

MOAFS RIVERS AND STREAMS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Summer Meeting – 9/5/2007 at Bennett Springs

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ange Corson at 10:00 am.

Attendees included Shannon Brewer, Paul Calvert, Brian Canaday, Ange Corson, Brian Elkington, John Fantz, Suzanne Femmer, Sherry Fischer, Kenda Flores, Nick Gironde, Jennifer Guyot, Drew Holt, Jason Persinger, Tom Priesendorf, Chris Riggert, Mike Smith, Bob Temper, Bill Turner, Kara Tvedt, Scott Voney, and Bill White.

The agenda was passed out and Ange announced a change in the agenda that Brian Canaday would be bringing up a piece of new business prior to our guest speakers.

Minutes from the winter meeting were passed out for review by the committee. Brian Canaday made a motion to accept minutes from the winter meeting. Jennifer Guyot seconded the motion and the motion passed.

New Business

MOAFS Brief for Legislators

Brian Canaday (MOAFS President) talked about MOAFS's Excom coming up with the idea to develop a packet for legislators. This packet would be mailed to each legislator and include information about MOAFS. The types of information that would be included:

- 1) explanation of MOAFS as an organization.
- 2) explanation of the types of information that we can provide to legislators with on resource issues.
- 3) specific information on current issues in the form of brief fact sheets.

Brian C. – As we move forward the Excom would be calling on the Rivers and Streams Committee to provide the basic information on rivers and streams issues, such as gravel mining, that would go into the packet to share with legislators.

Brian – What are the committee's thoughts on this idea and if we move forward with this can the rivers and streams committee help?

Bob Temper – This is a wonderful idea. I have spent time on capital hill working and testifying on these types of issues and know that legislators are often acting and making decision based on hearsay. We need to get facts into there hands.

Kenda Flores – Good idea that will help them see what we can do and what we already do.

Brian C. – Remember this will come from MOAFS and not from MDC.

Bill Turner – This is a great idea and Brian is correct that it has to come from MOAFS. This cannot in anyway appear to come from MDC.

Brian C. – MOAFS has a clear stance and relationship with many of the legislators that work on the committees that affect resource issues, but we need to get are info to all of them. Our goal is to get it out as soon as possible, but we are not going to rush. We will not ask group to vote on it before it goes out, but there will be opportunity to review it before it goes out to legislators.

John Fantz – We previously did a fact sheet of this type on CAFO's. Did it get sent out to this kind of audience and if so what kind of feedback did we get on it?

Bill T. – Can not remember who all it went out too or what kind of feedback we got.

Brian C. – Don't know about feedback to CAFO factsheet, but I think that it would still be useful as part of this. The key however is to get it out, make it useful, and make it something we do annually.

Bob T. – I just want to state how important it will be to reach all legislators with this, especially the ones not on the committees because they may not have any other information when they vote on these issues.

Brian C. then passed out copies of the packet MDC put together for legislators in order to talk about what form it would take, because this is where he got the idea from.

Sherry Fischer – Notice how appealing to the eye the MDC packet is. Ours needs to be same way if we want to catch their attention otherwise it will just get pitched.

Brian C. – I agree it definitely needs to grab there attention and it cannot be technical or long. It is important to remember when dealing with legislators the rule of three's. That we have 3 minutes to make 3 points on 3 pages otherwise they will tune it out.

Guest Speakers

Bill White (MDC) 2008 Farm Bill as it stands today.

Bill gave the group a 30 minute presentation on the gains that were made for conservation in the last farm bill and current differences and politics that will affect the upcoming farm bill and its schedule for being passed.

The 2002 Farm Bill expires September 30, 2007. As of yet a new bill has not passed and does not appear to be close to passing. Most likely the 2002 version will be extended until the new one is passed, but there is no solid timeline for when that will be.

He reviewed the progress made under the 2002 bill that focused on H2O quality and riparian areas. Biggest impacts were made in Missouri in the 22,000 acres of CRP buffers and 119,000 acres of wetlands established.

