



Kansas Regional Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

**1 pm Wednesday, July 8, 2020
GoTo Meeting and Conference Call**

Members Attendance:

Name	City	Category	Term	Present
Dawn Buehler, Chair	Eudora, KS	Recreation	2023	Yes
Heath Horyna, V-Chair	Topeka, KS	Industry/Commerce (cc)	2021	No
Adam Bauer	Milford, KS	WRAPs	2023	Yes
Rick Bean	Topeka, KS	At Large Public (cc)	2023	Yes
Marlene Bosworth	Sabetha, KS	Conservation/Environment (cc)	2023	Yes
Brad Bradley	Overland Park, KS	Fish and Wildlife	2021	Yes
Glenn Brunkow	Westmoreland, KS	Agriculture (cc)	2021	Yes
Sarah Hill-Nelson	Lawrence, KS	Industry/Commerce	2023	Yes
Leslie Holthaus	Beattie, KS	Conservation/Environment	2023	Yes
Daniel Howell	Frankfort, KS	Agriculture	2021	No
Darci Meese	Lenexa, KS	Public Water Supply (cc)	2023	Yes
William Ramsey	Leawood, KS	Planning, Restoration and Protection	2021	No
Greg Wilson	Olathe, KS	Water Assurance District	2021	Yes

Others in attendance:

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Josh Olson	KWO	Taylor Herman	KCC
Cara Hendricks	KWO	Dave Jones	KDA-DOC
Lauren Koons	KWO	John Reinke	KDWPT
Earl Lewis	KWO	Troy Munsch	NRCS
Richard Rockel	KWO	Allyn Lockner	Public
Nate Westrup	KWO		

- I) **Welcome and Introductions:** The meeting was called to order at 1:06 pm by Chair, Dawn Buehler. Self-introductions were given with RAC roll call completed on the conference call line.

- II) **RAC Business:**
 - a. **FY21 SWPF budget update:** Dawn opened the discussion, explaining that Earl (KWO) and Cara (KWO) were on the call to give the RAC a FY21 SWPF budget update. Greg asked if the RAC had seen any of the information yet, noting a desire to be prepared. Cara explained that much of the information had previously been presented to the RAC through the budget webinar and regional budget summaries provided by the KWO, but there was some new information as well. Earl started the presentation. Earl noted that the KWO wants feedback from the RAC on whether funding has been categorized correctly in the budget summaries. Earl also asked the RAC to think about what the top priorities are that are not currently being funded, explaining that, in the long term, the desire is to figure out how much it would cost to implement the RAC Goals and Action Plans. Earl reviewed FY20 and FY21 appropriations, noting adjustments from Governor Kelly for FY21. Earl explained that the \$2.4 million added in funding for FY21 will not be implemented, and that the plan is to hold funding at FY20 levels. Greg asked how that broke down for the State General Fund versus EDIF. Earl explained that the FY21 SGF funding will be approximately \$4 million instead of the originally appropriated \$6 million, and EDIF funding will be

Membership: Dawn Buehler (Chair), Eudora, KS; Heath Horyna (Vice-Chair), Topeka, KS; Adam Bauer, Milford, KS; Rick Bean, Topeka, KS; Marlene Bosworth, Sabetha, KS; Brad Bradley, Overland Park, KS; Glenn Brunkow, Westmoreland, KS; Sarah Hill-Nelson, Lawrence, KS; Leslie Holthaus, Beattie, KS; Daniel Howell, Frankfort, KS; Darci Meese, Lenexa, KS; William Ramsey, Leawood, KS; Greg Wilson, Olathe, KS;
KWO Planner: Josh Olson, 785-296-0875: josh.olson@kwo.ks.gov

