



**MUD, CAMP, & SPRING CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
MEETING MINUTES**

**CITY OF ALTOONA, IOWA  
CITY HALL  
407 EIGHTH STREET SE, ALTOONA, IOWA**

**JULY 8, 2015  
1:00 PM**

*Attendees: Karen Oppelt, Mark Arentsen, Jennifer Welch, Madeline Sturms, Wayne Patterson, Teva Dawson, Rich Leopold, Bob Rice, Mike Ugolini, Sue Ugolini, Russell Wilkins, Kyle Ament, Mark Land, Amanda Oswald*

1. Welcome – Madeline Sturms, Vice Chair
2. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes
  - a. April 8, 2015

*Approval of minutes motion by Russell Wilkins, Second by Bob Rice, motion carries*

3. Corps of Engineers Partnering Status

*Mark Land:*

*- Correspondence with the Corps is an ongoing process and there is still the potential for a partnership.*

4. Watershed Management Plan

- a. First Stakeholder Group meeting, June 22, 2015

*Mark Land:*

*- At the first stakeholder meeting, the group was presented with goals and objectives developed in 2005 from the RAMP-UP for Green Infrastructure program and asked to evaluate and update each of them. The results were drafted into a Goals & Objectives document.*

- b. Draft Goals & Objectives document

*The WMA went through each goal and read through the objectives individually before coming back to the group for feedback.*

***Goal 1: Develop consistent policies for storm water and flood management, water quality improvement, and a well balanced mix of land uses.***

*Bob: Did anyone in the stakeholder group mention “model ordinance?”*

*Mark Land: The group used “consistent policy” wording, which is similar.*

*Teva: That would also fall under Objective 1.2, regarding comprehensive plans.*

**Goal 2: Increase community awareness, support, and involvement in the Watershed Plan and its implementation.**

*Bob: For Objective 2.5, I suggest having an event with Metro Waste Authority, where they could show what they have done in the watersheds in an open house meeting format.*

*Mark Land: This summer, we also plan to bring together agricultural based property owners for a meeting.*

*Bob: I suggest speaking to the Farm Bureau to get examples of existing practices and showcase what has been done and how they can help. Schools could also be a good place to showcase current practices, such as prairies.*

*Mark Land: A bus tour is a possible idea. This could provide a positive exchange/interaction between urban and rural property owners.*

*Bob: Some city residents get negative perceptions of the watershed from the news. We want to be able to show that people are doing something to help in the watersheds.*

**Goal 3: Maintain, preserve, and enhance natural resources character and function for habitat, recreation, and quality of life.**

*Teva: In Objective 3.5, the public transportation wording is confusing. We should emphasize utilizing recreational opportunities.*

*Jennifer: The original purpose of the goals was tailored towards green infrastructure. So the goals could be updated to better apply to this situation.*

*Teva: My suggestion is changing it to “Utilize recreational opportunities as a vehicle to promote conservation and greenway preservation throughout the watershed.”*

**Goal 4: Identify and address soil and water issues to improve flood management and water quality.**

*Bob: Do these goals go in order of priority? I think the first goal should be the issues and then the policies are developed second.*

*Madeline: Are we ensuring that we are utilizing previous work completed by other WMA's? We have the opportunity to be proactive, due to less development in the watershed and less need for retrofitting.*

*Bob: We should incorporate the lessons learned from the other WMA's.*

*Rich: Some of these goals are very specific. This document should stay broad and general because goals and objectives that are too specific can draw attention away from the desired purpose.*

*Bob: If the stakeholders agree, then why would we want to change it?*

*Jennifer: The stakeholders haven't seen all of the objectives. They just modified the goals.*

*Teva: I don't remember Objective 3.3 during the stakeholder meeting.*

*Rich: Are people assuming that the one acre lots are the problem?*

*Teva: Maybe we should park the idea in Objective 3.3 for future incorporation into Objective 1.2.*

*Jennifer: Originally, the objective was developed due to landowners developing on smaller lots and creating difficulty for future development.*

*Bob: If it is too specific, people are going to focus on a number before the plan is even developed yet.*

*Teva: The one acre lots aren't the problem. It sounds like land use is the larger problem.*

