

State Soil Conservation Board Meeting
September 16, 2015
Farm Bureau Building
225 S. East St.
Indianapolis, IN

Members in Attendance:

Scott Ham
Bob Eddleman
Nola Gentry
Ray Chattin
Robert Woodling
Warren Baird
Larry Clemons

Others in Attendance:

Jordan Seger, ISDA
George Reger, ISDA,
Deb Fairhurst, ISDA
Leah Harmon, ISDA
Jennifer Thum, ISDA
Tara Wesseler-Henry, ISDA
Jane Hardisty, NRCS
Rob Orebaugh, Delaware SWCD
Greg Lake, Allen SWCD
Cress Hizer, IASWCD
Ashley Hammac, CCSI

Laura Fribley, ISDA
Julie Harrold, ISDA
Jennifer Boyle Warner, IASWCD
Meg Leader, ISDA
Trevor Laureys, ISDA
Walt Sell, Purdue Extension
Robert Lawson, NRCS
Paula Baldwin, IASWCD
Donovan Wilczynski, INDOT
Terry Ault, Jackson SWCD

I. Meeting Called to Order : 9:34AM

II. Approve Minutes of July 2015

Mrs. Gentry moved to approve minutes as presented, Mr. Baird seconded the motion
All in favor, motion passed.

III. Clean Water Indiana

a. Clean Water Indiana Grants – Leah Harmon

Applications are due Oct 1, a lot of interest in them and hosted several workshop for new applications due to recent flooding the board decided to allow for early plantings of cover crops with CWI, a scope modification would be needed to do this, no SWCDs have done this.

- Training funds, we did receive a few applications with them and select the recipients with those after attendance has been confirmed. Leah and JT are working on the AFR and incorporated feedback that we have received from districts.
- Jane questioned about the Cover Crops, were there any districts that requested the change to their CWI? Jane stated that by the time NRCS got their information out about their preventative acre program, the traditional EQIP applications were going out already and NRCS still has a backlog of people that want to help. Jordan stated that we accepted changes, but by that point the farmers were already rolling.

- ❖ Scott- we do have a few additions that we need to add to the agenda, one is listed, Jasper.

a. Jasper County- Dan Perkins

They do have a small modification that they have asked for. Dan Perkins is on the phone as a guest. Newton, Porter, Benton and Jasper, change to high clearance seeder. All the counties are in agreement to this. This is their second year with their CWI grant, which to implement a program that educates, incentivizes, and documents the use of a high clearance seeder (HCS) to seed cover crops (cc) in NW Indiana. The purpose of the grant was to give an incentive to a local person to get a rig configured. They have one but he is not really a local one yet.

Scott wants to get the practices on the ground.

Larry Clemons- making sure if we convert the equipment with grower, will they make a commitment to service other growers.

Dan- the farmer would do conversion to do his own and then help their neighbor, but they don't want them to make too much money off of, but it's innovative, so it's a good use of grant funds and to show that this is a viable program.

Warren- want a contract with whoever gets the fund that they would provide so much funds to the district.

Dan- agreed with this.

Nola – the length of time, you might want to say that some many work days a season to make it available.

Dan – agreed with that, they could not just offer one work day.

Larry – if we do this with CWI funds can we do this and there is an allotment for equipment basis and its case by case basis. If they have a local retailer they could work with that retailer too.

Bob - more logical for a commercial operation because they will have the time to get more acres devoted to planting of the seed and things that is the logical way.

Mrs. Gentry moved to approve the request and Mr. Ray Chattin seconded the motion
Majority in favor, Warren opposed. Motion carried.

Scott- We need to follow up with Geneva on this to make sure they follow the order.

- b. Jennings County SWCD** – Tara Wessler-Henry presented their modification proposal
New CWI modification came to the board late. Jennings, Jackson, Scott and Jefferson Counties want a modification to their CWI grant. We received it yesterday morning. Scott read the letter out loud to the board and public.

Tara gave a report they want to change in the filter strip, putting in pollinator habitat, they also want to add another incentive, and they will still meet NRCS spec. they are getting a lot of interest from SWCD on pollinator habitats.

Warren – what is the difference between this and the NRCS programs? Warren cannot see offering money for a program that NRCS already does allow for.

Jane- we have a program, but the additional habitat planting it's just not included in a standalone practice, this would be a different because this proposal is a standalone practice and they want to plant the mixture in the practices.

