state legislators. Perhaps those elected officials who are most concerned with the effective and thrifty use of state funds should weigh in on this issue as well.

Presented by: Ferry Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-16

Title: Agricultural Burn Permit Fee

Problem:

Washington Department of Ecology (DOE) lowered the % split of agricultural burn permit fees to the Conservation Districts for their coordination of the program with producers.

Recommendation:

WACD and Conservation District Representatives on the Agricultural Burning Task Force will promote and gain approval of a more appropriate % split of the permit fees that more appropriately represents the work that conservation district staff does to make this a successful program.

Presented By: Whitman Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-17

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 control soil erosion, improve water and air quality, and enhance wildlife habitat. Participants enroll 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 – conditions that are contrary to the program’s intended conservation goals. Field research demonstrates that carefully managed grazing can improve the quality of CRP grassland and reduce noxious weed pressure while also benefiting wildlife.

Two other benefits include the small carbon footprint (non-mechanical mowing) and the large savings to the taxpayer in the cost of grazing versus mechanical mowing. As now structured, the Conservation Reserve Program allows the use of other management tools (e.g., mowing, herbicides, and periodic burning which are federally cost-shared) while grazing – a more natural approach – is assessed a 25% reduction in CRP rental payments for grazed acreages. This ‘penalty’ and restrictions 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 revitalize currently unproductive land.

Recommendation:

WACD & NACD will work on legislative action to change FSA policy and/or rule to allow dormant-season grazing as a maintenance option for grassland enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) with a reduction in rental payments that corresponds with carrying capacity.

Presented By: Whitman Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-18

Title: CRP Takeout Transition Options

Problem:

Cost share options need to be developed to assist growers to take out CRP using NRCS practice standards 329 Direct Seed or a high standard 345 Mulch Tillage practice. This will allow conservation based practices to be implemented without excess burden on the producer while maintaining high conservation standards.

Recommendation:

That NACD, , petition NRCS and FSA official representatives to create a policy within USDA to support growers during the transition of CRP takeout back to conservation-based production agriculture as described above.

Presented by: Palouse Rock Lake CD

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Resolution No. 12-19

Title: National Leadership Support for State Field Office of the Future Efforts

Problem:

In 2012, the national leadership in the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and the National Association of Conservation Districts (NACD) requested that the Washington State Conservation Partnership prepare and submit a description of how the partnership will provide conservation services in the future to private land owners and operators. This request, labeled “Field Office of the Future”, enlisted ideas from state leadership, conservation district supervisors, and partnership employees about more effective and efficient program delivery. Washington State responded to this request by outlining, in an issue paper, our current activities, and our ideas about potential changes and options to increase the effectiveness of our services delivery.

However, the Washington State Conservation Partnership also decided to include in the issue paper statements and recommendations as to how NRCS and NACD national leadership can provide support to help our state partnership become more effective. This was necessary because some challenges to the effectiveness of our locally-led delivery system come from decisions and policies put in place by national leadership at USDA, NRCS or other agency. Washington State wanted to ask what our national leaders can do or do differently (or stop doing) to support efforts by Washington State to better serve our customers into the future.

These recommendations included actions such as improving state-level NRCS flexibility and decision-making authority, opposing policies and decisions by USDA headquarters, Office of Management and Budget, or NRCS headquarters that impair local delivery of services, opposing unrealistic project deadlines and requirements imposed on states by “special initiatives” created by headquarters NRCS, providing better support for Local Working Groups (LWGs) and support for State Technical Advisory Committee inputs, stronger support for LWG and state resource priorities, support for training, and others (see attached).

The overall impact of Washington State Conservation Partnership’s response to NRCS and NACD will be greater if the recommendations for national leadership support are extracted and delivered through the local-state-national resolution process to our conservation leaders at NRCS and NACD. This may allow NACD to adopt these recommendations as positions or policies in support of state efforts in general, and to work with NRCS to implement recommendations that support local efforts in delivering conservation services to landowners and operators.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Recommendation:

WACD transmit the Washington State Field Office of the Future issue paper recommendations for national leadership support (see attached) to NACD for action during the 2013 NACD Annual Meeting as national membership deems appropriate. Further, that WACD request that NACD follow-up on the recommendations with USDA and NRCS leadership as required to implement action requested by the membership.

