



Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83720

Telephone: 208-332-1790 • Fax: 208-332-1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION PUBLIC COMMISSION MEETING

Date and Time:

Wednesday, August 17, 2011

From 9 am to 4 pm MDT

Location:

Capitol Building

700 W Jefferson St, Boise Idaho

House Agricultural Affairs Room EW20

APPROVED MINUTES

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dick Bronson
Roger Stutzman

Dave Radford

ADVISORS PRESENT:

Randy Purser
Karma Bragg
Jeff Burwell

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

Teri Murrison
Kristin Magruder
Terry Hoebelheinrich

Erin Seaman
Delwyne Trefz

PARTNERS AND GUESTS PRESENT:

Harriet Hensley, Deputy Attorney General
Terry Halbert, North Side SWCD
Ken Stinson, Latah SWCD
Kari Schwendiman, Latah SWCD
Scott Koberg, Ada SWCD
Dennis Tanikuni, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation
Ray Houston, Legislative Services Office

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

ITEM #1 AND #2: WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dick Bronson, Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission (SWC) member at 9:21 a.m. with roll call taken. Dick Bronson, Roger Stutzman, and Dave Radford were present.

ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Bronson discussed the protocol for taking public comments for this meeting. Chairman Bronson requested that all parties wishing to make a comment indicate on the sign in sheet. Partners listening via internet audio streaming may make comments by emailing them to info@swc.idaho.gov and the comments will be forwarded and read by staff.

ITEM #4: REVIEW AGENDA

Chairman Bronson reviewed the agenda. There being no business to add, the Commission reviewed the Consent Agenda.

ITEM #5: CONSENT AGENDA

Vice Chair Radford moved to approve items A through E on the consent agenda. Commissioner Stutzman seconded. Motion passed.

ITEM #6: ADMINISTRATORS REPORT

Administrator Murrison reported on staff activities since the last meeting in June. She has spent a significant amount of time meeting with districts, partners, state agencies, the Governor’s office, and Commission budget analysts. There has been a focus on discussing agency activities to ensure there is no redundancy in services and she is actively looking for opportunities to share resources. Ms. Murrison also met Office of Species Conservation staff in Salmon to discuss project status and needs. There was a leadership meeting to review the strategic plan and discuss options for the concerns that were expressed and identify missing components. Conducted an all staff meeting in July where she was able to meet all of the Commission staff from around the state and discuss and share ideas. Other events around the state that she has attended include the Idaho Woolgrower’s Annual Rangeland Tour, Owyhee Cattlemen’s Annual Conference, and the Food Producer’s summer meeting.

Ms. Murrison discussed the disbursement of the remaining FY 2011 Water Quality Program for Agriculture (WQPA) funds that the Commission sent out in June 2011. Some districts asked if the Commission was required to send the funds out via the allocation process. Harriet Hensley, Deputy Attorney General, reported on her research and reported that the WQPA funds budgeted for that program are not subject to the district allocation process and the Commission had the authority to disburse the funds in support of their duties and responsibilities.

Ms. Murrison advised that Jeff Burwell, State Conservationist with Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) contacted Commission staff in late June with an offer for a grant for technical assistance

49 funds. Staff submitted a proposal and received permission from Division of Financial Management
50 (DFM) to proceed with the grant in the amount of \$80,000.

51

52 NRCS Partner Report

53 Mr. Burwell discussed the one-time technical assistance funds that became available to assist the
54 Commission with related personnel costs for staff that is providing the technical assistance on existing
55 CCPI projects in Burley, Twin Falls, and Marsing. Individual districts were also awarded grants (Franklin,
56 Jefferson) that will be working with EQIP and WHIP projects, TMDLs, and a grant with the Nature
57 Conservancy will be working on sage grouse issues. Mr. Burwell is actively working to get more funding
58 in Idaho before the end of the fiscal year.

59

60 Mr. Burwell discussed the budget issues that NRCS is facing for next couple of years. This next year
61 should be stable but FY 2013 is going to be difficult because it is likely that NRCS will be eliminating
62 positions and offices. NRCS will be coordinating with Farm Services Agency (FSA) because they will be
63 dealing with similar issues and the two agencies will attempt to maintain overall coverage and services
64 to landowners across the state. He is closing the Meridian office and is working with district on the
65 disposition of the office space. They will be renting the space and the focus of the office will shift to
66 support organic farming initiatives.