Ray- the addition of the pollinators will make this more appealing to the landowners. You will get the added benefit of the pollinators. These would be an established filter strip with NRCS EQIP, so then with the CWI funds you can add the new pollinator habitat with the CWI funds, but you could not do this with the EQIP funds.

Larry how would they use the \$56,000, how much per acre are they looking at.

Tara- does not think they have worked this out. In their current scope they have \$100.00 an acre for incentive for planting and max of \$5000.00 per landowner.

Jordan – Tara can follow up with any questions to get a response from them.

Nola – only change is to add the pollinators as a cover crops practice. That is not a change.

Laura – question the SSCB will show preference to items that are not offered through another program.

Ray – is this a spring planting or do they need an answer now.

Jane stated that they need to follow NRCS pollinator packets and packages the districts need to be careful when they are getting the packets, to make sure that they are not getting invasive in the packets.

Tara- they are looking at Oct. 1st, and there is some leeway, but normally it's Sept 15th. Looking at new filter strips and inter-seeding pollinator habitat and existing.

Bob - all in favor for this. We have not seen a single honey bee and normally found them, we need to do something to help them out.

Bob moved to approve the concept allow extra planting with pollinator habitat include NRCS specs as far as the seeding mix, even though it won't go into effect until next spring. Nola seconded this motion. Majority in Favor, Warren Opposed. Motion Carries.

Tara will follow up with them and the grants committee.

Jane – there is an active statewide board that pulled together the partners and looking at state wide pollinator effort that since this district and other show interest, maybe next year we could support districts to step up and take on a statewide project to work with group on pollinators, this is something that every district might be interested in and maybe we can tweak the grant next year.

Bob- can we quickly notify those that are working on pollinator habitats seeding as part of CWI grants is something they should think about as long as they understand that they are meeting the water quality objective.

Jane - doing filter under NRCS program and add pollinator later it's not included in the filter spec. That is another practice; they are just adding a pollinator seed mix to the existing filter strip seed mix.

Warren- Jennings application follow NRCS filter strip spec and wants to add pollinator to this project, addition. We just need to let districts know that we are going to follow the specification for filter strips and pollinator specs for the program. If a farmer comes in and has a CRP contract, that got approved for that year for filter strip and if they want to add a practice to the contract,

they cannot do that. If you want to do both together, they have to come back and do a whole new contract.

Jane -If they want to add pollinator planting and it's funded through CWI or on their own, they can do that, because it does not affect the practice or contract. You cannot just add a practice because they have already gone through the ranking sheet. We will need to add guidelines to them.

Ray – wants to see what the seeding mix is because of the invasive species and he cannot condone any of it.

Tara- it is what NRCS Specs, we need to make sure that any new CWI grants mention that we don't have sees spec with invasive species.

Warren – wants to see something more firm and make sure we have the quality that we want.

Rob- concern with clean water and pollinators don't have anything to do with that maybe another NRCS practice could help with the water.

Jane- your program can touch landowners that won't get into CRP, so CWI is a way to help these guys if they did not want to get into the program or qualify.

c. **2013 Allen County SWCD – 2013 CWI Modification** – presented by Jennifer Thum

Jennifer gave a brief history of the project. The original grant was to hire a conservationist professional to help the district spent \$600,000 in cost-share dollars throughout the St. Marys, Upper Maumee and St. Joseph watersheds. Jennifer stated that the cost-share dollars were spent quickly after their CWI grant was approved and the Tri-State Watershed Alliance, which was to be created with the CWI funds, received a ton of extra funds from other sources. As a result of these two things, their CWI account has over 89% of the funds still available.

Greg Lake, Allen County SWCD director went on to talk about the project and their request for modification. They would like to take funds from the technical assistance line item and use those funds to create a cost-share program for cover crops and for guys to use those funds for prevent acres. The NE was hit hard with rain and the guys up there are in need of something. Jennifer mentioned that there was an audit in 2014 and we had a discussion about the funds too.

Jennifer asked if Greg had spoken to the other counties about this proposal and Greg stated that he had. Greg went on to say that they was a staffing change in Wells County and that is why there has been some confusion with that office on their CWI grant.

The board stated that they felt this was a good idea and that they were happy to see that the request was to remove money from the technical/professional line item and place into cost-share rather than vice versa.

