

Ohio Soil and Water Conservation Commission
July 13, 2012 - Carrollton Senior Center
100 Kensington Rd. NE Carrollton, Ohio

Meeting Summary

8:05 am - Meeting was called to order by Chairman Price.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Commission Members Present

Chairman Tom Price

Etta Reed

Ron Hendrick

Kent Stuckey

Kevin Elder

Bill Knapke

Fred Cash arrived @ 8:10

Chairman Price called for the approval of the day's agenda: Motion by Mr. Hendrick; 2nd by Ms. Reed. All in Favor; Motion passed

Chairman Price asked for a motion for the approval of April 10, 2012 Minutes: Motion by Mr. Knapke; 2nd by Mr. Hendrick. All in favor; Motion passed

OSWCC Member Comments

Ms Reed met this spring with DSWR chief Gebhardt along with Carmella Shale, Geauga SWCD and DSWR Program Specialist, Dorothy Farris concerning the Urban Taskforce resolutions passed at the 2011 SSS, with most of the conversation directed at the Qualified Local Program resolution and the steps needed to move it forward.

Mr. Knapke has been involved in meetings rewriting nutrient standards, been involved in the GLSM agriculture solution meeting; and various other meeting related to GLSM water quality.

Mr. Stuckey was recently involved assisting with the State Envirothon along with Mr. Hendrick; this was his 2nd year of attendance for awards. He has attended his local SWCD meeting and after this meeting he is headed to Washington DC for the NACD legislative conference & meetings on the hill. He reminded the group of the upcoming OFSWCD Summer Supervisor School and would let Ms. Bankey provide more details under her report

Mr. Elder had no activities to report other than those associated with his Ohio Department of Agriculture duties.

Mr. Cash reported working with DSWR Program Specialist, Dorothy Farris as a guest on the

WKYC TV Cleveland, “Good Company” show where he and Mr. Brian Birrenkott of Scotts MiracleGro appeared to talk about Lawns and the environment. He has also been working with the staff and board members of several surrounding SWCDs on a Central Basin Group project. Mr. Cash along with NRCS State Conservationist Terry Cosby with the help of OSU Extension and US Congresswoman, Marsha Fudge have been working to promote urban gardens and high seasonal tunnels for Cleveland and surrounding communities.

Executive Secretary Report

Consider appointment of SWCD Board Members

Mr. Gebhardt presented the following for OSWCC appointments: A letter from the Scioto SWCD to replace Frank Pertuset who passed away recently. The board unanimously approved Steve Collins, who just finished a term and did not run for re-election, agreed to come back and fill out Frank’s term. Motion to approve the appointment was made by Mr. Elder; 2nd by Mr. Hendrick – All in favor; Motion passed.

Consider approval of joint boards: Mr. Gebhardt presented the commission members with the following joint board items:

Auglaize/Mercer Joint Board. A written update of joint board’s organizational progress for the Boley Group Tile Project – no action was recommended; information only.

Lake Erie Central Basin. Mr. Gebhardt briefly reviewed the joint request and asked for any comments from those present representing the group. Mr. Dan Donaldson, Administrator, Lake SWCD addressed the commission. He cited that the group has identified the need on several grounds including that there is no body in the central basin working on Lake Erie issues and that these SWCDs have similar issues to address. As recent as last night harmful algal blooms are making headlines. Additionally, they believe that having a tight watershed unit working with same partnering agencies; will make it easier for the group to apply for some of the larger grants for Lake Erie water quality. There are opportunities for shared employees; one example being work on Forestry issue/timber harvest – no one program can support a person, but as a group they all could use the expertise. Additionally, they feel they could run a basin wide Nutrient Management/NEO 4 R program more consistently and effectively. Lastly, the effort is supported by all boards and they have come together and organized.

Mr. Elder asked about how many watershed coordinators were housed in the area? Mr. Donaldson responded that there were 3 employed by SWCDs and 1 employed by Chagrin River Partners. He suggested that if you look at the map there is a lot of Lake Erie direct tributaries and that area has no organized watershed efforts and don’t have consistent management. The group looks to expand to other SWCDs in the future as this doesn’t cover exact geophysical “Central Basin”. Mr. Donaldson continued that the District Administrators in the area are already working together on other urban issues so it is easy to meet and implement.