67

68 NRCS will be working with partners to coordinate and collaborate to share resources to keep
69 conservation on the ground in light of the reduced and uncertain budgets. They are working under a
70 1950's business model and they need to update their business practices. He encouraged all natural
71 resource agencies to work together and pool resources to get conservation on the ground.

72

73 Mr. Burwell explained that he is looking at a \$1 million budget cut next year and is uncertain what affect
74 the debt reduction plan and the expiration of Farm Bill is going to have on agriculture. NRCS and other
75 agencies are looking to streamline and there is congressional and agency support to focus on three
76 priorities for funding.

77

78 The Contribution Agreement with the Commission is being finalized and should be completed and funds
79 obligated by September 2nd.

80

81 **Commissioner Stutzman moved to approve the NRCS Contribution Agreement for technical assistance**
82 **funding pending NRCS and attorney review and further directed the Administrator to finalize the**
83 **agreement. Vice Chair Radford seconded. No further discussion. Motion carried.**

84

85 **ITEM #7: FINANCIAL & MATCH REPORT**

86

87 Kristin Magruder, Commission Program Specialist, presented a request to convene a working group to
88 review the Financial & Match Reports due on September 1, 2011. The working group last year was a
89 valuable exercise for the peer review and input of type of match supported for allocation purposes. Vice
90 Chair Radford spoke in support of the process and requested Chairman Bronson chair the group since he
91 has the experience from last year. There was discussion over rescission of prior temporary rule, which
92 was necessary in order for the updated temporary/proposed rule to take effect on July 1st. The changes
93 in temp/proposed rule are to the districts' benefit to allow funds and services received from local
94 organizations to be considered for match allocations and also reducing the number of required reports
95 from four to three. Chairman Bronson spoke in support of the working group and the members that

96 served last year and volunteered to chair the group. Chairman Bronson further appointed the previous
97 working group unless they decline and suitable alternative will be recruited to take their place.

98

99 **ITEM #8: CONSIDERATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN**

100

101 Ms. Murrison reviewed the overall strategic plan process, which began back in February 2011. Based on
102 feedback received from districts and partners regarding the first draft of the strategic plan, she directed
103 staff to review all factors and prepare a revised plan for feedback and comment. She discussed the
104 timeline for rolling out the second draft plan with the presentation, which included two teleconferences
105 in which the plan was reviewed and feedback. There was discussion about the feedback received from
106 districts. Staff further prepared alternatives for Commissioner's consideration based on the feedback
107 and comments received.

108

109 Ms. Magruder presented the district survey results for FY 2011. There was discussion about importance
110 of having the district's feedback and Commissioner's voiced their appreciation.

111

112 Ms. Murrison clarified a concern over coordination. Coordination is a formal government to
113 government process and it had never been the Commission's intent to coordinate on behalf of districts.

114

115 Strategic Plan Presentation

116 Ms. Murrison discussed the necessity of revising the strategic plan, looking at a new model for service
117 delivery, and the timeline for the strategic plan process and getting feedback from districts and partners.
118 She stressed the importance of receiving direction today so the Commission can finalize the strategic
119 plan, performance measurements report, and FY 2013 budget request by the September 1, 2011
120 deadline. Vice Chair Radford asked Ms. Hensley what the ramifications would be if an agency missed
121 that deadline. She replied that she does not have any experience in that issue. Vice Chair Radford
122 concerned about having district buy in and support and there were questions posed to Ms. Murrison
123 regarding the same. Ms. Murrison advised that there is a considerable amount of work in preparation
124 for the upcoming legislative session and invited Ray Houston, Budget Analyst for Legislative Services
125 Office, to comment on the matter. Mr. Houston advised that the strategic plan and PMR are part of the
126 budget request and required under statute. All agencies have their own unique issues to deal with so
127 we are not alone in that regard. Further discussion followed.

128

129 Ms. Murrison discussed the rubric that the leadership team created to evaluate all of the criteria under
130 the strategic plan: satisfy legislative intent, promote fiscal responsibility, benefit environment, benefit
131 SWC, benefit districts, including landowner and land users. Locally-led efforts were paramount to all
132 criteria.

133

134 The Commission collected feedback and formal comments from districts and other partners, including
135 Department of Environmental Quality and Idaho Department of Fish and Game. For purposes of today's
136 meeting, staff categorized comments within categories.

137

138 Agency Organization:

- 139 - Most important concern was the technical assistance.
- 140 - There is support on both sides of the issue.