Mr. Eddleman made a motion to approve Allen County CWI modification form and Mr. Clemons seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

B Clean Water Indiana Budget Update

Jordan referenced the blue pie chart sheet – whole allotment of cigarette tax.

The orange sliver – 4.22% is the other pie chart that goes into the cigarette tax fund. 1/6 of that goes to CWI and that is the fund that the board has the discussion over and another 1/6 of that is cut

some goes to DNR, which goes to infrastructure and the purple is the Division of Soil Conservation funds.

Jordan then talked about the Quarterly Allotment Schedule.

When we were prepping for 2016, we submitted the past funds to mirror the first. The top is the DEPT of AG, and the SSCB board has no oversight for that. The division of soil conservation, we are own entity, if you drop down to the soils conservation division, that represents the purple portion in the pie chart. One piece in this comes from state agency then it goes to LG family of business to break it down with points system. This can move money down the list, but you cannot go up the list, The division budget, that goes to Jordan and the accountants to look at.

Point 1 salary

Point 2- IT

Point 3 – Services and Fees (computer software, basic supplies)

Point 4 – Gas, maintenance and other equipment. Gas, tires. That includes a small portion for DSS gas.

Point 9 – travel, training, postage and retiree cost.

Total \$1.9 that is before reserve. That can be adjusted as revenue comes in or leaves. All agencies are to hold a 3% reserve that gets us down to \$1.360.

With that moved to the second hand out – Soil and Lake Enhancement from Accountant.

Personal is eighteen people

External – retiree benefits, health benefits for the 18 people.

Supplies – trucks, supplies

Administration – as internal service funds go to accountant, state HR people, other agencies taking money from our budget.

Total – after 3% of reserve. State Budget has okayed this account as non-reverting funds so we can carry over \$27,129 on that. We are not going to build this account up, it's great to have a little wiggle room, this goes through the division budget.

Jordan moved to Quarterly Allotment Schedule.

Point 1 - salary

Point 2 – Telecom

Point 3 – FY 15

Point 4 – gas/maintenance for DSS

Point 7 – grants and competitive and AFR 10,000

Point 9 – DSS travel, SWCD surety bonds. And SWCD training reimbursement grants.

Less funds in 2016. The blue chart is just statutory amount; IASWCD has \$1 million appropriations that supplements the red sliver.

Jordan move to the Table “Clean Water Indiana”

LG accountant that take the table from State Budget and break it down further,

- Personal services, DSS salaries, Pays for 10 CREP RS, part of the CREP program manager; we still have funds left over which goes to the grant piece.

- External Services – CREP
 - Supplies and Materials and Parts – Tires, gas for DSS vehicles only
 - Grants – competitive grants, AFRs, commitment, CCSI
 - Administration – \$30,000 in training budget, retirement people,
 - ISF – internal service fund – are off the top fees. Fleet card take a cut, Etc.
- FY 15 carry over, CWI is too a non-reverting fund. We have a carry over.

Scott -What is our CWI balance?–

Jordan – we should be at \$1.14 million last year and we should be looking at around the same amount. We will also have \$25,000 coming out for CCSI, but \$1.2 million for the competitive grants.

Larry – Are we spending all of the CREP funds?

Julie - we are spending a larger majority this year, especially in the wetlands. Julie did not know the balance at this time, but they are making another change to get more of that money spent.

Larry wanted to know if we can move the extra funds to fund more CREP money,

Jordan – we cannot do this, if we had more expenses in CREP, we would tell them to wait until next year.

Julie – thinks we will continue to spend that money.

Soil Conservation Lake Enhancement – it falls in the purple and it can be confusing.

This is not associated with LARE, the green piece does not go to LARE anymore, and it supplements the DNR budget and goes to parks.

Jennifer Boyle Warner – Can the CWI budget be cleaned up and presented to districts to show that the IASWCD understands that it comes from cigarette tax and they want to understand the CWI funds.

Scott – he has gotten a lot of questions about CWI funds and people think it can be used for all sorts of items. They don't realize that the division has a separate fund outside the CWI fund.

We need to have a grants committee meeting, and we need to leave a buffer for the 3% and they maybe do a second round of CWI.

Cress Hizer with IASWCD discussed the cigarette tax budget with the SSCB.

Mr. Baird moved to approve the budget allotment and Mr. Clemons seconded it.

All in favor, no oppose, motion carried.

