

**KS Wetland and Aquatic Resources Plan Team Meeting
June 4, 2007**

Teleconference

Tim Christian, KAWS, opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. on the conference call and welcomed attendees. Attending were Christian, Doug Blex, and John Bond, KAWS; Deb Baker, KWO; Dan Zerr, KDHE; Ken Kuiper, NRCS; Paul Liechti, KBS; Frank Norman, AES; Rob Reschke, SCC; Eric Johnson, KDWP; John Silovsky, KDWP; Mike Rich, US FWS; Eliodora Chamberlain, EPA; and Patrick Trier, USACE.

Tim said he has a call into Travis Rome, NRCS, to find out more about the availability of their map layers and how this group might be able to use the data NRCS has available. He has not been successful in reaching Travis as of today, but will continue to try him.

Eliodora noted that the April 16 summary identified her to provide any definition for streams. EPA does not currently have a stream definition. She will provide the EPA wetland definition to Tim for distribution.

Tim asked for input relative to the three state plans - OK, TX, and MN - and what people liked/disliked about each.

Deb indicated she thought that the OK plan was the least robust and that TX was better, but she felt that MN had the best plan.

She noted the strengths:

Targeted local governments and developers

Incorporated the goals into the overall write-up

Provided detailed historical wetland information

Broke the state into regions

Strong glossary of terms

John liked the OK plan for the agency and organization responsibility descriptions.

He liked the MN plan for its extensive wetland classifications, wetland definitions, and that it broke out wetland acres by county.

It was noted that MN has done exhaustive mapping and that they have a stronger regulatory approach than perhaps other states.

As part of that discussion, John Silovsky volunteered to contact some people in Minnesota to see if they have updated their plan (since 1997), ask how the one-stop shop concept is working, and to see what research they are conducting.

It was noted that the TX plan lays out the state's priorities and noted how that was done. Eliodora said she could contact TX to see if they had updated

their plan and perhaps have someone call-in to give the Team a report on the work done in TX.

The group reviewed the eight or so pages of the KS Wetland and Riparian Area Plan that Tim had scanned. The group discussed the wetland and riparian area definitions (KS Water Plan) on page 5. Other definitions were discussed, too. The consensus is that we need two – one for the federal and jurisdictional area (to avoid any potential confusion) and one for the stewardship/broader use area.

Tim asked if others that worked on the original WRAP project had copies that each Team member could use. It was mentioned that Charlie Lee might have copies. Deb volunteered to make copies and provide to those who don't have them. Tim will provide her the mailing list.

Patrick and Eliodora discussed a new wetland definition that is being field tested in KS and the region right now. To help answer questions, Patrick invited Luke Cory to sit in and update the group on what is being done. Luke explained that he has used the criteria on one site and that the rain has kept him from being in the field. He noted that the new criteria appear to make the determinations more complicated. He said The Watershed Institute and several other firms are field-testing the criteria as well. He did not know how long it would be before the new criteria was modified or adopted. Ken Kuiper said NRCS soils staff might help explain some of the changes if that would be helpful.

Tim offered to draft an outline for the next meeting for review by the Team, but Deb suggested that it might be better if everyone reviewed and commented on the KS WRAP materials before the outline was started. The Team agreed, so Tim will simply begin an outline for the next session, but the main focus will be to review the WRAP. Eliodora asked what the outline would contain so Tim expanded - introduction, executive summary, historical background, current conditions – need for inventories, goals/objectives, regional concerns/strategies, wetlands programs/agencies, monitoring and evaluation, education and outreach, research needs, regulatory strategies, glossary of terms, and the like.

Deb noted that she thinks we should consider the role of land trusts in the new document since they have come on the scene in recent years and are doing easement work. This will be noted as the outline is developed.

Interim work (prior to the next meeting)

Tim - talk with NRCS about their inventory – ground truthing, scanning maps, etc. from their 1985 and 1992 farm bill wetland determinations.

Eliodora Chamberlain – provide EPA wetland definition, provide follow up on the Texas plan relative to progress, and if possible, to have a Texas representative call-in to discuss with the group.

Deb Baker – provide copies of the KS Wetland and Riparian Area Plan documents to the WARP Team for review prior to the July 9 meeting.

John Silovsky – will contact Minnesota to see if they have updated their plan, how their one-stop shop concept is working, and what research has/is being done.

The **next session** will be a teleconference on **July 9 at 1:00 p.m.** Tim will provide the conferencing numbers, passcode, etc. along with the agenda and other materials.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.