141

142

143 Coordination:

- 144 - There are some federal and state agencies that are coordinating and collaborating, but not all
- 145 (OSC example).
- 146 - Confusion about coordination being a formal government to government process.
- 147 - Some districts don't have capacity and could make better use of SWC staff.
- 148 - Some support IASCD taking the lead on certain activities; some districts do not.
- 149 - Most districts liked the idea of being at the table with other agencies.

150

151 Discussion about the intergovernmental coordinator position and the concerns voiced by the districts
152 and IASCD. Clarified the intent about district support and what coordinator would do.

153

154 Funding:

- 155 - All districts support more funding and additional funding opportunities.
- 156 - Some support full 2:1 match as top priority, others do not.
- 157 - Strong support to seek alternative funding opportunities to support cost share programs.
- 158 - Suggestion that SWC remove engineers, vacant TA, and pass through money to districts.

159

160 Draft Plan:

- 161 - Concern about perception of SWC changing mission and vision. Mission and vision was updated
- 162 to encompass the entire legislative intent.
- 163 - Too many benchmarks
- 164 - Prioritize goals
- 165 - Mention districts in mission
- 166 - Draft 1 disregarded. Ms. Murrison explained that the first draft is reflected in the second draft.

167

168 Discussion about using 'public land managers' in the vision as it has implications to the public land trusts
169 and Vice Chair Radford proposed that be modified in the final draft based on feedback from Idaho Farm
170 Bureau Federation.

171

172 Discussion about Farm Bureau comments. Dennis Tanikuni, Governmental Affairs Office, addressed the
173 Commission about the practical and political concerns. Farm Bureau has been a strong supporter of the
174 Commission over the years and made comments with the best of intentions. Concerned about the
175 political pushback that could occur as a result of not having a simple, solid plan that deviates from the
176 perceived function of the SWC. Vice Chair Radford asked about the focus of Farm Bureau and their
177 membership. Further discussion followed.

178

179 Ms. Murrison reiterated the importance of receiving comments from partners.

180

181 RCRDP:

- 182 - Districts support a funding mechanism for the time they spend processing applications.
- 183 - Many districts do not understand the program and funding or how the program positively
- 184 impacts SWC and the state.

185

186 Review of Proposed Agency and Staffing Plans:

187 Option One: Status Quo.

188 Option Two: Coordination

- 189 - Supported by statute, mission change
- 190 - SWC facilitates, doesn't not coordinate for districts

- 191 - Staff with intergovernmental coordinator
- 192 Option Three: Latah Proposal.
- 193 Option Four: Transition

194
195 Factors to consider for all options are the technical assistance focuses on mandates, agreements, and
196 existing projects first, then rank district needs. Convert one FTP to full-time loan servicing assistant (this
197 position would be paid from dedicated funds and cannot be paid out of general funds). Reestablish full-
198 time loan officer.

199
200 Review of Option One priorities, staffing, and staff recommendations if Commissioners select this
201 option.

202
203 Review of Option Two priorities, staffing, and staff recommendations if Commissioners select this
204 option.

205
206 Review of Option Three priorities and staffing. Implications of proceeding with this option because the
207 Commission would permanently lose the three FTPs and related personnel funding. There is also not a
208 guarantee the legislature would fund district allocations at the same level in future fiscal years.

209
210 Review of Option Four priorities and staffing. Within a transition plan, SWC would provide support and
211 transitional capacity. There would be a focus on removing administrative functions from field staff so
212 they could provide more technical planning and implementation to the districts. Priorities would be
213 district support and services, resource programs, incentive programs, strong organizational foundation,
214 and building relationships with other state and federal agencies to seeking opportunities and sharing
215 resources. Staffing would include a District Support and Services Specialist to focus on district needs and
216 facilitate needs assessment in cooperation with districts.

217
218 Ms. Murrison reviewed the evaluation criteria to be considered in selecting an agency and staffing
219 model moving forward.

- 220
221 Staff evaluation of proposed options:
- 222 • Status quo is potentially unsustainable in the long-term because it doesn't satisfy all of the
223 criteria or is only being marginally satisfied.
 - 224 • Coordination offers a good combination of achieving criteria but is not universally supported by
225 the districts because there is a resistance to change.
 - 226 • The Latah proposal would significantly erode SWC capacity to do business and permanent loss of
227 funding.
 - 228 • The Transition proposal would provide the highest level of technical assistance services and
229 provide the potential for coordination as well.

230
231 Staff is making a recommendation to finalize the strategic plan based on the transition proposal but will
232 defer to the Commission's final decision.