❖ Break 11:10am called back to order at 11:20am

d. Supervisor Recruitment Letter

Laura Fribley discussed the draft supervisor recruitment memo that she put together. The idea behind the letter is help the district staff and current supervisors out with all the requirements.

This would be an election checklist to help the SWCD go over the elections properly. The SSCB like the letter and thanked Laura for putting it together.

Mrs. Gentry moved to send the letter out to the districts about the supervisor recruitment and Mr. Eddleman seconded it. All in favor, motion carried.

IV. State Soil Conservation Board Business

A. SSCB Chairperson Report Scott Ham

Scott presented his resignation letter from Scott Ham, effective Jan. 15th 2016. This would allow for reappointment of the officers and new chairperson. The board can elect him to stay on as chairperson till that time. Ray is vice- chair, Scott has been mentored by past chairs, and he feels that Ray needs to look at his time to stew on the board. We talked about it, and have a few meetings and time to look at it. A succession plan needs to be looked at. He would look for another person from the Southern Region of the State.

B. SSCB Business Plan

Scott- we are not prepared to talk about the business plan at this moment. We will work towards the plan as draft and look at the OCT meeting to make it final. This is what we will work on.

C. \$10,000 Delaware Match – SWCD/CWI

Jennifer Boyle Warner gave a history of the meeting. A resolution was submitted by Delaware in 2014 to remove the government match rule for the \$10,000 in the CWI language. Delaware submitted it and it passed so it's a resolution. IASWCD was asked to hold off to see if we can get guidelines from the SSCB before we have to open up code, so Delaware came to the SSCB in spring and the Delaware submitted letter to receive \$10,000 to the SSCB and showed their match. The discussion that took place was that this was a onetime exception made to Delaware and did the SSCB did not want to set a precedent. Jennifer went to the IASWCD board and they were not satisfied, we then met with Delaware County with the supervisors and commissioners and talked about what is going on and they are not a district that is not trying, the county is struggling. They could not convince their Commissioners to give them the needed funds. Jennifer went back to Delaware, and the SSCB gave one time money and Jennifer needs guidance now to see if districts can ask them for a match when it does not follow under the no government and if not then they will need to open up code. This was not a one-time accordance for the money; Jennifer is asking to see if we can work together for them to approach the SSCB or for her to open up code.

The code – states that the \$10,000 is from a local municipal government.

Scott – is there any looking at if there is group or foundation that could provide that \$10,000. But they are still getting money from foundations or colleges, etc.

Nola –does not really like the idea about changing code, that this is going to give the County an excuse that they won't have to support the districts anymore because they can find their money elsewhere.

Paula – this was her reaction, we are going to give an out to the county's' But if we remind them that the \$10,000 or more provides them with control of the SWCDs and employees they can help make judgments of what that district does. They continue to provide infrastructure and other support for their count residents. That is one thing to counter that argument; hardly any County

wants to give up control of anything. We need to bring that money to the table. Plus most of the match goes to salaries.

Delaware Supervisor Rob Orebaugh- they see the benefit of what the district does without their input and requirements because of the local foundation does, and how long are they going to support them they don't know. On the southern edge of rain surge, the NE did not get planted so they wrote a rapid grant from cost-share funds for \$5,000 acres for cover crops, so they have over 500 acres in cover crops, it's amazing how quickly the foundation turned around their grant application, it only took three days. If we can get the match from the foundation that would allow them an opportunity to get the additional funds that would help their district.

What if the money comes from Corn and Soybean, like a company, Supervisors understand the concerns about opening code, can write some guidance for money to come from SSCB that would be good.

Larry –We are starting to disconnect from the County.

So in Delaware, we lost Candace last week. In our county we have no relationship with the commissioners. Our employees are contractors from grants. The HR guy would help out with finding someone, they are not county employees. Not having county funding, we can do what we want to do and they cannot tell us what to do, there is no county influence.

Larry – you cannot live on grant funds, it's not a strategy. The staff person has to be a grant writer to be employed. They have to continue to write grants for the district to function.

Robert – how is the stormwater handled?

Tara- they have a MS4 coordinator, but they are unable to work with them. Her funds come from the other municipalities in the county.

Paula – Marion County has been in the same situation, they have their own employees, what they do, they have a Memo of Understanding (MOU) with the County and that maybe something that the Board can assist on to keep the tie. If they have funding from outside source would be to get a MOU, not any dollars but it would help make a connection with the services that they provide and help lay the ground work for them to build them to work together.

