Meeting Notes

1. Call to Order and Introductions

2. Previous meeting notes
   a. Concurrence gained

3. SFY 2013 WRAPS RFP
   a. Walked through the RFP and discussed changes; items discussed included:
      ii. Projects must have a plan/significant progress to apply.
      iii. Projects have to be targeting TMDLs.
      iv. Projects should be achieving annual imp goals as stated in the plan.
      v. Comments: good program requirements.
      vi. Page 2: planning and assessment cap: Add phrase that projects can apply for the extra implementation if they want to.
      vii. Ranking changes: Jaime explained adjustments
         1. Comments: EPA: if a top tier project was awarded multi year award and now is bumped down to second tier what happens?
            KDHE Proposed: if more years are promised – honor old cap but next time they apply they have lower cap – need to discuss this point further and decide what to do – any thoughts? Sure hate to lose the flow that is now getting started with multi year projects – keep that in mind as look at grant apps for SFY 13 – limit them in the supplemental phase – limit versus value – suggested to come up with a couple of options to send out to workgroup for review.
      viii. Hillsdale in RFP – expose no apps will be accepted now – kdhe should finish plan in feb – go through review process then solicit for hillsdale project in summer 2012. Competitive application – for hillsdale sponsor.
         1. Concurrence on this approach
      ix. Service provider categories- no significant changes - work group felt all listed services are still of significant value.
         1. Comment: on riparian description – doesn’t discuss design - p 7 shouldn’t this include design? Due to MoA with DoC and others we don’t want to permanently hire design. Question from KFS – would it be advantageous to stick with only top priority projects? WG recommended against this – don’t limit yourself – diversify.
4. WRAPS Partnership Agreement Revision
   a. Drafted in 2003 – opportunity for other organizations to participate in the workgroup – language said partnerships would be honored unless subcabinet was dissolved – so need to change language – KDHE walked the WG through revisions:
      i. Purpose changed
      ii. General duties and responsibilities not changed much – number 7 is new
      iii. Workgroup duties
      iv. Now only 2 members need to sign – not all work group members.
      v. Will be contacting current partners – need to sign new agreement and solicit for new partners
      vi. Are current wraps projects partners? No, they must apply like all other partners
      vii. Do projects receive agenda and minutes? Not at this time, that is part of the incentive to sign up as a partner. But perhaps to increase transparency we should change this.
      viii. To get the projects coordinators more involved through the WRAPS partnership.
         1. Exofeciant or a respective for the coordinators at the WRAPS Work group meeting.
         2. Posting meeting minutes and agenda on a website.
         3. Should the agenda’s minutes should be internal to WRAPS group meeting?
         4. Comments regarding project RFP should be left to WRAPS Work group members. Should these comments be internal?
         5. Agreed to post agenda and meeting minutes on the www.kswraps.org
         6. To attend a WRAPS Work Group meeting need to be a partner.
         7. Voting rights are assigned to members who have signed a MOU.
   b. KDHE requested concurrence via email by Friday. Concurrence was gained Friday December 2, 2011.

5. Grand Lake Meeting
   a. November 8, 2011 meeting in Joplin, MO four states
   b. Topic at the meeting is the model to create the TMDLs for the Grand Lake. States are not being involved in the model at the level they would like.
   c. A partnership agreement will hopefully be signed by all the four governors.
   d. Issues from Region 6 regarding approval of EPA 9 element plans.
6. 106 Funds RFP (KDHE)
   a. FFY11 was cut unexpectedly and some 319 went to the 106 program – some 106 funding came back to WRAPS for extra BMP funding. $183,000 available – must be spent by Nov. 30, 2012. Grant conditions handed out and discussed. Deadline to apply – December 5th – questions – interest is there, half a dozen applications will come in – review only within WMS. This will be good test run for DOC money – DOC brought up that they need to make sure tech assistance is available – reminded that stipulation that projects are allocated – this means that they should already be designed or on a design wait list. Work Group Questions:
      i. Who got funding? Please report at January meeting.
      ii. Do you think this should be Incorporated into ranking? New score matrix is all about this feedback loop.

7. KFS Riparian Assessment: Delaware WRAPS project update
   a. Handout – project goal is to use GIS remote sensing groundtruthing to inventory
      i. GIS update – phase I – level I watershed assessment in 8 huc 12s- and mainstem completed by KAWS – phase II need to use NAIP imagery to classify forest type to 1 m resolution instead of 30m resolution. They will also look at loss of forested areas
         1. Jude will be doing flood work – complete.
         2. Buffers – rehired local guy to fix buffers on ARRA streambanks.
      ii. On the ground recon is completed except for Muddy and Negro Creeks - 145 riparian plots completed. Top 75% of mainstem Delaware is completed.
      iii. Kansas natural resources

8. Updates:
   a. Status of 9 Element WRAPS Plans (KDHE)-end of plan writing process is near – handed out updated watershed plan sheet
   b. Federal EPA/OMB and GAO 319 Program Reviews (KDHE/EPA)
      i. EPA/OMB – report is finalized and submitted to OMB – Steve will summarize – handout – Appendix C included recommendations for ways to improve program. Evaluation of state programs – are they making satisfactory progress – EPA will send out guidance for evaluation for each region – if states don’t meet satisfactory mark – potential for giving funding to other better performing states. Funds utilization – congress is looking at unspent funds – Kansas in good shape – planning has set the stage to spend money – other states not through planning.
ii. GAO – separate study – heard grumblings that one of their findings will be that program is grossly under-funded. Has been a thorough evaluation. From the ground up evaluation – been polling random watershed projects (subgrantees).

iii. Looks like 165million in next year budget – so 150,000 more cut – 480,000 cut last year.

iv. Kansas feature – handed out/reviewed.

v. Kansas in good shape if any of 6 recommendations come to fruition – Kansas will be on federal workgroup to develop details of these recommendations. Kansas is also on an ECO committee – national committee.

c. Clean Water State Revolving Fund RFP (KDHE)
   i. Soliciting for new projects through Dec. 20 – RFP is similar to what it was last year – still up to 100% principal forgiveness for nontraditional borrowers – traditional borrowers get 75% principal forgiveness. Details on website – 2 webinars – get people interested and unafraid – 2.6 for green infrastructure practices.

9. Subcommittee reports
   a. Riparian Work Group

   b. Dan Devlin – saw Don Huggins at the KACD conference and he announced nutrient requirements for lakes – will be coming out with rivers/streams nutrient criteria.


11. Announcements
    a. Work Group Members
       i. Jeff Gross – Congress passed budget for Farm Bill program – 100 million cut in tech assistance – getting some inquiries from Missouri basin – levees won’t be repaired by the next cropping season – crop insurance will be double or triple normal prices. Jeff is retiring. New member will be joining in January.

       ii. Bill Beck – Public Lands Forester Grant and Topeka Area bush honeysuckle control.

    b. Visitors
    c. Future WRAPS WG meetings:
i. January 24, 2012- also basin sediment advisory meeting at KWO that afternoon. Note that on next agenda mail out.

ii. March 27, 2012– All Day

iii. May 22, 2012

iv. July 24, 2012