233
234 Randy Purser, IASCD President, spoke in support of the status quo based on the IASCD resolution in 2010
235 to not support any additional SWC administrative staff but instead fill that position as technical
236 assistance. Chairman Bronson spoke on the merits of having a statewide support position and asked to
237 have a meeting with the IASCD board next week prior to approving a final plan to discuss options. Mr.
238 Purser agreed.

239
240 Chairman Bronson proposed an option for meeting and staff will work with Commissioners and IASCD to
241 secure a meeting time and place. Jeff Burwell offered the Twin Falls office to conduct the meeting.

242
243 Ken Stinson, Latah SWCD District Manager, clarified that their proposal is not endorsed by the Latah
244 board because they have not met to review this proposal, and takes responsibility for submitting this
245 idea. He discussed the idea of the district independence model that has been considered over the years
246 and options that would help districts become less dependent on Commission technical or administrative
247 staff that would include utilization of existing district resources, division plans, and IASCD strategic plan.
248 Mr. Stinson spoke in support of the responsibilities being put on the locally elected officials in the
249 districts and the value it would place on the districts without impacting general funds.

250
251 Mr. Stinson responded to a question on whether he had a specific example of other states that worked
252 under the small commission staff with independent districts. Mr. Stinson explained how their district
253 started out with a traditional district model that had administrative staff and began with one 319 grant
254 and built from there by tapping into the available federal funding in a natural resource area of concern
255 that impacted their part of the state. Does not believe that the allocation of 6-7 state staff across 50
256 districts is unsustainable in the long term. There are Commission programs that are unique and specific
257 to the Commission and should be built and promoted separately from district issues. Discussed taxing
258 authority of the Spokane District in Washington. Commission thanked Mr. Stinson for his constructive
259 feedback and good ideas.

260
261 Chairman Bronson voiced concerns how other districts might perceive his proposal as a “scorched earth
262 plan.” Ms. Murrison saw potential in some of Mr. Stinson’s ideas for moving forward in a transition
263 plan. Chairman Bronson asked about the merits of a needs assessment so that districts knew what their
264 deficiencies are and identify a plan for moving forward. Mr. Stinson offered to meet with Commission
265 staff to discuss specific ideas and spoke in support of the Latah board as being the driving force behind
266 the success of their district and the level of expectation for the elected officials should be high.

267
268 Karma Bragg, IDEA President and Custer SWCD, addressed the commissioners. She is conflicted about
269 supporting any of the proposed options because she is an employee of the Custer district as well as the
270 IDEA board members. She does support a level of transition regardless of the option chosen and that
271 districts should have a choice about how they participate in the change. Ms. Bragg commended Ms.
272 Murrison for taking the time to consider all of the issues and concerns and believes all four options have
273 merit. She also spoke in support of the other statewide roles that the Commission used to staff and the
274 tremendous impact they had. Districts support of each other is an important component to success and
275 Division 6 is good about offering that support to each other.

276
277 Vice Chair Radford asked her opinion about the implications of choosing the “wrong” strategy. Ms.
278 Bragg spoke for herself by stating that she is not good with change but they will make the best of what is
279 chosen. Commended Commission staff for making the effort to provide the opportunity to involve the
280 districts to get as much feedback as possible and for the difficulties they face when making these
281 decisions.

282
283 Terry Halbert, North Side SWCD District Manager, addressed the Commission about the first strategic
284 plan. He was very disappointed in the lack of benchmarks and forward movement in the first plan and
285 did not comment on it. When he saw the second draft, he was encouraged and excited about the
286 possibilities that were contained within that plan. Mr. Halbert described how his district has grown over

287 the past five years, growing from a budget of \$4,500 to over \$100,000 this year; \$49,000 of which is
288 local funding. He watched and learned from other districts and agencies to see how they were
289 successful and implemented the same in his district. Currently employs a part-time engineer and
290 contracted with an engineering firm to provide additional project work. He is concerned with the
291 stagnant status quo and what the perception will be from other parties to see if past lessons have been
292 learned.

293
294 Vice Chair Radford asked for feedback from Mr. Halbert on DEQ's comments towards the urban/rural
295 interface. Terry responded that they were able to offer solutions to parties that weren't able to move
296 forward with an issue. Ms. Murrison recommended addressing the language in the strategic plan to
297 reference serving both rural and rural/urban interface.

298
299 Ken Stinson readdressed the Commission. He gave credit to the entire Commission, both
300 Commissioners and staff, for asking the districts for feedback, for providing information, and for making
301 a positive transition over the past couple of years. He wanted to thank staff for making the effort.

