

Minutes of the InWMC Board Meeting

Held on May 20, 2015 at USGS Offices in Indianapolis, Indiana

Attendees:

Sara Peel
Tony Bailey
Dan Scott
Jeff Frey
Gretchen Quirk
Chi-Hua Huang
Joe Foy
Allan Henderson
Jody Arthur
Shawn Naylor
Jill Hoffman

Action Items:

- Contact the following key people to discuss the development of a white paper on lake and reservoir water quality; send example white paper (**Shawn Naylor**):
 - Cyndi Wagner
 - Tom Bruns
 - Bill Jones/Melissa Clark
- Send field day questionnaire to the Board to use when discussing field days with potential sponsors (**Jody Arthur**)
- Begin working with Bob Barr and Shannon Zezula to coordinate a fall field day at School Branch (**Jeff Frey, Tony Bailey and Shawn Naylor**)
- Contact the following key people to discuss possibility of holding a field day in the Lake Erie basin:
 - Greg Lake at NRCS (**Tony Bailey to contact**)
 - Bob Gillespie w/St. Joseph Watershed Initiative (**Jeff Frey or Jill Hoffman to contact**)
 - Someone from the City of Fort Wayne (**Jill Hoffman to contact**)
- Contact Lisa Bihl to inquire about alternatives to Wild Apricot and the costs associated with switching services (**Jill Hoffman**)
- Develop an executive summary of the optimization network paper for the InWMC website (**Shawn Naylor and Jeff Frey**)
- Develop an action plan of who to contact about the optimization network for the purposes of publicizing it and what to provide them (a nugget, the full document or a one-pager) (**Jill Hoffman**)
- Finalize the Communications Committee work plan and send to Shawn (**Jody Arthur**)
- Find out if Laura Esman will continue to be the contact for the water monitor inventory going forward (**Jody Arthur**)
- Check to see which board members are paid up (**Sara Peel**)
- Send current board list and candidate list to Sara Peel (**Jody Arthur**)
- Investigate the possibility of using Survey Monkey for holding the general election (**Jody Arthur and Sara Peel**)
- Review InWMC bylaws and present proposed revisions to the Board for review (**Jill Hoffman, Sara peel, Jody Arthur, Dave Scott**)
- Meetings held on third Wednesday of odd months; Next meeting on July 15, 12:30-2:30 p.m. at USGS offices, Indianapolis (**Board**)

Shawn Naylor called the meeting to order at 12:39 p.m.

Old Business

Shawn asked if there were any changes to the minutes from the last meeting. Jody verified that there were none. Minutes approved without motion.

Discussion re: formation of a technical advisory group to assist NRCS/Farm Bureau group

Shawn said the Nutrient Management Strategy will meet tomorrow morning. Justin Schneider is leading that effort with Mike Dunn (Indiana Soybean Alliance) and Jill Reinhart (NRCS). Shawn will be at this meeting to discuss w/Jill Reinhart and Justin Schneider how InWMC can assist with their efforts.

Communication with Jane Frankenberger re: Mounds Reservoir white paper proposal

Jane had proposed to do a white paper on this topic. Due to the political sensitivity, it was decided in the last meeting that we weren't going to take up the issue. Jane sent an email pressing the issue further. Shawn responded recommending that Jane instead develop a white paper. He suggested that we bring others who are lake and reservoirs experts together to work on an issues page. Jane has not gotten back to Shawn on this.

Jill thinks a white paper will be great for that topic but that it should be more general about reservoir water quality and management. She said she recently attended a special meeting of the city council in Anderson and there's still a lot of controversy around this issue. Jeff said this will now be a big focus at the June meeting of the IWRA.

Shawn asked for suggestions on who might work on the white paper: Cyndi Wagner, who specializes in harmful algal blooms (HABs) and Tom Bruns, a drinking water expert were suggested. Jill added that Bill Jones would be a great addition and Melissa Clark.

Shawn will reach out to these folks with a sample white paper to gauge interest. Jill said she would be happy to review a draft white paper if one is developed.

Update on discussions re: watershed/regional water quality monitoring for mayor's group

Jill said they will be meeting tomorrow. Jill is presenting a draft of presentation that they plan to take around to cities and town councils. S. Charbonneau and others are moving some efforts forward in the legislature. So, they're watching those. She said she still needs to follow-up on some recommendations; they have a second version of their white paper in their hands now. If they vote to approve it, Jill will start her road show presentations.