NACD will work with appropriate agencies to effect the 19 component elements of the WACD issue paper on the Washington State Field Office of the Future.

Presented by: Palouse Rock Lake Conservation District

RESOLUTION PASSED



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

Attachment to Resolution No. 12-19

Washington State Conservation Future

A resolution in response to “Field Office of the Future” request by NRCS and NACD

The Washington State Conservation Partnership applauds NRCS and NACD efforts to enlist ideas for more effective and efficient program delivery. This white paper includes a comprehensive set of components for the future of conservation services for private land owners in Washington State. Each section has information on current activities to increase effectiveness, potential changes, and needed support from national partner organizations and their leaders.

1. Structure – NRCS & Conservation Districts

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS NHQ needs to provide efficient and effective tools including examples, case studies and templates for use at a state-level in order for NRCS-WA to properly charge leased space to Conservation Districts. Without such tools, there is a fear of the loss of synergy among the workforce in the instance that Conservation Districts are forced, due to cost, to move out of USDA-owned offices.
-

2. Review of Field Offices Co-Located by NRCS and Conservation Districts

Current Status of 47 Conservation Districts

- 17 of our districts are not currently co-located with NRCS
- 16 of our districts are working toward a separate space and lease
- 14 districts are dramatically affected by the NRCS lease rental requirements...many of which represent the best examples of District-NRCS partnering for conservation program delivery.

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS NHQ could provide opportunities for Conservation Districts to earn revenue that would offset the cost of the rental of office space. One suggestion is to opening up the Technical Service Provider (TSP) program and other similar opportunities to Conservation Districts where alignment in workforce capacity exists, additionally, NRCS NHQ could accept alternatives to cash rental or work for lease payment agreement.
-

3. Local Work Groups

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. We need the national headquarters to continue allowing flexibility at the state level the formation and operation of local workgroups.
- B. We need not be told by the national headquarters how to run the LWGs procedure-wise and program-wise and the state conservationist should have the latitude to structure these LWGs in the way that he or she feels like they need to be structured.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

- C. There is a concern regarding the reduction in funding of programs used at a local-level to support national priorities. State-level reductions in the amount of the monies taken off the top need to be reduced allowing the LWGs to identify conservation needs and evaluate effectiveness of technical and financial assistance to meet the needs.
-

4. State Technical Advisory Committee

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. We need the NRCS NHQ to continue support for STAC input to the State Conservationist, then authorization of the STC to implement recommendations from the STAC.
-

5. Program Delivery

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. Increased flexibility at state conservationist level for program delivery decisions, procedures, policies, partnering and program implementation
 - B. Increase coordination, flexibility, and common sense regarding program delivery deadlines at all levels of NRCS, while maintaining a consistent schedule from year to year.
 - C. Combine programs wherever possible and simplify, streamline administration, clarify and make program requirements less restrictive.
 - D. Continue NHQ support for technical service provider agreements with state conservation agencies and conservation districts to address workload needs.
 - E. National financial support and resources are necessary to achieve outreach requirements of full program delivery.
-

6. Partnership Coordination

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. Support and promote this type of coordination at national level.
-

7. State Resource Assessment & Long Range Planning

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS NHQ needs to encourage and allow flexibility at the state level and the local level in the development of resource assessments and the use of those resource assessments.
 - B. NRCS NHQ needs not to change nomenclature on resource concerns and land uses for at least 3 years
 - C. NRCS NHQ needs to provide tools, resources (CEAP, AWEP) and technical support to the state for the undertaking of resource assessment and area-wide planning, which will assist in long-range planning.
-

8. Technical Capacity

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. The need from the NRCS NHQ would be to continue to recognize and allow states to do technical training activities with conservation partners and partner organizations.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

- B. Another need is to have a portal similar to what is available for TSPs (GeoAgro/ Conservation Planner) for conservation district employees to be able to access to conservation plans, projects, and tools, and activities that are needed for customer service without having to enter into the NRCS system.
 - C. Districts need to be able to enter the NRCS System to enter the conservation accomplishments from work districts are doing, most of which is in the conservation technical assistance account. PRS doesn't allow for data entry under CTA outside of Toolkit.
 - D. A NRCS policy change is needed to get funding over into the CTA arena at the national level for both for NRCS technical capacity but also for technical capacity of districts and state conservation agencies even if it means moving to a state block grant system for CTA activities.
 - E. Increased flexibility for training budget spending limits is necessary for implementing training needs.
-