Chairman Price asked how long the group had been working together. Mr. Donaldson replied just about a year on this particular matter.

Chairman Price also inquired as to whether the county commissioners had been advised about

this project. Mr. Donaldson responded that they felt since no dollars were going to be passed between SWCDs/counties, that they felt that wasn't necessary.

Carmella Shale, District Administrator/Engineer with Geauga SWCD was recognized and explained that to be effective the group needed to expand beyond coastal counties. Mr. Donaldson added that they are looking at demographics and large land users such as golf courses and alternative agriculture.

Mr. Gebhardt asked with regard to working in areas like the Ashtabula River or Grand River, why would the other counties support that? Mr. Donaldson responded that first they wanted to get a geographic presence; and secondly take advantage of expertise - resource sharing; employee sharing. For example, he said Ashtabula SWCD as a lot of forestry expertise and Lake SWCD has expertise with the Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index. HHEI is one of the areas the group wants to expand and get grants to expand into the rest of the basin; Geauga SWCD has storm water quantity management that can be shared. No one county has expertise. This is a natural out growth of NEO Urban team.

Mr. Gebhardt remarked that he was not aware of any similar groups in western basin and they are able to implement water quality projects without joint boards. Mr. Donaldson responded by saying that we see a lot of federal dollars; coastal dollars going for things like CREP etc. We think problems are just as important; we thought this was a good way to bring attention and dollars to the area.

Jan Rybka, District Administrator, Cuyahoga SWCD, interjected that this is their attempt at being proactive; to address nutrient problems before they become huge; and it is important get away from reacting.

Mr. Gebhardt remarked that he didn't think the coastal office focuses along coast only:

Mr. Hendrick added that he was very supportive; likes the efficiencies and was in line with current thinking.

Chairman Price asked about the reference to Oil and Gas in the tool box grant application and what did they mean by it. Mr. Donaldson explained that they get calls daily; they can't always say that you have to call ODNR Division of Oil and Gas. Previously SWCDs took the lead in urban drilling years ago and have a lot of experience. They see the need coming. They are interested in surface problems; ag impacts; urban/suburban issues; and they are going to be asked locally to help. Such things as using HHEI will be helpful to this effort. We need to be educated and involved and we will be asked to assist our communities.

Mr. Elder commented that his big concern is having the county commissioners on board; Ms Reed commented that was a concern of hers as well.

Mr. Donaldson replied that no one is thinking of spending money out of county yet; he didn't anticipate any problems with commissioners.

Mike Wilson, District Administrator, Trumbull SWCD commented that they had already talked with their county commissioners and those commissioners were very supportive.

Mr. Donaldson added that all the SWCDs are members of and work together as part of the WRRC&D, a county commissioner supported group.

Mr. Cash remarked that regarding the Oil and Gas issue, his time as an engineer with CT, SWCDs have been very helpful.

Ms Shale commented regarding the spending money that they don't have a construction project; and these are doing things consistent within and among in each county.

Mr. Gebhardt asked what the dues structure is.

Mr. Donaldson responded that they were \$600 for SWCD with land area totally within the basin and \$300 for SWCDs with partial land area.

Mr. Gebhardt inquired about the reference to possible watershed group problems, quoting from grant about undercutting" from other groups such as the Chagrin River Watershed Partners and the Western Reserve Land Conservancy. He asked: how do you frame that in terms of this grant?

Mr. Donaldson responded that they all work with them; but the model is important; our organizations can't work on economies of scale like those entities; they have more flexibility; this is not a power play.

Mr. Gebhardt inquired if this will this be a competitive process, Duplication of missions etc? We have struggled with that is well.

Ms. Shale remarked that it is already there.