*Rich: Why do only one acre lots affect water? The landowners could have better land use practices than before.*

*Jennifer: It is difficult to develop farmland behind smaller lots and you are dealing with more landowners.*

*Bob: To educate landowners regarding land use practices, you would have to convince 17 of them, instead of one.*

*Teva: It sounds to me like it should be worded as "thoughtful consideration of land use planning."*

*Rich: I like that wording and it keeps it open ended to be able to specify later.*

*Jennifer: So does that mean that Objective 3.1 is too detailed?*

*Mike: I think the second sentence should be removed. I shouldn't be told to whom I can and cannot sell my land.*

*Rich: I don't want to set us up to lose before we start. Tougher conversations will happen later.*

*Bob: We have to do what we can to take the blinders off. We have a greater opportunity to do good things with this watershed, since it is less developed.*

*Jennifer: Does Objective 4.4 need to be reworded?*

*Teva: It should say something about using data driven decision making practices.*

*Mark noted he will make the discussed revisions and send out to the group for final review.*

a. MWA Reimbursable Environmental Grant Award

*Mark Land:*

*- MCSCWMA was awarded a \$2,500 reimbursable grant from Metro Waste Authority to be used for education and outreach. The application states the money will be used for mailings, advertising, educational handouts, and development of a website.*

*Bob: Polk County is the fiscal agent for the grant.*

*The group also had a discussion about possibly using the grant money for a policymaker tour of practices in the watershed.*

a. Planning schedule update

*Mark Land:*

*-Discussed the updated planning schedule.*

*Madeline: Is there a public meeting date set?*

*Bob: Are we having just one meeting or two meetings?*

*Mark Land: We originally scheduled having two meetings. One early in the process to get feedback and one later to present the information.*

*Teva: For public outreach, we could consider get elected officials out to the fields. We need something dedicated to policy makers, who should see firsthand what their policies would involve. Also, I was thinking about the website and wanted to discuss the*

*coordination/facilitation moving forward. We could house the website in the MPO website and integrate for future maintenance but it depends on how much work wants to be done.*

*Mark Land: It sounds like we are going to have two meetings; one with an elected officials tour and one with the public to present the plan. The stakeholder group will serve as the input in the process of developing the plan.*

*Rich: I think City Administrators, Supervisors, etc. would have interest in a community tour to see the issues in the watershed.*

*Bob: We could bring them out to Thomas Mitchell Park for a presentation but we don't want too many people there.*

*Mark Arentsen: The organizational information is good but we need to come up with projects. I hope this leads to dollars coming down the line for visible results of our efforts.*

*Teva: I think the elected officials idea is also a good way to engage people and get feedback.*

*Mark Land: We will work with Metro Waste Authority to get an elected official list for August. Also, some assessments of the watersheds have been done but there are more to do. Similar to Walnut Creek, we were going to fly a quad copter over parts of the watersheds to present at the public meetings. Do you know of any specific issues or problem areas that we should look at?*

*Rich: The issues are probably typical of most similar channels. There will be areas of erosion, cut banks, and other streambank issues.*

*Bob: We could look at subdivision areas, flooded areas, and work that Metro Waste Authority has completed. Are there any commercial areas near the creeks?*

*Russell: Runnells has flooded areas that could be looked at.*

*Jennifer: Thomas Mitchell Park would be a good place to fly to show what can be done and how it helps the watershed.*

*Mark: It sounds like we want to look at Runnells flooding, examples of work that has already been completed in the watershed, streambank erosion, and Metro Waste Authority work. We will also need to determine if we need to talk to landowners in some of these areas.*

*Madeline: Teva or Jennifer, do you need anything formal from us for the WMA council meetings?*

*Teva: Looking forward for the future of the WMA's, Jennifer and I met and are coordinating with both the MPO and Polk SWCD to support the WMA's. We propose the executive councils of the WMA's meet on a quarterly basis to discuss any items, such as grants or policies, which would be applicable in the watersheds and determine who would be best to pursue each item.*

## 5. Adjourn

*-Motion to adjourn by Bob Rice, second by Russell Wilkins, motion carries.*

*-Adjourn: 2:26PM*