302
303 A break for lunch was called for at 12:25 pm.

304 The meeting reconvened at 1:46 pm.

305

306 Commissioners took further comments on the draft strategic plan.

307

308 Scott Koberg, Ada SWCD District Manager, provided feedback on behalf of his district. Spoke in further
309 support of the Commission maintaining an annual plan within the overall strategic plan so the districts
310 have a better idea of what Commission activities would be from year to year and how it relates to the
311 districts and the overall direction. He was concerned about the movement towards "boots in the office"
312 versus "boots on the ground." Sees some merit to Ken Stinson's proposal and the transition proposal.
313 The Ada district supports the technical staff to help the districts rather than letting the FTPs disappear.
314 He is inclined to support the transition plan but is concerned that there may be the perception that the
315 District Support position would be sucked into an administrative role or that it is a cover for the
316 intergovernmental coordinator.

317

318 Vice Chair Radford asked Mr. Koberg what his suggestion would be to convey the message to districts
319 about the one-time money that may or may not be there in the future. Mr. Koberg spoke in support of
320 IASCD being a good resource to help orchestrate the technical needs around the state beyond what the
321 Commission can do. He discussed the history of IASCD and the Commission and the partnership that
322 worked together with DEQ and the Idaho State Department of Agriculture to get projects done and
323 finance the technical assistance in districts.

324

325 There was further discussion about what the districts could do to support the idea of this being the new
326 norm for budgets and staffing. Vice Chair Radford asked what amount of time it takes for technical staff
327 to become good technical staff. Mr. Koberg responded that it can depend on the district boards and the
328 projects that they move forward with. It takes a lot of time to build the trust and relationships with the
329 local landowners, leaders, and partners. It depends on the district, their resources, project types, and
330 technical needs to determine how many districts one person can support.

331

332 Ms. Murrison advised that Shelby Kerns, DFM Budget Analyst, advised that the deadlines for strategic
333 plan, PMR and budget are in statute. Ms. Magruder advised that Eileen Rowan sent an email stating

334 that she is supportive of a transitional plan assuming that there would be a year to flesh out the details
335 and review again next year during the annual review.

336
337 Ms. Murrison concluded with comments about her observations during her tenure to date. Based on
338 what she has witnessed with current statewide activities of districts and other agencies, her fear is that
339 the districts and the Commission would become irrelevant to conservation if we don't step up our
340 efforts to seek a better way to do business. She spoke on behalf of the efforts and extra hours that all
341 staff is putting in to attend meetings, to keep operations going, and believes that the Commission in not
342 adequately compensating them for their efforts. Statute clearly states what the Commission is
343 authorized to do and is making a recommendation to move forward in a way that supports the
344 legislative intent, provides a benefit to districts and to the Commission.

345
346 Chairman Bronson advised that the Commissioners will not be adopting a strategic plan today, but
347 directing staff to proceed drafting strategic plan, PMR and budget for consideration at the August 30th
348 meeting.

349
350 Commissioner Stutzman asked about the need for two full-time loan staff. Chairman Bronson discussed
351 the need for separation of duties and the part-time hours placing a burden on other Boise staff to
352 maintain the program. Ms. Magruder spoke further in support of staffing the loan program full-time:
353 separation of duties, timeliness of processing requests. Also discussed that if we do not utilize the FTP,
354 the Commission will lose it this fiscal year because it cannot be supported from the general fund
355 personnel budget.

356
357 There was further deliberation over the four proposed options. Vice Chair Radford spoke in support of
358 the transitional option as being the best scenario to address the multiple concerns of all districts and
359 partners. Does not believe that the Commission can afford for the staff to get any smaller. In an ideal
360 world, option three would be the best because that would mean that all of the districts would have all of
361 the resources that they needed and the Commission would focus on the loan program, processing the
362 district allocations, and help facilitate programs with other agencies. In the interest of unification, he
363 believes option four is the best bet.

364
365 Commissioner Stutzman agrees that option four is the best but wants to reinforce the need for the
366 technical support because there are several districts that need to have that continued support.

367
368 Chairman Bronson spoke in support of option four as well. He commented about the need of the staff
369 that are spread thin and does not want the districts to perceive this as building the bureaucracy because
370 that is not the intent. With reduced budgets across the board, it is imperative that the Commission
371 looks at innovative ideas to seek opportunities.