Scott- how do we do 92 MOUs?

Paula – I was just thinking that this could be for the districts that don't have funding from the County.

Warren – wants to develop something and to be enforced. I don't think that we can change things from district to district.

Jordan –Kyleen stated that the SSCB board has discretion that comes from the competitive grants buckets. What Paula mentioned about MOU for the counties that don't provide money, we could then write into the CWI guidance that if the County has an MOU would then take the \$10,000 off the top and it would be in the grant guidance with that you could mandate that you have a MOU. What would happen with the 10,000? The AFR if unused, we could move funds into another account. Warrick County did not get match, so that \$10,000 moved into the competitive grant line item. So we could move the funds to competitive grants. To provide matching grants to the districts. If they a district forgoes the \$10,000 then that money could be placed into the competitive grants then the SSCB can award them a grant based off the MOU funds. This would

need to be established by what code the money is coming from. This is doable, so do we still need to open up code or not?

Bob – we don't want to change the code, there were a group of dedicated supervisors, and we have two problems, the resolution that Jennifer has to deal with, the member said. Then we need to deal with the individual counties, how to we convince the county level employees what we can do to help them. How can we get council to see all the good that the districts do? Do we develop a program without all the exceptions? We need a taskforce that sits down and study these issues.
Scott- could we get on the agenda at the County Commissioners where we can talk to all of them at once. Would us addressing the commissioner or sending a letter to the county help?

Bob- We need to look at the bigger picture. Some professionals, districts, we need to make something happen.

Nola – SWCD relationship with the county is not any different than the relationship they have with Extension. There needs to be a relationship with County and SWCD or the funding might not happen.

Robert- the quick fix and easy response need to work better with commissioners. Maybe the value of the SWCD you need to sell that to the residents and people need to understand the economic benefits of the SWCD.

Nola – get non board members talking to elected officials, we want this to succeed.

Scott – it's been brought to SSCB, how do we guide Jennifer Boyle – can we do something at the County Commissioners conference?

Paula- the districts should be telling their story and make it compelling, but private conservation groups the RCD, foundation or county commissioners if there is shortage of money for them and they need to look at kids or someone to look at helping the soils. The money will go to the kids.

Robert- all has to do with how you sell the conservation.

Paula – hard to sell clean water and healthy soil and feeding kids and harder with urban population. Delaware is a perfect example of that. The SSCB needs to be flexible and ready to be where the funding source comes from.

Robert – we have been flexible and will remain flexible.

Warren – we need a task force so we can look at this and then make a decision.

Jane – think of this very seriously, we have been prancing around this to keep. If you are going to change what 's written down, you have a lot of districts that make it work, with that being said, it's nice to bring in new partners and have the flexibility and you are using Band-Aids. We have 400 appointed or elected supervisors that this is their job and if they are not figuring how to be strong in their community and maybe that is what we need to think about. How do we help them, how do they look at other states and see how we can help them. Those 5 individuals are they doing everything that they can. You need to be careful before you change code or law, there are 92 and most of them have it figured out.

Scott – do we have guidelines for districts that don't get the political subdivision match of \$10,000 or are we willing to develop it. What is the resolution going to change it?

Bob – two things, how to help individual districts and we have a resolution how we need to handle the districts. Maybe the resolution could be changed.

Nola- how can we satisfy the resolution, when we are to be neutral on the resolutions. It's case by case.

Jennifer – I can go back to IASWCD and ask how to proceed further

Warren – make a task force to get ideas and then take it to the IASWCD to see if Delaware could amend it.

Jordan – board members are going to change, the guidelines would be year to year, and only thing to force permanent change would be in code.

Jennifer- was asked to hold off on legislation to see if we could find another way around this.. If I am being told that there is no other way to hold onto it, and Jennifer has been following this, and she needs to tell the IASWCD board something.

Bob- can you tell your board there is a lot of discussion and the SSCB has solved the problem in that it can be case-by case.

Jennifer – that does not guarantee them the match though.

Ray - can we make policy that a way that ensures the SWCD gets the \$10,000 from the SSCB. Do we need to have a policy that will satisfy the needs of the membership?

Jennifer- if you do that we can bring it to the members and then do we move forward with this.