approximately \$500,000 instead of the originally appropriated \$900,000. Earl then gave a brief overview of Kansas Water Plan budget guidelines, noting the statutory requirements to fund certain initiatives. Earl explained that, with significant funding coming from fees, there is a desire to have some credibility ensuring that people paying in are getting something in return and that funding is balanced. Earl outlined the three priority budget categories for water projects: groundwater initiatives, water quality, and reservoir water supply & sedimentation. Earl went through funding breakdowns by budget category and region and described the process for addressing water issues and making funding decisions: identify issues that fall within the Kansas Water Plan categories, include those issues in the Kansas Water Plan through the RAC Goals and Action Plans, implement the necessary projects and initiatives to address those issues with SWPF funding. Earl asked the RAC to think about whether funding is supporting Goals the way they want them to. Earl went through the FY17-19 average SWPF funding by program and noted that the KWA has requested full statutory funding of the SWPF each year when they pass budget recommendations. Earl encouraged the RAC to consider what the priorities are that should be maintained, what projects could potentially be reduced, and what priorities aren't currently being funded. Funding for streambank stabilization was mentioned, and Cara explained that it is a joint effort between several groups, including KDHE, DOC, and KFS, to identify hot spots and reduce the amount of sediment making it downstream. Dawn asked if it was known how effective such measures are. Cara explained that there are post-construction assessments being done, noting that the research coordination group (KGS and KSU) is doing a multi-year effort to evaluate effectiveness. Earl elaborated that after high-flow events, like last year, stabilization sites are checked for damage. Earl noted that the longer those sites have been in place and vegetated, the better they tend to do handle those events. Rick mentioned that the RAC talks about a lot of different studies, but doesn't always hear the outcomes. Rick expressed an interest in hearing more about implementation and asked if there was a document covering the topic. Earl noted that was a good reminder to the KWO to be circling back to RACs about projects. Earl stated that the research coordination group is trying to get at the question of effectiveness, but that the KWO will continue to work on coming up with ways to better share information with the RACs. Rick noted the importance of knowing if problems are actually being solved, particularly when asking for future money. Earl commented that the KWO topical webinars have been an attempt to share a lot of that information. Marlene noted that having that information is particularly useful for prioritization. Sarah asked the KWO what their biggest desired change would be. Earl noted that targeting is probably the biggest suggestion. Sarah asked where the KWO would want to spend additional funds if they had it. Earl mentioned Water Injection Dredging (WID), and noted that, if the effectiveness of WID in reservoirs matches results seen elsewhere, the KWO would be remiss to not push forward with that technology. Greg commented on the funding categorization by RAC Goal and suggested that it would be beneficial to see what programs and projects benefit other RACs' Goals and Action Plans. Greg noted that it would provide additional prioritization information for the KWA to consider.

- b. Project prioritization matrix and budget recommendations discussion:** Josh (KWO) shared the results of the project prioritization matrix analysis requested by the RAC at the previous RAC meeting. For the analysis, Josh used recently funded KWO projects and the draft matrix Greg provided with revisions from Greg, Marlene, and Dawn. Josh explained that he did his best to be objective, but noted such analysis is likely to have a bit of personal bias. Looking at the results of the analysis, it was noted that the streamgaging score was very high. Josh explained that streamgaging intersects with a lot of different efforts, and thus, received points for many categories in the matrix. Dawn noted that, with only three people providing feedback on the matrix, she thought the matrix could be used for discussion at this meeting, and then the RAC could try to make a more final matrix in the future. Marlene noted the need

for some time to review any potential issues with the analysis. Leslie asked about the project completion date category in the matrix, and Greg explained that he included it based on the thought that projects that are about to be completed should get greater consideration. Leslie mentioned that many BMP conservation projects are one-year efforts, so she was surprised to see them get low scores for project completion date. Josh explained that he treated longer-term programs with shorter-term enrollment as having completion dates of more than two years. Josh noted that the prioritization results would be different if completion date was evaluated based on individual projects rather than the broader program. Sarah noted the bathymetry category of the matrix and questioned where bathymetry is currently being done. Nate (KWO) responded that Clinton Lake has been surveyed and Tuttle Creek Lake is in the process of being surveyed.

The discussion shifted to making FY22 budget recommendations. Brad asked whether the prioritization matrix results should be used by the RAC for the budget recommendations for FY22. Josh cautioned against the idea, noting that, having received feedback from only three RAC members, the matrix likely does not fully represent each RAC member's priorities and the categories they represent. Josh noted that feedback would be needed from all RAC members, and the RAC would need to formally agree on the scoring criteria and weights in a finalized matrix before considering to use it as an official recommendation from the RAC. Rick agreed that the RAC should not stick to the prioritization results too closely and noted that rankings tend to be very suggestive. Rick suggested that, if nothing has changed from the FY21 budget recommendations, the RAC maintain them for FY22. Dawn noted that the flood last year was a major change. Dawn expressed that the flood impacts make Water Injection Dredging (WID) even more relevant, noting a desire to see the downstream impacts of WID implementation as well. Sarah agreed and stated that she would move WID up in priority. Greg stated that he didn't have a problem adding something about flood damage, but that he was fine with keeping the three budget recommendations from FY22. The RAC decided to add examples for the BMP recommendation, but keep the rest the same as the FY21 recommendations. Brad moved to approve the recommendations. Dawn and Rick seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

- c. **Review of June 12th meeting notes:** The meeting notes were reviewed and approved as written.
- d. **Overview of KDWPT discussion:** Marlene gave a summary of a discussion with Ryan Stucky and Dustin Mengarelli that several RAC members participated in. The discussion focused on funding questions about ag leases on federal lands around reservoirs. Marlene explained that most of KDWPT's funding is fee-based, and that ag income is considered incidental – KDWPT doesn't consider it a reliable source of funding for budgeting purposes. Marlene explained that KDWPT relies on ag leases for increased manpower to manage land. KDWPT doesn't get a lot of rent, but they get benefits like prevention of weeds and undesirable vegetation from taking over. Marlene noted that 8% of storage was lost in Tuttle last year. Marlene noted that KDWPT is making a concerted effort to require cover crops on new ag leases. Marlene asked Dawn if she had any comments as another individual that attended the discussion. Dawn said that Marlene's summary captured the discussion well. Dawn mentioned that she asked Dustin what he would do to improve management, and Dustin stated that rivers are channelized, pushing water too fast into the wildlife areas, and causing up to 2-3' of sediment deposition in areas. Dawn shared that the KDWPT and KWO are working on setting up a field tour in September to look at BMPs and sedimentation impacts. Dawn noted that KDWPT is doing a lot of things that the RAC doesn't know about.

- e. **Overview of KDHE impaired waters call:** Marlene also provided a summary of a KDHE call in June about impaired waters. Marlene summarized the discussion regarding changes to the 303D list, as well as WRAPs and the source water protection program. Marlene noted that there are funds coming into the region from the State Revolving Fund (SRF) to purchase highboys that can be used to seed cover crops on standing corn, explaining that the technology provides the benefit of allowing cover crops to get planted earlier. Marlene stated that they would be used in the Tuttle Creek and Delaware watersheds. Marlene also described an “Understanding Ag” group that is working with companies (General Mills) and producers to create soil health academies. Marlene further detailed efforts to get local soil experts to talk to others in their region. Glenn mentioned that he had signed up to have some cover crops put in, and that the highboys Marlene mentioned would be used to complete the work.
- f. **Review and revision of Goals and Action Plans:** Dawn shifted the discussion to finalization of the Goals and Action Plans. Josh noted that he had left the suggested revisions tracked within the document. Josh mentioned that he noticed in reviewing the Goals and Action Plans that the terms “flood” and “drought” were largely absent. Josh questioned if, given the prevalence of those topics in RAC discussions, the RAC might want to incorporate the terminology more directly into the Goals. The RAC agreed and added the terms into Action Steps. Josh also mentioned that adding an Action related to work with surrounding states on sedimentation had been discussed at the previous RAC meeting, so he had incorporated a draft Action into one of the Goals. Greg commented that he had asked for a goal related to working with Nebraska, and that he thought it was good to have as an Action Step. The RAC went through all revisions for the original four Goals and was given the opportunity to suggest any additional revisions.

Dawn started discussion on the proposed goal, Priority Goal #4. Dawn thanked Brad for his work on the Goal and revisions he provided prior to the RAC meeting. Dawn questioned whether the KWO would provide the annual report on natural solutions included as an Action to the RAC or KWA. Brad suggested the RAC would be the primary group, but the KWA could see the report as well. Sarah asked what the KWO’s take was on the Goal, and noted that the second Action with project examples was really busy. Brad suggested making each set of examples its own bullet, and Josh updated the Goal accordingly. Josh noted that the Goal supports conversations that are already occurring on the topic in various programs (SRP, KRRFSS), and that it highlights an issue the RAC seems particularly passionate about. Based on this, Josh was generally supportive of the Goal and suggested that it had the potential to have a positive impact. Adding to that, Dawn noted there are additional funding sources for these types of projects, which increases the strength of the argument to the State in their favor. Dawn suggested it would be a powerful way to get more money into the state. Dawn also shared that Aaron Dieters mentioned that the KDWPT is starting a pilot study about beaver introduction and was supportive of the Goal. Dawn stressed that the benefits of natural solutions extend beyond just what the KWO and RAC are doing. Sarah stated that she was a strong supporter of the Goal and was looking for a read on the potential receptivity to the idea of natural solutions.

Referring back to Josh’s prior suggestion, Brad questioned if flood and drought were mentioned everywhere they needed to be. Dawn questioned if the RAC might want to add them to the HAB Goal. Earl suggested not including them there, as the Goal is more about water quality than water quantity. Marlene brought up the five watershed principles that the RAC intended to include as a preamble to the Goals. The group reviewed the five watershed principles, and Sarah asked if there was anything in them that could rub people the wrong way. Sarah noted that there had previously been some question about the

phrasing “prioritization based on science.” Earl commented that it could be taken offensively if it is indicating that other groups are not using science. Josh questioned what the RAC’s definition of science was, suggesting that it meant data-driven and supported research. After some discussion, the principle was reworded to “prioritization based on data.” The five watershed principles were added as a preamble to the Goals. Brad moved to approve the Goals and Action Plans with the agreed upon revisions. Marlene seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III) Agency or Public Comments

- a. Allyn Lockner referred to the Goals preamble and questioned if it needed to be tied to the Vision and State Water Plan, noting it was the RAC’s contribution to the Vision. Dawn replied that the purpose of updating the Goals is to update the Water Plan and Vision. Earl agreed, noting that the updates will hopefully get approved in January.
- b. Earl stated that the next KWA meeting was likely to happen the last week of July. Earl noted that it would be a virtual meeting, and that the August KWA meeting may be virtual as well.
- c. Dawn mentioned some to-dos for the group. Dawn noted that the Funding and Governance Subcommittee has been working on a proposal to generate funding and asked if they would be ready to present by August. Brad noted that he had been communicating with Burke Griggs to get feedback and wanted the subcommittee to meet first before presenting the material to the full RAC. Dawn also expressed a desire to select a date for the field day with KDWPT about sedimentation and conservation. Dawn suggested working on the project prioritization matrix as well, so it could be finalized at a future meeting. Based on the list of tasks, it was suggested the next RAC meeting occur in September. Referring to the Funding and Governance efforts, Brad noted that he was eager to get their proposal to the KWA, but that he wanted to go through the appropriate steps, starting with the subcommittee. Brad stated that they wouldn’t bring the proposal to the KWA until the RAC was fully supportive and voted on it. Sarah noted that the Funding and Governance Subcommittee wants to talk to experts and make sure the proposal can be taken seriously. Brad noted that Chair Owen encouraged the RAC to think outside the box, which includes considering how to take the approach in western Kansas and make it work in eastern Kansas.
- d. Dawn shared that the Friends of the Kaw are going to be embarking on July 17th on a nine-day paddle spanning the full 173-mile length of the Kansas River to raise awareness of the Kansas River Water Trail. Dawn noted that the group would be making stops in communities along the way.

IV) Upcoming Meetings:

- a. Next KWA meeting (July 30th, 9:00am, GoTo Meeting)
- b. Next Kansas RAC meeting (September Doodle poll)

V) **Adjourn:** Dawn adjourned the meeting with no further business at 3:30 pm.