

DRAFT

Watershed Assessment Group Minutes
Administration Building Public Meeting Room
Date: November 5, 2021

Committee members present: Mike Cox, Sandra King, Darren Moon, Linda Murken, Leanne Harter, Kimberly Grandinetti, Scott Wall, Sara Carmichael, Amelia Schoeneman, Andrea Wagner

Leanne Harter called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM.

I. Approval of Agenda

Motion to Approve – Wall/Schoeneman

II. Learning Moment – Wagner and Schoeneman presented on the Wetland Natural Resource Protection Ordinance. Will be working more with Conservation Board and Planning and Zoning Commission before submitting to Board of Supervisors. See below for more information.

III. Review Meeting Notes from prior meeting – August 4, 2021

Motion to Approve – Schoeneman/Wagner

IV. Old Business

A. ARPA Funding Requests

Harter and Murken gave an update on the ARPA funding and the process Story County is following. The County will receive \$18.9 million. Board of Supervisors opened applications for internal and external projects this fall. They received 37 external and 16 internal projects for a total of \$31.1 million. Harter and King are part of the internal scoring group that will review projects and provide recommendations to the BOS this winter. There will be three work sessions this month: Internal Applications - Nov 19 2:30-4:30pm, External Applications – Nov 29-30 2-4pm.

B. Edge of Field Update

Carmichael and Cox gave an update on where this project is currently. There are at least 21 tile outlets that can be treated with the two edge of field practices – bioreactors and saturated buffers. At least eight of the practices will be installed upstream of the Ames Water Treatment plant and they will take care of any and all funding for those. The other outlets are around the Nevada area and need to have County financial support. Details on specific funding sources are TBD. Harter and Schoeneman brought up the fact we will need floodplain permits to move forward. Carmichael will look into that.

C. Monitoring Update

Carmichael gave an update on the water quality monitoring efforts for the county. Volunteer monitors have been asked to turn their kits back in to Conservation so they can be updated. They will be given back out early next year. Prairie Rivers of Iowa completed a snapshot monitoring effort on October 24. The first-year report will be out early 2022.

D. Headwaters WMA Update

Murken provided an update on the WMA efforts. JEO, the consulting firm completing the watershed assessment, has been present at all WMA meetings and the group is happy with their process so far.

DRAFT

Completed report is expected December 2022. Next meeting is November 18 from 10-noon at the Roland Community Center.

V. New Business

A. Budget items for FY23

Cox, Carmichael, and Harter lead the discussion on reviewing FY23 budget line items for the Implementation Matrix. Here is what was decided for each Category:

1.2 decrease from \$5,000 to \$2,500 for mailings and educational materials

2.3 and 2.4 \$5,000 for a feasibility study for both wetland and stream mitigation banks

2.7 increase from \$25,000 to \$50,000 for edge of field practices

2.8 remove \$500

2.9 \$25,000 for water quality monitoring contract with Prairie Rivers of Iowa

2.10 decrease from \$5,000 to \$2,000 for municipal outreach education

2.11 \$250 for support in Fourmile Creek WMA

2.12 remove \$10,000

2.13 remove \$50,000

2.14 keep \$1,000 for legal notification requirements

VI. Staff Updates and Assignments

Harter noted that the CRS reclassification has been completed and Story County remains a Class 7 community. For each class rating we achieve as a county, residents may receive 5% discount on flood insurance.

No other updates due to running out of time.

VII. Other Items Not on the Agenda - none

VIII. Next Meeting Time and Date

Friday December 10, 9-10:30 – will be reviewing and updating the Implementation Matrix

IX. Adjournment – adjourned at 10:37am

Wetlands

- **Delineation is required and determination from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) if its jurisdictional** in the case of any development that may impact it/its buffer area.
 - A jurisdictional wetland means it connects with a waterway federally regulated by the U.S. Army Corps/a waterway that is protected by the Clean Water Act.
- Can maintain **150 foot buffer from apparent wetland and not complete delineation** (USACE will still need to make determination if impact proposed).
- **If non-jurisdictional, proposed Story County requirements apply.**
 - **100 foot buffer required from delineated wetlands.** Considering allowing buffer averaging or creating a wetland classification system where a smaller buffer is required.
 - **Some types of wetlands** (potentially based on size/species) **are not allowed to be impacted.**

Wetlands

- If impact allowed, and **more than 15% impacted, mitigation requirements apply:**
 - For mitigation areas **preserving** existing wetlands off-site, wetlands shall be preserved at a ratio of **1:1**.
For mitigation areas **reconstructing** or creating wetlands, wetlands shall be replaced at a ratio of **2:1**.
For mitigation areas **restoring** previously drained or impacted wetlands, wetlands shall be restored at a ratio of **2:1**.
- For jurisdictional wetlands, compensatory mitigation requirements of the Corps shall be applied.
 - Whichever entity's (county, state, federal) requirements are greater shall be deferred to.
- Considering what **HUC Level** off-site preservation/creation/restoration is allowed in.
 - HUC refers to Hydrologic Unit Code, i.e. the scale of the watershed.
- If commercial or residential development proposed on area with farmed wetland, restoration required.
- Considering protecting constructed wetlands pending feedback from NRCS.