Mr. Donaldson commented that they are working as a checker board; some of these groups are doing the easy things; the joint board designation gives us the coverage; not necessarily duplication with all entities; it might provide a lot of consistency;

Mr. Wilson commented that SWCDs are called when townships have problems with these other groups;

Mr. Gebhardt remarked that you make an excellent point and how will that enhance that?

Mr. Stuckey inquired as to how does this play into what a joint board is supposed to be doing.

Mr. Elder remarked that we've already done the Musk and Miami. I see pluses and minuses. His chief concern is that the local entities are in concurrence.

Mr. Gebhardt remarked that he has problem with no specific project; creating an organization with out problem defined.

Mr. Elder inquired: what would be the impact of waiting?

Mr. Donaldson explained that we have some grants that we'd like to apply for; that's why we weren't in a hurry to talk with our county commissioners.

Mr. Price asked if then weren't you just chasing grants?

Mr. Donaldson replied that formation of the joint board better position's us to get grants than for an area that is smaller.

Mr. Gebhardt requested permission and was granted such to read the joint board authority from the Ohio Revised Code for the commission.

After the code was read Mr. Price commented that it was definitely "Out of the Box;"

Mr. Donaldson responded, yes, but that's what we've been hearing for the last 5 years; this project is in that spirit

Mr. Elder commented that he would have to agree that reports have encouraged SWCDs to do that and redefining was necessary.

Ms. Fish was recognized and reminded the commission that the joint board in her area was for watershed planning not an actual Conservation Works of Improvement.

Mr. Cash remarked that given his activity on the proposed joint board he would be abstaining, but wanted to add that given that we have a major crisis, we can get ahead of the game; this will allow us to learn what is going on and avoid the crises. I think this was in the spirit of what other reports have encouraged.

Mr. Knapke asked why not the Rocky River?

Mr. Donaldson remarked that the group was still trying to decide on what the actual boundaries are; and that they wanted to get the core formed and get it going and then look at expanding.

Chairman Price asked for a motion on the matter.

Mr. Hendrick motioned to approve the joint board request.

Chairman Price announced that the motion dies for lack of a second

Mr. Stuckey commented that we need to find a remedy. He motioned to table the request to the November 2012 OSWCC Meeting. Motion was 2nd by Ms. Reed

Discussion: Mr. Elder encouraged the group to contact local officials before November.

Mr. Cash asked Fred Hammon, Administrator, SWCD Section, ODNR/DSWR if the OSWCC will have these authorities by November;

Mr. Hammon responded that the DSWR is working to get in next budget so wouldn't be effective until 2013. Perhaps group could come back with more specific project activities.

Mr. Gebhardt remarked that it might be possible to get it in some legislation; before 1st of the year or a bill in the works for January;

Mr. Elder stated that he didn't want this to be a discouragement.

Mr. Hendrick commented that we need to move the statute to move the process

Mr. Stuckey commented that isn't this one of the charges of this group?

Call for the question from Chairman Price: All those in favor; abstention by Mr. Cash; motion approved to table action on the Lake Erie Central Basin joint board request.

Fred Hammon presented the next joint board request: Allen and Hancock: Wilt Ditch; 3000 acres, typical JB request. Chairman Price asked for a motion to accept

Mr. Elder made the motion; Mr. Hendrick 2nd the motion
Chairman Price asked for any discussion; Mr. Gebhardt asked Mr. Hammon if the county commissioner had approved it? Mr. Hammon responded, yes.
Chairman Price called the question; All in favor; motion passed.

Public Comment:

Irene Moore: Jefferson board welcomes you; applaud rotation of summer meeting; we can't deny Ohio SWCDs are national leaders; we do appreciate your hard work; we are in the quality of life business.

Chairman Price related his fond memories of this part of the state, particularly the Cadiz airport.

Fred Cash remarked about one of the benefits of being on this board is to see what happens in other parts of the state. Being from an urban area, he doesn't get to see this and other parts of the state.

Jennifer Fish, Director, Franklin Soil and Water Conservation District
~ Speaking on behalf of board, read the following statement:

“Over the past couple of months, the primary messages that staff have been hearing at meetings are in relation to the threats of state match funding. More specifically, that this funding could be directed to state priorities such Grand Lake Saint Mary's and Lake Erie or that the state match formula may change to decrease the amount of match that we receive. We realize that this is all conjecture at this time, but statements at outside meetings give us pause with enough to ask for our voice to be heard at today's meeting.