One of items that they want to move forward is to get a better inventory of available water monitoring data and how they can use it to move their efforts along. Jill said there are some datasets out there that are not a part of what we've inventoried in our Optimization Network. These may not be data we can use, but we should keep an eye on this effort to see if it makes sense to bring these data into our network in the future.

Jill said this effort has been very interesting. They've gotten maps and have been talking about a lot of the same things the Council has been talking about such as data gaps but they've also been looking at aquifer maps. They've been discussing what a good regional planning entity would look like in terms of composition and technical expertise. She is going to encourage them to reach out into surrounding counties and cities including Muncie and Anderson and all the way down to Columbus based on the information they have in their maps.

Jill said this group will probably soon want to begin moving forward on some of the easier

recommendations in the report. One that is particularly relevant to the Council includes trying to figure out how we get a lot of the data that they are collecting. One of the next steps is another inventory of other data sets out there, collection methods and how they might be able to fit those data in (e.g. tightening up comparability for greater data sharing). She hopes this is one of the things she hopes they will advance – better sharing, better coordination and transparency.

Jill will be suggesting a larger region over which they should engage which will present some challenges. Jill said it's cool that central Indiana is having some public officials discussing water quality and quantity at the regional level. It helps to put a spotlight on coordination across boundaries.

Jeff said a big part of this was water quantity issue. Jill said it started that way but now included water quality, which is an economic issue as well. Getting millennials to want to live in your community includes quality of life issues like being able to recreate on your local waters.

Update on 2015 Symposium and Field Day event planning

Symposium topics were discussed at the last board meeting. Further discussion tabled until the General Membership meeting.

For Field Days, School Branch is a possibility for early fall. Jeff said that would be a good one because all the edge-of-field monitoring equipment is in now. So, there will be a lot to see. Plus, we'll have the data collected throughout the summer.

Jeff, Tony, Shannon, and Shawn will work together to coordinate a field day to show highlights and discuss big picture. Shawn said we'll want to coordinate with Bob Barr, too. Jody suggested they might need to have a morning and afternoon event based on the likely high level of interest.

Jeff suggested all the work going on in the Lake Erie basin - might provide a regional field day. Tony suggested perhaps piggybacking onto some of the other things that are going on up there right now. Jeff said he could help with this effort and suggested that Greg Lake (NRCS) might be a good contact. Bob Gillespie (St. Joseph Watershed Initiative) would be another. Jill said she can also reach out to the City of Fort Wayne.

Jody reminded the board of the questionnaire developed to facilitate field day planning. She'll send the questionnaire to the Board to use when discussing field days with potential sponsors.

Strategic Plan Progress and Committee Updates

Status on the development of a Board work plan

Shawn said he is still waiting for a work plan for the Ground Water Focus Committee and asked about one for the Collaboration and Coordination [a.k.a. Optimization] Committee. Jeff said they have one.

Shawn wants to finalize the strategic plan in time to present it at the GM meeting. Shawn will send out a final draft to the board in early June for one last review before presenting.

Ground Water Focus Committee Update

Shawn said they are working on real time soil moisture network and developing a web site to show where monitoring is occurring and to identify gaps. The link to this site will go under projects on the InWMC web page. Ginger Korinek is working with IDNR on a Google map

that will show all the information spatially. Shawn said he expects this to be done in the couple of months.

Gretchen has been discussing the issue of arsenic in ground water w/Ginger and is working on gathering the data for Marion County to give to Gretchen and Sally for further analysis. Gretchen is working with GIS staff to map hotspots. Map should be done in the next month or so. She will be happy to present it at a future meeting.

Jill asked if there is a place to get water well tested. Gretchen said they do it for residents in Marion County for free. Otherwise you can take a sample to ISDH but there may be a cost. Not all counties provide this service.

Network Optimization Committee

Jeff says they're making good headway. Final list of 322 sites. They've added about four new sites. Jeremy Webber will update maps and make a couple of new figures. Jeff is hoping to have that done by end of month. Jeff Thomas from ORSANCO is going to re-run the land use with the final list. ETA next two weeks. So close...

Jeff said that Aubrey Bunch and Gretchen have been a huge help.

Jeff said they have added some additional suggestions on things we'd like to see on a state level. Would like to get feedback from the board for additional suggestions regarding other things we'd like to see. This will be the last part of the paper.