372
373 Chairman Bronson directed staff to proceed with drafting strategic plan, PMR and budget in accordance
374 with Option Four Transition Plan.

375
376 **ITEM #9: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PLAN FY 2012-2015**

377
378 Ms. Magruder presented the IT Plan as submitted for FY 2012-2015 to the Office of the Chief
379 Information Officer. The plan includes components to support the loan software program and database,
380 a virtual board to supply Commission board members with access to agency email and documents
381 remotely, an upgrade to the agency website to provide more information to districts and partners,

382 improvements to Idaho OnePlan including online statewide BMP reporting, and creating an online
383 application for the RCRDP loan program. Further discussion followed.

384

385 **ITEM #10: RCRDP IT INITIATIVE – DIVERSIFIED BOND FUND PRESENTATION**

386

387 Diversified Bond Fund Presentation. Shawn Nydegger, State Treasurer’s Office and John McCune from
388 Capitol Investments gave the Commissioners a brief introduction to the bond fund. The IDLE fund,
389 which is where the loan funds currently sit, is a short-term, low-risk investment fund. As an alternative,
390 the state began the diversified bond fund to provide a higher rate of return, but it does have a higher
391 risk and is meant for investments that will be sitting for a longer period of time. The current yield is
392 2.15% as of the end of July. There is an inverse effect for bonds – if interest rates rise, the value goes
393 down, if the interest rates lower, the value goes up. Mr. McCune discussed the types of securities and
394 the pros and cons of the fund. Recommends minimum investment duration of three and a half years to
395 mitigate the possibility of loss. He related the fund to a mutual fund account, but it is not attached to
396 the SEC and is only for Idaho investors. Chairman Bronson asked about the participant breakdown. Mr.
397 Nydegger responded that is approximately 60-40 split of municipalities to state investors.

398

399 **ITEM #11: RCRDP LOAN RATE FOR FY 2012**

400

401 Idaho Code 22-2732 permits the Commission to set the loan rates annually. Last year, the rates were
402 reduced one percent. Staff is not recommending a change to rates, but to change the terms: 1-4 year
403 for 2% APR; 5-9 years for 3% APR; and 10-15 years for 4% APR. Staff is presenting this information to
404 Commissioners for consideration at the August 30-31 meeting. Chairman Bronson believes this change
405 is warranted to support proposed changes and consideration of investing funds into the diversified bond
406 fund. Vice Chair Radford also noted that there has been discussion about providing a funding
407 mechanism to pay districts for the time they spend on the loan application process and requested a staff
408 recommendation in support of such measure.

409

410 Chairman Bronson called for a five-minute break at 2:57 pm prior to entering Executive Session. The
411 only remaining agenda item is the RCRDP loan business.

412

413 Meeting reconvened at 3:05 pm.

414

415 **ITEM #13: RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RANGELAND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

416

417 **Vice Chair Radford moved to enter into executive session pursuant to Idaho Code § 67-2345 (d) to**
418 **review pending RCRDP loan applications only. Commissioner Stutzman seconded. No discussion. Roll**
419 **call vote was taken with all voting in the affirmative. Motion passed unanimously.**

420

421 The Commission moved into executive session at 3:07 p.m. Terry Hoebelheinrich, Teri Murrison, Kristin
422 Magruder, Harriet Hensley, and Erin Seaman were invited to stay.

423

424 **Vice Chair Radford moved to end executive session at 4:01 p.m. Commissioner Stutzman seconded.**
425 **Motion passed and the audio streaming was initiated.**

426

427 Commissioners discussed the disposition of pending RCRDP loan business.

428

429 Loan No. 652

430 Amount: \$78,200 (alternative \$30,000)

431 Term: 7 years

432 Rate: 2%

433 Project description: Install center pivot irrigation system and well.

434

435 **Vice Chair Radford moved to reconsider Loan A-652 at the August 30-31, 2011 meeting.**

436 **Commissioner Stutzman seconded. No further discussion. Motion passed.**

437

438 Loan No. A-653

439 Amount: \$4,000

440 Term: 5 years

441 Rate: 2%

442 Project description: Complete irrigation improvements.

443

444 **Commissioner Stutzman moved to deny the applicant's request. Vice Chair Radford seconded. No**

445 **further discussion. Motion passed.**

446

447 **At 4:05 p.m., Vice Chair Radford moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Stutzman seconded. Motion**

448 **passed.**

449

450 Respectfully submitted,

451

452 Roger Stutzman

453 Commissioner and Secretary,

454 Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission