



## **Board Fall Quarterly Meeting**

Thursday October 13, 2016

4:00-5:30 PM

Multipurpose Room, Gilbert Community Center

### **Board Members:**

Present: Erv Klaas, Ann Campbell, Jean Eells, Rick Sanders, Sonia Dodd

Absent: Tom Foster, Kevin Griggs, Suzie Moore, Mark Scott or Randy Baker (Substitute)

Quorum present: Yes

Others present: Penny Brown Huber, Kayla Hasper, Annie Fangman, Bob Kindred (City of Ames Substitute), LeAnn Harter

### **Proceedings:**

- Meeting called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Vice-Chair, Ann Campbell
- Review and Approve July 13, 2016 minutes, Erv Klaas motioned, Rick Sanders second, none opposed
- Review and discuss amendments to Bylaws led by LeAnn Harter of Story County
  - 566B is changed to 466B
  - Add definition of 466B.22 from Code of Iowa 466B.22 provides that two or more political subdivisions (defined as including cities, counties and/or soil and water conservation districts located within the same United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Code 8 watershed), ...
  - Harter highlighted Section C of Article I, Membership in the Squaw Creek Watershed Management Authority is limited to cities, counties, and soil and water conservation districts located within the Squaw Creek Watershed.
  - In Article IV Section B. The Directors shall serve staggered terms of four years.
    - Bob asked if we should be tracking term limits for each representative
    - Rick said that should happen so the board knows when to re-appoint, and that the staggered basis should be established for term expirations.

- Article IV Section D. A person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed in the same manner as the original appointment for the duration of the unexpired term. Section E. A Director is eligible for reappointment.
- Article V, Section A1.a and b Remove secretary from Board of Directors. The Board may appoint a Secretary who need not be a Director. Section 3b. Terms are annual from ~~January~~ July 1<sup>st</sup> through ~~December 31<sup>st</sup>~~ June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- Article V Section A5a. If an officer is unable or unwilling to perform his or her duties as outlined in Article V, ~~Section D~~, the Board will hold a special election to elect a replacement officer.
- Article VI Section A. A plan shall be adopted by the Board at the annual meeting for the fiscal year from July 1 to June 30.
- Article VII Section A. Officers shall be elected at ~~an organizational meeting. In subsequent years~~ the annual meeting and installation of officers will be held in June. The Chair shall designate the day, time and place of the annual meeting.
- Article VII Section E. A majority of the membership of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of holding a meeting of the Board. The affirmative vote of a majority of a quorum shall be necessary for any action taken by the Board. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not impair the rights of a quorum to exercise all the rights and perform all the duties of the authority.
- Article VIII Section B. ~~A simple majority of the Board present at the meeting shall suffice to pass a measure submitted for vote at a regular meeting.~~ New Section B. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not impair the rights of a quorum to exercise all the rights and perform all the duties of the Authority.
  - Bob asked if removing original Article VIII Section B would still require a majority of the quorum for a vote.
  - LeAnn and Rick both said yes, according to new Article VII Section E.
- End of major proposed amendments to Bylaws.
- Ann asked if we should decide between calendar year vs. fiscal year
- Jean asked if a motion was needed to change.
- Ann mentioned whether it made a difference if the Board approved the other Bylaw changes first.
- Bob asked if there was a quorum present.
- Penny said yes, we have 5 out of 9.
- LeAnn mentioned that the current Bylaws are the same in that a decision can be made based on the majority of the Board that is present.
- Jean put forth a motion that the Board adopts all the Bylaw amendments with the addition that they go with the calendar year.
- Rick Seconds.
- Ann says all those opposed, say nay
- None opposed, motion carried

- Discuss changing the SCWMA structure to accommodate new watershed projects.
  - First, Penny introduced acting Watershed Coordinator, Kayla Hasper
  - Presentation from LeAnn Harter
    - Asking the question, can the Bylaws be amended to include Keigley Watershed?
    - Precedent in Polk County, Can the Board of Supervisors provide funding? They have 4 Watersheds coming together to form the Raccoon River Watershed Alliance.
    - LeAnn proposed an Umbrella Strategy of forming a South Skunk River Watershed Alliance
      - Templates are there to form the group, the hard part is meeting with people to form the group
    - WMA's can apply for grants. An Umbrella/Alliance technique allows individual WMA's to seek bigger grants.
    - LeAnn mentioned that Kevin Griggs stated that an alliance could have the possibility to bring on more staff and expand outreach.
    - Penny asked if prioritizing watersheds would be effective.
    - LeAnn agreed.
    - Bob asked if the main purpose of the alliance would be coordination, and LeAnn agreed.
    - Ann mentioned again the increased funding opportunities.
    - LeAnn said the main goal would be getting people to the table, prioritizing goals and strategies, and creating funding synergy. She mentioned that larger and more dynamic groups are getting the funding.
    - Erv mentioned that to get funding you also must have a watershed assessment. There could also be some limitations as far as deciding where to start and asked if HUC 10's were the size to start with.
    - Ann asked if creating a larger group would increase quorum issues that the WMA already has.
    - LeAnn stated that new quorum laws could be developed.
    - Sonia mentioned that positions could be weighted on the WMA based on Watersheds.
    - LeAnn said that was a possibility and mentioned a coordinator position would be needed.
    - Erv said that HUC 10 is a more manageable level. He has repeatedly suggested that SWCD's should be organized according to HUC 10 Watersheds. This would reduce the number of SWCD by half and would solve problems of working across created boundaries.
    - Rick asked if forming WMAs for the HUC 10s would then start the action towards starting the alliance. He then proposed that Ames, Story County,

and Story County Soil and Water Conservation District could start to form the Keigley WMA. He stated that putting together HUC 10 Authorities that could come together in alliance.

- Erv gave some insight into the history of WMAs and that they started forming them on targeted watersheds.
- LeAnn said that an alliance cannot be formed before having everyone at the table.
- Rick asked if the WMA is formed to create a plan, but has no real authority.
- Penny said yes.
- Rick said that we cannot form an alliance until we have more authorities, since we have funding on the table and the ability to make a plan then we should form an authority. The four here can reach out to others to start forming the WMA for Keigley. Then he asked if we were suggesting a change to the Squaw Creek WMA at all.
- Penny said no.
- Rick mentioned how this conversation can happen at a separate meeting instead of trying to put a square peg in a round hole.
- LeAnn asked if she can propose to the Story County Board of Supervisors that they take the leadership role to get the Keigley WMA formed.
- Rick said that the BOS would want more buy-in from the City of Ames for example, and asked Erv how the SWCD starts the process.
- Erv said at meetings.
- Penny said how it is possible for a WMA to manage another watershed plan. Prairie Rivers of Iowa is managing the creation of the Keigley Watershed Plan, but another WMA could manage an additional watershed plan.
- Rick said that there has to be some limit to what PRI and SCWMA can manage and assess. We can't get too far out over our skies and propose something that is outside of our jurisdiction.
- Penny mentioned how a lot of the people currently in attendance would be on the Keigley WMA.
- Rick asked if all we need to do is go back and tell them we got a grant and then sign a new 28E.
- Erv said yes, all parties would have to sign the 28E agreement.
- Penny mentioned how it is a good opportunity to bring those to the table who haven't agreed to be involved if we show others have shown their support as we continue to lift watershed knowledge in the area.