Scott – like to sit on the Task Force and we have one and bring forward the information and find language that could be brought back to Oct. meeting to do this or not do this. We not make decision today

Mrs. Gentry moved that we look at task force of three members, Nola Gentry, Scott Ham and Warren. To look at the resolution and reproach the board in October with a recommendation. And Mr. Baird seconded it.

All in favor, motion carried.

The next IASWCD meeting is November 13th

- ❖ Scott Ham left at 12:24pm
- ❖ Ray Chatten took over as chair for the remainder of the meeting.

V. Soil and Water Conservation Districts

- a. Washington County letter- Jordan Seger
LG visited Washington County on August 21st, and she received a similar letter. The letter talks about the trend towards more tillage, and they wanted the SSCB to be aware of that as well. In the letter Washington SWCD shared their thoughts as to why this trend might be progressing. The tillage transect in spring and fall using pilot projects and working with the partners. Jordan referenced a letter.
- b. Noble County – Jennifer Thum
Mrs. Gentry moved to appoint Kyle Bailey to Noble County and seconded by Robert Woodling.
All in favor, motion carried.

VI. ISDA updates

- a. Director's report- Jordan Seger
Jordan just took questions
No questions

- b. Technical Report – George Reger – reviewed his paper that talks about the RS bi-weekly report to team leader and send them to Deb and shows the activities and shows the region 5 report on sediment load. Shows how they spend their time with CRP, EQIP and grass waterway, increasing number of survey request.
- c. Agricultural Affairs – Meg Leader
Mention a few things updating lab samples on corn samples 200 field samples about 25% of them. CCSI CIG grant did not go through.
- d. Accountability and Tech – Deb Fairhurst – written report, doing tillage transect, SharePoint, created WLEB website.
- e. District Support Specialist- Laura Fribley - We have included detailed written report. In terms of upcoming events, we would love to see you at them.
- f. Water Quality and CREP – Julie Harrold has written report – if any questions. Can relay them
None

VII. Conservation Partners Reports

a. IASWCD – no written

Normally the IASWCD region directors organize fall region meetings. This year we care going to do a state call on Nov 9th. The region directors and the DSSs met and they felt this might be a good option for us to try. During the call, there would be an update from the ICP leaders and they would go over the resolutions.

Ashley Hammac – introduced himself. He has been with CCSI since March and is the agronomist. Lisa is the manager.

b. IDEM

No report

c. DNR

No report

d. Purdue

Walt Sell – Assistant project leader ANR – he works with soil health to work with the partners, in Purdue, acknowledge with CCSI and thinks that partnership is growing and thank the SSCB for their pledge last month and thank NRCS to help with that funding.

e. FSA

No report

f. NRCS

Jane – good news, end of year and we did well in Indiana in terms of numbers. Jane introduced the new AC in the Northwest, Mr. Robert Lawson. Mr. Lawson has been with NRCS since 2003, Iowa DC and then central IL as DC and was interim AC in the central region. NRCS is filling their vacancies. We have five DC positions open that are being filled and one in Terre Haute. Barry Fisher has gone into soil health division, we will be advertising IN soil health specialist. The State Biologist is retiring too, we are going to open up position outside of the government and other people can apply for those positions. We are working on an all partner employee day of May 3rd in 2016. All in partners and employees who work out directly with landowners.

Shutdown – Not heard anything about they heard it, it's in the media, and it's all about the politics. We don't think it's going to happen. However, we need to think about it.

Jane – gave the SSCB some handouts on the WLEB. It's a critical topic and it will be political. In Indiana we are trying to show that we are doing our part to deal with what's there. Jane passed out information from the EQUP standpoint, and the RCPP program. The WLEB, all the farm bill, program money that has been used. We are out and meeting with the farmers, but we are bad about listing the accomplishment and what they are doing. It's amazing what each of the counties are doing. The science based things they are doing. The other item is put tougher WLEB Senator Donnelly wanted the sheet; we need to keep these things in front of each other. We are thinking about next year.

g. IDEA

No report

IX. Public Comment

Donovan Wilczynski– IDOT – erosion control specialist in LaPorte – wanted to get out and meet the locals.

X. Next meeting

2015 Meeting Dates

October 27, Sugar Ridge Fish and Wildlife Refuge, Pike Country

XI. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned by Mrs. Gentry and seconded by Bob Eddleman at 12:51pm.