9. Sharing Resources

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS and NACD need to work on policy positions and decisions that build the partnership, and actively oppose policies and decisions from USDA, OMB, and within NRCS that negatively impact the conservation partnership operations, in particular at the local service delivery level.
 - B. NRCS NHQ needs to improve the system being used for conservation activity plans (CAPS) to allow conservation district technical employees to develop CAPs when there is not a viable pool of TECHREG registered providers that is available in the state
 - C. Need NRCS authorization to use our current contribution agreement system and task order system for accountability, budget, and monitoring in Washington State for CAPs
-

10. State Conservation Agency/Commission Structure

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS and NACD need to protect existing flexibility for state conservation partnership coordination and work on policy positions and decisions that build the partnership, and actively oppose policies and decisions from USDA, OMB, and within NRCS that negatively impact the conservation partnership operations, in particular at the local service delivery level.
-

11. Funding & Budgeting

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. Continue with the nomenclature for a few years while we develop budgets based on resource concerns and land use.
- B. NRCS NHQ policy should allow more flexibility for the State Conservationist to run conservation programs as appropriate to address resource concerns within the state.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

- C. NRCS NHQ should reexamine the classification of time needed to establish a relationship with a producer in order to get conservation planning started.
- D. Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA) funding must be increased and it must be flexible enough to allow for agreements with conservation districts for non-Farm Bill related conservation work, such as the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Partnership.
- E. TA for staffing of positions in the state should be based logically on workload and allocations to be able to implement contracts and performance goals.

12. Client Services

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS NHQ needs to provide necessary flexibility to states regarding operations and resources to adequately address local resource concerns, clientele diversity, and evolving program needs.
- B. Look at a more reasonable timeframe allowing the state staff to put together the information needed to more adequately develop quality program delivery for their state.
- C. It is imperative that CDSI be implemented in a timely manner to gain much needed efficiencies in program delivery and servicing the public.

13. Public Outreach

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. Funding from NRCS for the state public affairs specialist position, a conclusion to the national Public Affairs department reorganization plans, and the removal of the moratorium on hiring.

14. Accountability

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS NHQ needs to update performance goals to better reflect program allocations and state resource priorities based on the SRA.
- B. More support is requested from compliance division regarding State Quality Assurances and Operations Management training resources for field District Conservationists.

15. Conservation Planning

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NRCS NHQ must provide a “portal” for conservation districts (either not-located or located with NRCS) for the readily available access and use of tools and other new innovations in conservation planning and practice development that are needed to provide technically sound service to land managers. This would be an improved system for uploading conservation plans and accomplishments are needed.
- B. Area-wide planning tools and support is needed from national centers for use for county- and state-level resource assessments.



Washington Association of Conservation Districts
2012 Final Resolutions

- C. Implementation of CDSI Conservation Desktop is a necessary requirement for moving us back toward a technically sound RMS level planning for NRCS and CDs.
 - D. Federal funding entities must recognize the time needed to develop a technically sound conservation plan and allow funding expended for this important element of land manager assistance.
-

16. Special Partnership Projects

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NHQ to back off unreasonable deadlines that are being imposed on states with limitations on funding authorities, which doesn't reflect field conditions.
 - B. Provide SWAT funds to states necessary for partnership agreements to accomplish outreach and program implementation.
-

17. Agreements

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. The national policy needs changed so conservation districts do not have to move out of service centers in order to do CAP training. We need the opportunity to work directly with conservation districts from the NRCS to do this type of work because of the lack of TechReg eligible folks in the state of WA a special dispensation is needed.
-

18. Communication

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. Share effective communication systems being utilized throughout the nation.
 - B. Encourage and support STC leadership in development and implementation of effective communication systems.
 - C. Examine the amount of email requests for information from NHQ level including the unreasonable deadlines for response.
-

19. Conservation District Supervisor Leadership Development

Support Needed from NACD & NRCS at National Level

- A. NACD will continue to promote District Board Member training and certification programs with state associations and state conservation agencies.