- Rick put the motion forth that LeAnn and Penny come to the next Story County Board of Supervisors meeting to propose that they (Story County) do the work to form a new 28E agreement for the Keigley Watershed.
  - Erv seconds the motion, and stated that the 28E agreement forces the motion along for everyone to come together.
  - Rick said that Story County would sponsor it.
  - Motion carries unopposed.
  - Bob wanted to re-affirm the what and the whys of forming the new 28E agreement. He asked if by broadening the scale we are hoping to increase engagement and communication between the different agencies and also together can move forward and more funding could be available.
  - Erv agreed and mentioned that it gets back to the Nutrient Reduction Strategy and how the plan for that is to expand watershed planning and improvements to the whole state.
  - Bob provided the analogy that it is like growing watershed planning like an onion, a layer at a time. He also warned that there has to be a balance between efficient governance and groups coming together.
  - Jean said that by adding Keigley, it should provide a 2 for the cost of 1.
  - Bob agreed by saying that there could still be one meeting with multiple WMAs present since there is a lot of overlap between the local watersheds. He asked Erv how SWCD handle coming together.
  - Erv said that there are regional meetings that allow people to coordinate and discuss, then there is a statewide meeting.
  - Sonia asked if the Skunk River Alliance would be the first in the state.
  - LeAnn said it is similar to what Polk County is trying to do.
  - Jean mentioned the Cedar River Watershed Alliance
  - LeAnn said that they have the addition of a DNR staff member
  - Erv said they have other entities represented such as the DNR and Army Corps of Engineers.
  - Bob mentioned how we are unique at the headwaters of the South Skunk and can pull people up.
  - Rick agreed that we will get some interest as the headwaters and can serve as a model for other watersheds.
- Update on Squaw Creek Watershed Plan from Kayla Hasper, Acting Watershed Coord.
  - Women Caring for the Land workshop in partnership with Women Food and Agriculture Network on November 10<sup>th</sup>.
    - Follows WFAN's established process of focusing on women landowners and working with them on understanding soil health and conservation practices.
  - Water Quality Monitors, raw data has been posted to PRI website.

- Penny said how it is just the raw data for now and that EOR will analyze the data at the end of the season and give us a summary report.
    - Rick asked if the standards were appropriate and how they were created. He asked for a list of all the different standards so they can compare apples to apples.
    - Annie explained that the eco-region standard is to protect ecology within streams. The drinking water standards are different because they protect humans from ingesting high levels of different pollutants in tap water.
    - Rick said how as we get conservation practices in hopefully we can see a difference being made over the years. He compared it to eating an elephant one bite at a time.
    - Erv explained how the Squaw Creek Watershed Coalition has been monitoring Squaw Creek and its tributaries for 15 years. Their data is on the DNR website. They are now limited to 2 snapshots a year. Last Saturday they performed one on Squaw Creek. Almost everyone said that Phosphorus was high probably due to run-off and erosion. They are continuing the monitoring and their results are comparable.
  - First hardcopy version of the Watershed Newsletter has been distributed.
    - Erv suggested placing it at coops and other related entities in the watershed.
    - Kayla confirmed that they were sent out to major partners.
  - Finishing up the Quarterly Report to IDALS.
  - New Live, Work, Play Watershed Signs have been printed and distributed to WACC team members.
    - LeAnn asked if Story County could get a larger printed version for their office.
    - Annie said she could look into it and send the file to her.
  - Annie will redesign the Steward Signs to have the zoomed in version of the watershed map. She will be contacting farmers to begin getting those ready to print.
  - Annie showed pictures of the finished soil tube displays and planned prairie root display.
  - Annie mentioned how the banners are now at the Gilbert Library and will be moved to Stanhope on Nov. 10<sup>th</sup>
- Conservation Innovation Grant – Keigley Watershed
    - Penny stated that we got the grant, but the start date has been pushed back by the federal government due to paperwork back-ups. It will not begin until November 1.
  - Board Members Update on Watershed Initiatives and/or Issues

- Rick said that he would like to update that Story County is hiring people to do an assessment of the remaining HUC 12 watersheds in Story County. If they can do assessments on the HUC 12s then they will feed together to make a HUC 10 and move forward on forming another authority. This moving forward with the plan of putting watersheds together to make a larger watershed plan.
- LeAnn mentioned how they will be using the Tomer analysis and targeting areas.
- Rick said how they will use EOR.
- Erv asked if they can do that without putting out a request for bids.
- Rick said that since they have been used for other watershed analysis in the area that they have proven their capabilities. Erv agreed.
  
- Adjournment
  - Ann put forth a motion to adjourn at 5:30PM
  - Rick seconded/moved, meeting adjourned
  - Next meeting scheduled for January 12, 2017, 4-5:30PM Gilbert Community Center

*Minutes submitted by Annie Fangman*