What is the current form and status of 2008 farm bill? House passed their version in July and it contained lots of good conservation, but President has threatened to veto. Senate has done very little with their version and probably won't until October or later. The current bill has 25 to 50% more money for conservation than 2002 bill. Also the wildlife habitat in previous bill has become fish and wildlife habitat in current bill. The National Fish Habitat Initiative is referenced in the bill. WRP will add a floodplain easement program and WRP acres are doubled. A special projects program is also included. Biofuels are a big part of the deal as well.

Questions:

Bill T. – Is there still potential to lose ground?

Bill W. – I don't think so. The current congress is very supportive of conservation and all indications are good that we won't lose any ground and the gains that have been made in the current bill.

Paul C. – Let's think about ways we can use these programs in our jobs to improve our use of the money on aquatic issues, particularly the special projects program.

Bill W. – Obviously all projects must get approved by the state conservationist, but I think there are opportunities available.

Bob T. – Where do our Senators stand?

Bill W. – I have worked directly with McCaskill's staff and she is very supportive of conservation on this bill and have asked me questions on certain aspects. Bond also appears to be supportive.

Drew Holt (MU Extension) Protecting the Elk River and Shoal Creek watersheds – Getting local stakeholders involved

Drew gave a presentation discussing the Elk River Watershed Improvement Association and the Upper Shoal Creek Watershed Improvement Group. The Elk River Watershed is located in 6 counties in three states (Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma) and in two EPA districts. Currently 127 miles of streams are listed as impaired. The Elk River Watershed Improvement Association has an 11 member board representing a cross-section of stakeholders and operates under the guiding principals that they will deal fairly with each other and seek a consensus. He then discussed the wide variety of issues and projects they have worked on. The Upper Shoal Creek Watershed Improvement Group is focused on a much smaller area. Shoal Creek is impaired with fecal coliform and the group has worked to deal with the official impairment as well as other local concerns. They have bought into the idea that everyone doing something even if it is small will make a big difference.

Questions:

Ange Corson – How do you deal with property rights perspective?

Drew H. – You need to be willing to engage them and listen to them. We your talking make sure you stick to the facts.

How do you send out invites and try to balance the room for different perspectives?

Drew H. – Plan the best you can, but really flying by the seat of your pants and hoping. Important to talk to the locals and build names that are involved.

Bill T. – Explain your position and how you are funded?

Drew H. – I am a grant funded employee through University extension.

Break for lunch at 11:55

Meeting called back to order at 1:00

Updates

Changes to Stream Stewardship Trust Fund (Paul Calvert)

The Heritage Foundation receives funds from contractors for mitigation. That money is used through the Stream Stewardship Trust Fund to pay for stream projects. Projects are ranked based on whether they are restoration, enhancement, or preservation work in that order. There is currently a new method for calculating how much mitigation is required by contractors. Contractors will now fill out a worksheet that calculates the credits due and they must mitigate for that number of credits. Mitigation work will also be calculated based on credits. Overall this should bring more money into the fund. This new mitigation method will make it more difficult to do preservation work because it will focus more on restoration.

Any one that is stream certified by MDC can apply to use the funds, however projects from outside the department can be funded they just need to be funneled thru a department employee. There is no limit on the amount of money that can be used on an individual project. The application process is fairly simple and I encourage everyone to apply. At a future meeting, I will teach the new method for evaluating credits.

Under old method a contractor paid about \$2 a credit into the fund, but under the new method they will pay approximately \$35 a credit.

Stream Handbook (Paul Calvert)

MOAFS has worked for many years to produce a stream guide, but never managed to get it into a publishable form. Recently, MDC decided to produce it own stream guide. Rather than reproduce what MOAFS had already done, MDC and MOAFS entered into a cooperative agreement to use MOAFS's previously produced chapters and turn them into a series of web based fact sheets. MDC has been working to take the chapters and cut them into fact sheets. Most of the chapter are going to make multiple short factsheets. Eventually there will be 30 to 40 facts sheets. Plan is to post them on the MOAFS webpage, the MDC webpage, and the Stream Team webpage.

Paul C. then passed out a prototype of the first fact sheet.

Questions:

Ange C. – How soon will they be available?

Paul C. – Goal is to have a few posted by winter meeting and to have 12 or so by next July 1. Some headaches getting them onto the MDC webpage.

John F. – Is it because of server space?

Paul C. – No it has nothing to do with that, they will all be housed on MDC server and just linked from the other webpages. And since they will all be PDF's it is not the format of the documents either. The problem is that Ange developed an interactive intro page for the fact sheets that is a sticking point with MDC's web people because they want the format to match the rest of the website.

Suggestion made that we just put the interactive intro page on the MOAFS website and avoid the conflict with the MDC web staff.

Suzanne F. – We might also be able to put links to the facts sheets on the USGS web page.

MNRC Rivers and Stream Workshop for 2008 (Tom Priesendorf)

The first workshop at the 2007 MNRC focused on Stream advocacy and how to get people involved. It was a panel discussion with several members representing NGO's that talked about experiences in developing watershed groups. There was a lot of good information exchange and Bill Turner did a great job moderating the session. At end of workshop we were able to gather that there was interest in holding another workshop next year and get some guidance from the audience on where they wanted it to go. From that guidance several of us have developed a mission statement for the 2008 workshop. Currently we are not locked into MNRC, but things are looking good so we are trying to move forward with getting speakers for the panel as if we are locked in. Currently we have 3 of the 4 we have targeted on board for the workshop. Lance Hedges will be giving a talk about organizing stakeholder groups (terrestrial issues, but similar steps needed for watershed groups.) Rob Pullium will be talking about getting the word out to key stakeholders. Hope to get Gene Fox involved, but have not been successful yet. If anyone knows Gene personally you might talk to him for us. We would like to have him talk about using the media to get your message out.

Paul C. – Good luck trying to get Gene. He is very busy and I am not sure we can get him.

Bill T. – What is the objective of having Gene?

Tom P. – Effective use of the media to get your overall message out. It does not have to be Gene.

Bill T. – Try Holly Berthold as a replacement.

Tom P. – Holland Neil is locked in as a panelist that will give a case history of the Watershed Committee of the Ozarks. We still have one more slot for some case history on building a watershed group. Drew would you be interested in filling that slot?

Drew H. – I would be interested.

Tom P. – OK great that means the only thing we are lacking other than the media talk is someone to act as moderator. Bill did a great job last year, but it is a tough job I would hesitate to ask Bill again since it is such time commitment and would like to spread that burden around. Anyone have suggestions?

John F. – What about Brian Canaday?

Tom P. – He would be a good choice I will follow up and ask him

Bill T. – If not I would be willing to do again if needed.

Tom P. – We still need to get official word that we have a slot and when it is but we are gonna move forward as if we do.

Mike Smith – It was mentioned at last MNRC meeting and I believe that we are in.

Tom P. – Great it is looking good then so we will continue to move forward.

Experimental Streambank Stabilization Project Update (Jason Persinger)

The study calls for testing 5 experimental techniques at 5 different sites across the state. Currently 19 projects have been installed, 2 projects are currently under construction, and 2 projects are waiting on permits to be installed. Five experimental rock weir projects have been installed and all of these have been tested by at least one flow event. 4 of these are currently working as planned. The project that failed was due to the rock used in construction being too small and getting carried downstream during a high flow event. That project will be repaired during the next couple of weeks using larger rock. Five experimental log weir projects have been installed and two of these have been tested by high flow events. Of the projects tested one appears to be working and the other failed. The log weir project that failed was the first one built. After it failed it was replaced with a rock weir project and the other four log weir projects were modified based on what we learned. Five toe rock projects have been installed and a sixth project is waiting on a permit. Three of the five have been tested by a flow event and all are currently working as planned. Two back slope projects have been installed, two are currently under construction, and we are currently looking for a fifth site. Only one project has been tested by a flow event and so far it is working. Two gravel roll projects have been installed and we are waiting for the permits on another. We are currently looking for two more sites for this technique. Neither site has received a flow event yet.

New Business

Southern Division AFS Warm Water Streams Video (Jason Persinger)

The Warm Water Streams Committee of the Southern Division produced a video entitled: *Warm Water Streams: A Resource Worth Protecting*. This video was developed for educational purposes and it is free to use. I thought we might be able to put to some use.

Group watched the 28 minute video.

Following the video Mike Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Tom Priesendorf seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:35 PM.