Franklin Soil and Water has strived to set an example for sharing with our fellow SWCDs, furthering natural resources information to increase efficiencies, and making sure our voice is heard at the state legislature. We believe that we have a strong operation that represents the SWCD family very well and is an asset to the future of SWCDs. We also believe that more can

be done at the local level for conservation of our natural resources.

Without consistent state match funding we will lose an important leverage for local funds and will be left without this well-established, respected and efficient local technical resource and outreach tool. To lose this resource will cost state and local governments' money and impact the availability of our natural resources over the long term.

As the commission is discussing state match funding and the commission report, we want to bring to everyone's attention to what we see as opportunities in relations to the delivery taskforce report, shared services, and urban SWCDs.

In relation to SWCDs state wide:

- We firmly believe that SWCDs are one of the best avenues to bring local agencies together to share resources in regards to natural resource conservation. This includes everything from agriculture, urban land development, and oil and gas.
- SWCDs have a great opportunity to provide state outreach programs down to the local level. We already do this with agriculture programs and we can increase these opportunities for other EPA and ODNR programs.
- SWCDs continued state funding success is in large part due to the fact that we appeal to both urban and agriculture natural resource interests as well as to both political parties.
- And SWCDs provide some of the greatest value dollar for dollar through conservative salaries, dedicated staff, ability to adapt to changing needs, and ability leverage support from partners and volunteers.

We hope that the commission will look at how they can leverage these opportunities and the success of SWCDs, such as Franklin, as they move forward in addressing state match funding challenges and implementing the commission task force report.

Let's find our efficiencies and improve our operations where we can while also continuing to make the case for state match.

Thank you for your time today.”

Chairman Price thanked Ms Fish and noted that is a point well taken

OSWCC ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Conservation Task Force Report - *Chairman Price/Gebhardt/Hammon* *Appoint implementation work group*

Mr. Gebhardt remarked that with the report being finalized; legislature being out of session, we are looking at potential revised code language changes and getting it ready for when the legislature comes back probably in the form of an omnibus bill from ODNR. These will be changes to 1511 and the department will be working over the summer and will be shooting for after January 1 in order to properly vet to all partners.

Chairman Price explained that as an effort to implement the Conservation Task Force Report, he was appointing Fred Cash to chair a special meeting; between now and November to work on implementation..

Mr. Gebhardt commented that other things driving the law changes is the nutrient working group recommendations that would require chapter 1511 changes, such as those address the fact that nutrient management plans don't address fertilizer; so these changes would address that; also looking at "distressed watershed" process, for example asking for nutrient management plans for all in a huge watershed.

2. Tool Box Grant Program applications consideration – Hammon

Mr. Hammon noted there were four applications and that the committee recommended all four to be funded. He interjected that due to the tabling of the Central Basin Joint Board, there is now a problem with the Cuyahoga application. He reviewed each application:

- Seneca, new look at drainage, high tech video, GPS mains; intensive look at drainage system, 50K
- Miami Joint Project; 2nd application; more match this time;
- Warren SWCD: put together NRR tool; designed to work with ERIN; usable by all SWCD; standardize I&E reporting; provides uniformity.
- Cuyahoga; Support Joint Board; much of the grant was for Joint Board administration; Mr. Hammon recommend not to fund this at this time until joint board issue.

Ms. Reed explained that the Warren County application is an outcome of Urban Task Force OFSWCD resolution and noted that it is voluntary for each SWCD.

Mr. Cash questioned the Seneca grant with regard to the equipment ownership and whether the application included a maintenance provision or protection of that asset. Mr. Hammon explained that the SWCD would very hands on; there would be fee structure for other entities to assist with the cost of maintenance; and his experience with similar equipment and conversations with SWCDs they have adequate protection measures.