Jill provided more information about what the mayors are doing. She said the mayors group has its own white paper that identifies things they would like to do but it also includes things they'd like the state to do. Hopefully, it will include some of the same/similar things we would like to see. Jill has tried to inform that effort with the things she knows we're looking for. She added it's good to compare all lists and to have another board pushing the same things.

The mayors know that the state needs to step up and do some things. So, they'll be pretty active over the summer session and into the next legislative session. Their strategy is to lead by example, working on the things they need to do and pushing the state to do more. This is their response to some of the mayors wanting to create this outside entity to manage water. The mayors don't want a top-down directive. So, they're trying to get ahead of that.

Shawn thanked Jeff for spearheading this document. It's a very significant piece of work and very well timed for the state. This work will help to show that the monitoring community and the InWMC are very proactive.

Jill asked about how we might market it. Jody said we need to be very intentional about how we market this piece in order to get the most benefit for the council. We have a lot of tools at our disposal from a communications standpoint. Shawn suggested an executive summary page to go under the projects with a link to the document. Shawn will work with Jeff to develop this.

Jill suggested several touch points (social media, our newsletter and those of other organizations, etc.) and said we should develop an action plan of who to contact and what to provide them (a nugget, the full document or a one-pager). She said she'd write something up to get us started a contact list.

Jeff said another thing to follow up with is that they've been requested to do the same thing with the stream gage network, to optimize that for different uses. USGS will do this internally. This was suggested by the Silver Jackets. We now put this together with the monitoring information.

Communications Committee

Jody said the committee covered a lot of ground at its last meeting. Went through their draft work plan. She will finalize this and send it over to Shawn when complete.

Jody said the committee now consists of herself, Ashlee Haviland, Greg Bright, and Matt Worland.

Spent most of the meeting getting organized and going through the tasks. She said the most important thing they accomplished is that they have established points of contact on the committee for different communications related requests. The committee is still trying to figure out where to put this information so that people can see it and use it but she will send it to the board in the meantime so they know who to contact for what.

She said they have a good plan that will be easy to follow. The committee will probably be meeting once a month in the short term because there is a lot of work to do to update the website. They are inventorying content on the site to see what needs to be updated and asked for the board to send her an email any outdated information they find on the website.

Ashlee is working on the newsletter. She'd like to get it out in the first week or two of June. Shawn asked if she was interested in any specific topics. Jody recalled that Ashlee told her it was hard to get enough content at any given time to do a topical newsletter. Shawn suggested a summer water issues. He said he and Greg are almost done with the fish consumption paper, which could be summarized for the newsletter. He also suggested beach closures and possibly HABs. We have plenty of experts we could consult for these topics.

Jody said that the committee plans to send out regular solicitations for newsletter content so that we don't run short on content. Ashlee and Greg work together on the social media.

The committee is still without a chair. Jeff volunteered Matt and said he'll work to get the Communications Committee work into Matt's work profile to provide longevity. Jody plans to try to recruit a couple more committee members to make the work easier to manage.

Jeff asked if we've had a chance to look at the issues pages to see about how to organize them. Jeff mentioned a program called Research Gate where you can sign up to get notifications about new research. He said this might be a good way to keep track of Indiana-specific research.

Jody said Greg has contact 17 university professors about how to engage more students in our organization and has gotten five responses so far.

Jody told the board that the Purdue has secured funding for the Water Monitoring Inventory. IDEM will not now bring that in-house as planned. She said there are a couple of related things that aren't included in the new funding that might still come to IDEM. Jody doesn't know if Laura Esman will continue to be the contact but will find out.

Board Elections

Shawn said we need to vote on how to finalize the ballot and asked Jody to summarize the issue.

Jody said that we have more candidates than we have positions in some categories, which will result in some competition. She said competition in an election is not a problem per se. But, this is the first time we've had this situation. Jody said we have two extra in federal agencies, two extra in academia, and one extra in consultants/industry. So, we have five extra candidates and

only two At-Large positions. In the past, we've always just used the At-Large positions like wild cards, adding any extra candidates from one category into the At-Large category. But we can't do that here because we have more candidates than At-large positions.

Jody said several suggestions were made in the email discussion about how to handle this, including:

1. Increasing the size of the board to accommodate the extra candidates;
2. Tallying up the GM votes and put the runners up into the At-Large positions;
3. Have the board vote on how to fill the At-Large positions from the candidates that did not win in their categories.

Jody said that once we figure this out, we need to change the bylaws and have them voted on by the GM, which makes this a pretty high priority for the board if we want to have our elections at the GM meeting in June. She said if that's the case, the first option is out because changing the size of the board would require a change in bylaws which would have to be voted on by the GM. If we're not worried about having the elections at our GM meeting, then we can consider all options. She said this would also give us an opportunity to discuss this issue with the GM if we want.

Jody said that competition for board positions is a good problem to have and that increasing the size of the board to avoid it isn't a practical solution in the long term. She added that losing an election doesn't have to disenfranchise a member or an organization. We have many ways to participate in the council.

Dave Scott asked if the term is the same regardless of position. Jody said yes.

Jill agreed that we should not increase the size of the board just to risk offending someone. As an organization, we decided the structure of the board based on our needs and mission. She added that we need to be careful not to implement changes in our election process prior to having them approved by the GM (bylaws).

Jill said that we have to be careful to make sure we are functioning with in the bylaws, We have to amend them if we're going to take on any of these options so that we can proceed in keeping with the bylaws. If we're going to have elections before any bylaws changes, then we need to follow what they say.

Jody said the bylaws don't speak to this issue adding that we can't hold the election now until we decide on one of these approaches or another and then get approval from the GM.

Jill said the discussion right now should be how we want to handle our At-Large positions. She said these positions are typically used in a strategic way. She said on most boards, these positions are for someone you might want to have on the board for strategic reasons but don't have a spot for them. You can use the At-Large position you can move them into. She said the At-Large position shouldn't be a runner up slot. We need to have a clear procedure for filling these positions. If there is more than one person in a given category and they want to run in the At-large category that might be acceptable, too. We just need to think more about how we want those At-Large positions to work. Do we want them to be runners up or do we want them to be their own category that people run within because we've encouraged them to be there.

Shawn said that these were originally slated to be legislators. We changed them because we didn't have the inertia. He suggested that maybe at this point we might want to change this category to public policy makers to allow for

Jill said that At-Large positions are nice to give yourself the flexibility to add people with specialized skills or something else to offer, someone we want to invite to serve on the board.

She gave some examples. It's a tool that helps bring people on regardless of category. She thinks we should do it in this way, for people to specifically run in the At-Large position.

Dave said this is what his experience has been with the boards on which he has served, that At-Large positions are filled strategically by the board.

Jody asked how we would do this in this case because we didn't proactively go and seek certain people to fill a niche on the board. She said unless you do this, you're going to end up with vacant positions.

Sara said you can look at who you have in those extra positions and decide who you really want to have on the board. If someone has something we want we could put them in an uncontested election to make sure they're elected again.

Jody asked in how this is different in principle from having the board vote to appoint the At-large positions.

Sara said it isn't other than it's targeted. She said in the past our board has appointed people to fill open positions. So, we should probably continue to do that.

Jeff said this is a good problem, and it changes year to year, what categories we might have difficulty in filling. So, the At-Large position is a good option to have. He asked if we vote on an option today, can we put it out there to the GM with the ballot so we don't prolong this?

Jody said any decision we make today will have to be put before the GM. So, we probably ought to make the decision today.

Shawn said he isn't convinced that the elections don't have to be held immediately and we don't necessarily have to put the bylaws and the ballot out at the same time. He suggested we try to resolve this issue by the GM meeting and try to hold the general election within the next month.

Jill said one option is to look to see if there is anyone in the contested positions that we want for strategic reasons and then ask them to run in the At-Large category. Another option is to leave the At-Large vacancies, let the election happen and then look at what we need and make the appointments to the At-Large positions until our next election.

Jody said our bylaws say nothing about appointments and that she likes the second option. Jill said this might be in the article on how we handle vacancies. Jody read the article to the board and Jill confirmed that this gives us the ability to implement the second option (to appoint). The appointment is a board decision. The board can appoint based on any rationale it chooses.

Jody observed that since we don't need a bylaws change to implement this option we could probably hold the election any time. Sara said the sooner we hold the elections the better. We've already asked people to serve and now they've been in hiatus.

Jody said she can send it out tomorrow if the board decides to do that.

Shawn asked if the ballot is finalized. Jody said there is still some question about Mark Howell. She has confirmed his candidacy but wasn't sure if he was replacing Greg Bright in the Consulting/Industry category or running alongside him.

Sara said Greg had said he was fine for running for one more term.

Sara suggested we hold the election a couple of weeks before the GM meeting, with the board

voting via email on the appointments to the At-Large positions.

Jody said that if the ballot is acceptable to everyone, she can draft an email for the GM election before the end of the week. She'd like to find a way to automate that and is considering Survey Monkey. Sara said survey Monkey might work because GMs are the only members that can vote, and that's a much smaller set of our database.

Jeff said that we could send it to everyone, General and affiliate members as a way to get the affiliates to join as General Members. If they want to have a vote, they have to upgrade their membership.

Sara will check to see which board members are paid up and will help Jody to set up the elections if needed. Jody to send current board list and candidate list to Sara.

Tony Bailey asked if membership is based on the individual or the organization. Who is being elected? If we're having an election, who are they voting for, the agency, the representative, or designee? And then which of those can and can't vote, if you're going to say everyone who votes has to pay?

Jody said that if you're representing an organization, you're voting for that organization because that's how we built the board. And if you're voting and attending for that organization, you have to be a paying member. This is because we don't distinguish that in our payment categories. Everyone registers as individual members and then pays their dues. She said her opinion on that is that it's incumbent upon the agencies or organizations to make sure their representatives' dues are paid so that they have a vote. She said right now, we don't have a way parse out in the database whether one is paying as an individual or an organization. She added that at \$10, she doesn't think that's a big burden. Jody said some members pay through their organizations and others don't.

Jill said that there are a lot of complexities here and that we may need to have a discussion offline. She's hoping it's clear in the bylaws. Jody said it isn't, and that the question of how membership is defined, whether by individual or organization, has come up a number of times over the years and has never been resolved.

Jill said it wouldn't be fair for one person from an organization to pay and then several people from that organization vote endless times for their candidate.

Jeff said this isn't how it works, that an organization would get one vote. Jill said that if we're not sure if the person is the member or the organization is a member, this is an issue. Jody said the question keeps coming up so it would be beneficial to get this figured out. Dave volunteered to review the bylaws. He said some of these things really need to be tightened up. You can't go by the feelings of the group. You need to go by the bylaws. Jody, Jill and Sara to participate in the conversation in a bylaws review group.

General Membership Meeting Planning

Shawn said he'd like to use the GM meeting to come up with a topic for the fall symposium.

Jill mentioned possible topics for next year might be changes in Hoosier Riverwatch and addition of well reporting; she said the whole idea of water and public health would be a great idea for a symposium. She mentioned fish consumption, HABs, waterborne diseases, CSO outfalls and associated risks – A lot to choose from. Jeff suggested we could partner w/IKE

Shawn is a fan of broad topics because it brings in a more diverse group of people.

Tony suggested climate change and water. Jill said this would be a good one, too. Managing water across changing climate has so many facts to it.

Tony asked if there was any possibility to piggyback with other event, to partner with another organization with similar interests. This might get people together who normally don't talk. Jill said there can be some potential benefits to this as well as some pitfalls if you're trying to meet too many peoples' missions. Maybe, though. Tony said he's seen these done as two-day things where everyone is together the first day and then each group has its own separate meeting the following day.

Potential Topics

- Low head dams
- Water and public health
- Climate change

Agenda for General Member meeting:

- Overview
- Presentation of the Strategic Plan
- Discussion of symposium topics
- Rough details for fall field day/trip
- Bylaws (voting on revisions any approved by the board)
- Election Results

Jill asked if we have something to make it more interesting than just conducting business. Shawn said you have to find a balance – the council needs a business meeting each year to get everyone up to speed on the workings of the council.

New Business

Jody said Wild Apricot will soon be raising prices on its service and explained the new pricing structure and costs. No decision needs to be made at this time. Jill said her group recently changed to another membership service. She said she would ask Lisa Bihl about alternatives to Wild Apricot and the costs associated with switching services.

Wrap-up/Next Steps

Treasurer's Report:

Balance as of May 8, 2015	\$1,165.08
Income (Dues)	\$30.00
Expenses (PayPal fees)	<u>(\$1.77)</u>
Total	\$1,193.31

Meetings held on third Wednesday of odd months; **Next meeting on July 15, 12:30-2:30 p.m.**

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.