

OFFICIAL MINUTES
STATE SOIL CONSERVATION BOARD
SEPTEMBER 3 and 4, 1964

The State Soil Conservation Board met in a regular session on September 3, 1964 at 8:00 p.m. in the Town and Country Motel, Wichita Falls, Texas.

Board members present were: E. W. Wehman, Chairman, J. C. Porter, J. S. Sharp, A. F. Leesch, and J. Frank Gray.

Others present were: Harvey Davis, Executive Director, S. E. Jones, L. F. Stewart, J. M. Norton of the State Board staff, and A. L. Bading, Executive Director of the Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

The minutes of the meeting of July 12, 1964 were read and approved.

A. L. Bading reviewed and discussed some of the latest events and happenings relative to actions by the Association of SCDs, its Board of Directors, and Soil Conservation Districts over the State. He further discussed a meeting with Marion Monk, President of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and a subsequent meeting with a study committee of the NACD on the future role of Soil Conservation Districts, with reference to existing laws, current conservation programs, trends of the programs, authority of SCDs to carry out programs, and needed changes in the laws by which Soil Conservation Districts may effect the establishment of their conservation programs.

Mr. Bading further reported on the support of the Association toward the recommendations and suggestions given by Harvey Davis to the House Interim Study Committee on soil and water problems.

Following the discussion with Mr. Bading, the meeting recessed until 8:00 a. m., September 4, 1964.

September 4, 1964

The State Soil Conservation Board reconvened at 8:00 a.m. in the Town and Country Motel, Wichita Falls, Texas, with the same persons in attendance with the

exception of Mr. A. L. Bading.

The application for assistance on the Three Mile and Sulfur Draw watershed near Van Horn, Texas, in the High Point Soil Conservation District was reviewed for the Board. On motion by J. Frank Gray, seconded by A. F. Leesch, the Board disapproved the application pending a field examination to determine economic feasibility.

The two applications on the Sweetwater Creek in Texas and Oklahoma were discussed in the light of a division of effort and of funds between the two states to be considered in the work plan development. Information submitted by the two Soil Conservation Service offices indicated that most of the structural costs would be allocated to the Texas portion since most of the measures would be placed in Texas, and that most of the primary benefits would be derived in the Oklahoma area, but with secondary benefits accruing to Texas from the structures, the total benefits would likely be about fifty percent to each State. On motion by J. C. Porter, seconded by Frank Gray, the Board concurred in and approved a 50% division of cost of planning the watersheds to each State. No priority for planning was set at this time.

Harvey Davis reviewed the program for the Southern Conference of State Soil Conservation Boards, Committees, and Commissions to be held in Oklahoma City on September 21-22, 1964. On motion by A. F. Leesch, seconded by Frank Gray, the Board approved Davis, Norton and two other Board or staff members to represent the Texas Board at the Conference.

A letter received from Billy Davis which cited the progress and current status of the McClellan Creek watershed and requesting consideration of a planning priority in the near future was reviewed for the Board. After some discussion of available funds and facilities, the Board directed Mr. Davis to contact the sponsors by letter

and to inform them of the present status of watershed planning in which the facilities are scheduled well ahead and no funds are presently available with which to initiate any additional planning. In reference to their question of a trust fund for planning, it was thought that local financing would enhance their chances for earlier planning.

Harvey Davis reviewed planning on the Donahue Creek and Rush Creek watersheds and stated that he signed project agreements on August 31, 1964, in the amount of \$750.00 for Donahue Creek and \$58,276.00 for Rush Creek. On motion by J. S. Sharp, seconded by J. C. Porter, the Board ratified the signing of the Project Agreements by Davis.

A request for State funds for the newly organized Sherman County Soil Conservation District was reviewed by Davis. On motion by A. F. Leesch, seconded by Frank Gray, the Board approved requesting \$11,223.00 in the State Board's Budget Request for the new Sherman County Soil Conservation District. The amount of the fund was computed on the same basis as the original grant to districts.

A request from the Dos Rios Soil Conservation District #322 to change the boundaries of subdivisions 2 and 3 in order to more nearly equalize the number of landowners was brought to the Board's attention. On motion by A. F. Leesch, seconded by E. W. Wehman, the Board approved the request. (Wehman relinquished the Chair to Porter in order to vote.)

Harvey Davis reviewed the present budget for the Board and gave an accounting of the year end fund balances. It was noted that some of the accounts had balances that would be returned to the General Account of the State with the exception of a carryover of Supervisors Mileage and Per Diem.

The Annual State Meeting of Soil Conservation District Supervisors to be held in Sherman on October 27, 28, and 29 was discussed. The schedules and programs were reviewed and participation by Board Members and staff was discussed. A

suggested list of problems and items for discussion is to be prepared by the staff to assist the Board members in conducting the Area Meetings and participation in the other meetings. Harvey Davis discussed the need for income to help pay costs of the Annual Meeting. The Board suggested that Davis find out if a registration fee could be legally established to fill this need.

The Board expressed concern over the need for assistance from the Extension Service, such as that offered by Jack Barton and Lynn Pittard before they resigned, and directed Harvey Davis to contact Dr. Patterson and John Hutchison by letter and in person to express the Board's concern. The Board also directed the staff to encourage Districts to work closely with the local County Agents and invite them to their meetings.

In the light of improving working arrangements and relations, the Board directed Harvey Davis to arrange meetings with Heads or Directors of other State and Federal agencies to be held in conjunction with future scheduled Board meetings.

The problem of County Agents working in more than one Soil Conservation District within a county was reviewed and discussed. In some instances, a Soil Conservation District may involve a portion of several counties which presents a problem in regard to which County Agent will work with the SCD Board or just how a division of effort can be made. Also, the problem takes another shape when the SCD embraces two or more counties. It was thought if the Extension Service would designate a particular County Agent to work with districts where these problems exist that the situation would be improved. A need for adjusting some District boundary lines was discussed. On motion by J. C. Porter, seconded by A. F. Leesch, the Board authorized the staff to make a determination of the seriousness of the problem and to offer their assistance and counsel to those districts needing or desiring to change their boundaries.

The Board discussed the recommendations and suggested items for study presented to the House Interim Study Committee on Soil and Water Resources, July 24, 1964 by Harvey Davis and also statewide soil and water conservation programs, district operations, and relations with State, Federal, and local agencies and organizations. In view of modern day needs and the fact that Soil Conservation Statutes have not been materially amended since 1941, the Board voted in favor of the following changes:

1. Change the name of Soil Conservation Districts to "Soil and Water Resource Development Districts" and likewise the State Soil Conservation Board to "Soil and Water Resource Development Board".
2. Change or amend the law in order for the Districts to have permissive legislation for taxation and the power of eminent domain for carrying out district operations and conservation and resource development projects.
3. Amend the law in recognition of the changes in authorities and responsibilities of Soil Conservation Districts in light of modern day needs.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.


Chairman


Secretary

10-27-64
Date