Chairman Price called for a vote on each application separately:

Seneca Application; Motion made 1st by Mr. Hendrick; 2nd by Ms. Reed – All in favor; Motion passed

Warren Application: Motion made 1st by Mr. Hendrick; 2nd by Mr. Knapke; Ms Reed, abstained. All in favor; Motion passed;

Miami Application: Motion made 1st by Mr. Hendrick; 2nd by Mr. Knapke; Ms Reed, abstained. All in favor; Motion passed

Cuyahoga Application; Motion made 1st by Mr. Hendrick; 2nd by Mr. Elder to table action on the application to the November OSWCC meeting and hold 20K; motion to amend the motion to 20215 by Mr. Hendrick; 2nd by Mr. Elder. Amendment vote, All in favor with Mr. Cash abstaining, amendment passed. Vote to approve table of the application, All in favor with Mr.

Cash abstaining; Motion passed

3. Conservation Assistance Grant application consideration – Hammon

Mr. Hammon reported that five grant applications had been received for a total of \$101,000; He recommend to fund all. Three of the SWCDs/applicants will be at the end of 3 year requirement. Mr. Hammon further explained that with the change in the flat rate that is helping to support these SWCDs.

Mr. Stuckey motioned 1st to approve all Conservation Assistance Grants; Mr. Knapke 2nd, All in favor; Motion passed.

Mr. Hammon explained there was one other Conservation Assistance Grant to consider, Lorain SWCD's 2011 grant. He noted that Lorain submitted the grant late, but was accepted by the OSWCC. The SWCD missed all reporting deadlines and funds have been withheld; but submitted a final report recently. The SWCD was able to get a commitment from the Lorain County Commissioners for 106,000 for 2012. Ms. Farris, the program specialist for Lorain SWCD was asked to comment on the process. She explained that she had been trying to work with the staff and the board on what was required in sustainability plan and reports, however their lack sufficient participation, discussion or approval by the board at a board meeting.

Mr. Elder made a motion to approve the five current Conservation Assistance Grant requests; 2nd by Ms. Reed. Discussion: The Harrison SWCD board member present explained they had been working with their county commission; seeking guidance and advice from Program Specialist, Chad Amos; and wanted to thank the OSWCC; we realize our responsibility; we are trying;

Mr. Elder commented on having staff emphasize the report requirement to newly approved applicants; Mr. Knapke reported on the tough circumstances of Williams SWCD; Mr. Hammon interjected that they had had to move and were struggling just as the county was struggling. He noted that Paulding and Williams were the two big losers in area 1 with a 50% reduction each.

Call for the vote by Chairman Price; All in favor; Motion Carries.

Chairman Price asked the commission members on what they wanted to do with the Lorain situation:

Mr. Elder made a motion not fund the remainder of the 2011 Conservation Assistance Grant to Lorain: 2nd by Mr. Cash; Discussion

Mr. Cash asked what we are going to do to make them understand. Mr. Hammon explained that in the redrawing of Program Specialist boundaries Lorain will be serviced by a different person and the new face/new ideas may help; also Fred will go up and talk to the board as well try to provide some peer to peer assistance.

Vote: All in favor; Motion Carries

4. Approval 2013 State Match – Gebhardt

Mr. Gebhardt stated the Mr. Hammon and Ms. Evans would address the specifics on revenue and proposed match rate but revenues were up
Ms Evans began with revenue from 2012: 5bv0- tipping fees- last year we projected \$8 million; the final is 8.2 million, \$200,000 over; 1st time we had carry over in tipping fees. Overall there was nearly a 700,000 total carried over, this includes obligations not realized such as pollution abatement not spent and Lorain's CAS money.

Ms. Evans went on to explain that the commission members had in their packet a blue sheet, detailing state match funds; 2.9 million – GRF plus 8 million from tipping fees. Subtracted from that were obligations, including a new line for nutrient management grant, which also includes funds for the regular non-point source education grants; Grand Lake St. Mary special project funds - recommend at 80K; Watershed coordinator funds at 214,000 - same as last year, which matches federal dollars; money for SWIMs is 100,000 up from last year with new initiatives for nutrient trading and Windows 8 updates; another 50,000 for the Earth Resources Information Network (ERIN) - same as last year, which includes funds for moving the project to DNR house servers from DAS; plus the earmark of 250,000 for Heidelberg College Water Quality testing lab. Ms Evans remarked that she had forgotten to include the regular pollution abatement dollars set previously at 100,000 and to be continued at the same amount this year. Overall it will reduce match about 1%.

Ms. Evan suggested that if these were folded into the revenues that there would be a cash balance of 694,481.45. She suggested that the commission discuss use of these funds. She added that local appropriations were down about \$300,000. So, over all match would be 85% up from 78% last year this would include adding all the carryover an influenced by the lower local dollars to match on.

Mr. Price stated for clarification that if we reduced the budget by 300,000 than that would turn into a 3% reduction in state match.

Mr. Cash and Mr. Stuckey both commented that if Jill is comfortable we are comfortable rolling over all of the carryover into state match. Mr. Elder remarked that the money is better spent by SWCD than sitting in an account.

Chairman Price called for a motion. Mr. Cash moved to approved state match as presented by Ms Evans rolling over all of the carryover and including the 100,000 in pollution abatement funds. Mr. Elder 2nd the motion. Discussion: Mr. Hammon explained that regarding the Nutrient Reduction Education Program there is a need for state and partners to look at how to get the info out and get SWCDs engaged. This program will touch on Western Lake Erie Basin issues; inland lakes, and the Central basin. The 200,000 is for 7500 grants to pay for 4R activities; one on one events; outreach activities; enough for 25-30 SWCD to do these outreach activities. We will be holding a 30 day application period before harvest; then couple of other rounds to ramp up.

Mr. Gebhardt added that our (DSWR) education person would be dedicated to assist SWCDs with this process

Mr. Hammon then commented that the 80,000 Grand Lake St. Mary funds are for distressed watershed efforts; to help get the nutrient management plans done by mid Dec and inspections completed as prescribed - it helps us meet our obligations in that process.

Vote: All in Favor; Motion approved.

5. Western Lake Erie water quality activities update- *Gebhardt/staff*

Fortunate for the dry conditions this year; Lake Erie/GLSM looking good; inland lakes for example, Stone Lake in Clermont, do have some problems.

In the Western Lake Erie Basin: 5 or 6 SWCDs meeting for special monies added to our budget from the mid budget review. There will be money for on the ground projects; we brought Ed Crawford back to administer much of program dollars. We will be focusing on 3-4 areas: controlled drainage; cover crops; variable rate technologies. Terry with NRCS may report on other things. Indications are from staff that producers are responding; incentives will be offered; coordination with NRCS. There is a communication strategy to be announced 7/18, the "Clean Lakes Initiatives" which includes inland lakes; and is a joint Ohio EPA/AG/DNR effort focusing on common messaging; single point of contact for information; managing the hype. We want to insure info is being reported accurately as possible and is a multi-tiered joint effort including Point Sources such as Combined Sewer Overflow sources.

6. Nutrient Trading programs in Ohio overview and new Interstate Program- *Hammon*

Mr. Hammon reported there are 3 trading fronts in Ohio; on-going in Holmes Co; Miami project ongoing; and a new one with the Electric Power Research Institute, EPRI, project; representing power plant nationwide. They are working on a N trading project nationwide; we are working with them to develop for release on Aug 9 an interstate trading agreement; which includes upper Ohio pilot project with Jefferson, Columbiana and Mahoning SWCDs. These will be the 1st interstate trades in the country. This is a very big, very complex deal that will set the stage and process for the entire country. Each credit will have its own ID number with trades like on the Chicago board of Trade. We are looking at this as a new sources of funding for SWCDs not funded by the government; our goal is to make sure that all the costs are paid for by those who need the credits; we are trying to build it into the cost of the credit: technical/administrative/monitoring. We are trying to ensure this.

We are also working on a SWIMs module to track this trading. It will record and ID the project, record it as complete as well as calculate the credit and track the credit. A Beta test of module is expected in August.

7. State Biennium Budget 2114/2015 - *Gebhardt*

Next month we will be gearing up till July 1 of next year. New folks in the statehouse adds to education process. Even with revenues up; the strong message from the governor is that we don't need to spend it all. Jill is already crunching numbers. We are taking nothing for granted; it is a new opportunity to lose and get money.

8. NRCS Office of the Future workgroup update – Terry Cosby, State Conservationist, NRCS

Mr. Cosby reported that Michelle Lohstroh is meeting with partners and others within NRCS to work on proposal due out in September. We will be looking for the most efficient organization. The Secretary of Agriculture says folks want smaller government. That is the trend: The 1 DC: 1 county is thing of the past.

Agency Reports:

OSU: Mr. Hendrick reported he was re-engaging with Envirothon with his participation in the State Envirothon and the granting of 2 scholarships to participants; OSU is still searching for a soil fertility specialist, and hopes to hire late this fall; otherwise the college is in a holding pattern without Dean.

NRCS: Mr. Cosby reported that for the EQIP program, 77% of funds have been obligated. NRCS is holding meetings around the state asking how to do equip next year; asking how to improve it. We want to get funds obligated before Christmas.

- Conservation Security Program has not seen a great sign up; and the national office asked for money back. We are meeting to work on ways to encourage CSP sign up: with reduced CSP sign up I lose funding for staff years and I lost a lot of staff years. In the future each area and each county will have goals.
- Mercer SWCD was approved for a 700,000 grant from USDA for nutrient management.
- We are going through audit for training and trying to improve quality of our contracts.
- The Cleveland High Tunnel Initiative is up to about 70,000 in contract. Up to 400,000 is to be set aside for it. We are seeing that zoning in many communities is preventing High Tunnel implementation. Rep Fudge is passionate about SNAP and production of local foods among other things.
- With regard to the Conservation Innovation Grants, the national announcement is July 15, and then I can do the state announcement.
- The Secretary of Agriculture was here a couple weeks ago; Chief Gebhardt, ODNR Director Zehringer, and Dept of Agriculture Director Daniels met in Clermont and talked about helping with storms disaster including tree plantings as well as looking at urban/suburban solutions.
- He will be in DC with Kent for NACD meeting. And lastly he held outreach meetings with assistance from RC&Ds to educate non traditional customers on USDA programs.
- Mr. Cosby asked if there were any questions. Mr. Knapke asked about the Cooperative Conservation Agreement for the Wabash grant. Mr. Cosby stated that contracts in that area are paying for 25% of my staff Mr. Knapke commented that there are good people in the office, but temporary budgets don't keep the good staff. Mr. Cosby commented that retirements don't help either.
- Mr. Cash said his board appreciated what the NRCS staff has been doing in the urban area in northeast Ohio. Workshops are helping those new to the Federal opportunities; we've seen a great effort by NRCS. Mr. Cosby commented that NRCS currently has an Urban Conservation position opening on the street for Cuyahoga County.
- Mr. Price asked how folks will be able to everything online. Mr. Cosby replied that we need you to help carry that message about what is needed; our staff is declining as program money is increasing.
- Mr. Elder inquired about the timeline of the Office of the Future initiative. Mr. Cosby explained that there is a September 1, 2012 deadline. He will come back to OSWCC in November with more information. Chairman Price stated that he would like to see this

as an agenda item for the November 2012 OSWCC meeting.

FSA: none

EPA: none

ODA: Mr. Elder thanked everyone for the tour the previous day. He had not seen a high tunnel before. He reported that ODA held a 2 day Certified applicator training in June. August 9th is the Manure Science Review workshop with OSU/NRCS. Mr. Elder stated that SWCDs and OSU extension need to be aware that pond management is critical and understanding the conditions is important. Outreach is needed on this subject. He reported that the Phosphorus Taskforce report coming August 1st will look at modified goals for achievement. Mr. Elder questioned whether it would be possible to trade dissolved P. He commended the Central Basin group because an increase in algal blooms was seen there and it wasn't as well of a defined source; there is a much more diverse ecosystem. There were legislation changes for the Dept of Ag in Omnibus bill: it changed criminal negligence standards to meet USEPA criteria for primacy. Reporting of nutrient changes to understand where they are coming from; invasive issue still being addressed.

ODNR: Mr. Gebhardt on behalf of Director Zehringer expressed appreciation to Mr. Cosby for getting dollars out of DC to the WLEB and other areas. He also expressed thanks for getting the Secretary of Agriculture in Ohio for a few days for a real discussion on problems. With regard to the harmful algal blooms and invasive carp, the department is working with University of Notre Dame in sampling DNA. We are getting detections; found silver carp in little Miami River. We are monitoring in Lake Erie and working on a MOU with Indiana. Regarding Great Lakes Compact rules, we are working on the adverse impact definition. There was new Oil and Gas legislation, HB 315, and we are going into rulemaking including how it may work with 1515. ODNR is putting together meeting with OCCA and OTA to discuss water withdrawals from trucks along the roadsides. We regard to the state parks in the Cleveland area, the administration is looking at arrangement of transferring management of some parks to Cleveland metro parks.

Mr. Cash asked when Mr. Gebhardt thought the distressed watershed designation will be lifted. Mr. Gebhardt replied that the tourism biz is up, but the problem is that the controlling factors are not in our control. There is a possibility of taking a look at it this fall. Mr. Elder added there are many factors influencing the situation and time is needed to heal. Mr. Gebhardt explained further that once nutrient management plans get completed, that is a big part of the designation, so once those are done and we can verify implementation then we can take a look at lifting it.

OFSWCD/SWCDs: OFSWCD CEO Mindy Bankey reported the OFSWCD is gearing up for SSS and making final preparations. With the OFSWCD's Soybean Council Grant they recently launched the 4R Tomorrow campaign for nutrient stewardship. The Scott's Backyard Conservation effort launched in April is being melded with 4R as well. Other than that they are awaiting to what new FB brings

OASWCDE: Ryan Smith representing the OASWCDE reported that they will be at SSS to

recruit and re up memberships. He and Michelle Maddox will be the employee association reps for Field Office of the Future working group. There are 2 OASWCDE scholarships presented each year: The Continuing Education Scholarship had no applicants and is still available. The association is looking at putting together an Oil and Gas Day for employees and board members. Mr. Smith then asked Irene Moore to talk about the National Employee Association. Ms. Moore reported that the national conservation partnership meets quarterly; the last meeting was a conference call with all 50 states, the next meeting is next week in DC. The association does work with NACD on professional development and conservation tour at NACD annual meeting; the organization serves on all NACD committees and taskforces. Ms. Moore thanked the OSWCC for coming to this part of the state and for all OSWCC work.

Mr. Elder inquired about the item in the OSWCC member folder from Fulton. Mr. Hammon commented this was an informational piece since the City of Archbold gave dollars to the Fulton SWCD for cost share projects, some of the funds will be spent in Michigan, we are only matching the capital funds up to \$8000 for a conservation capital projects in Fulton County.

Mr. Elder inquired to Mr. Cosby about a farm bill update. Mr. Cosby stated he had no comment. Mr. Stuckey reported that the House version is identical to Senate version (Conservation Portion). We are ok with those. Mr. Stuckey then asked Ms. Bankey for any comments. Ms. Bankey indicated the conservation title was held to the level we asked; we knew there would be reductions, but nothing we couldn't support.

Mr. Cash commented that as a part of urban farm initiative Mr. Cosby had asked us to facilitate discussion about tweaks to farm bill to accommodate more urban environment; he didn't know if we were able to do this, at this time, but asked that we will next time. He further explained that the Farm Bill program requirements for producers are not suited to the urban growing environment. Mr. Cosby commented that it is important now to get that info in for the rule making process and make sure that info is included. The Urban Taskforce could be used to formulate the discussion and comments.

Mr. Price thanked everyone and asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion made by Mr. Elder, seconded by Mr. Hendrick at 11:20 am.

The next meeting of the OSWCC will be November 8, 2012.