

REAP CEP Board Minutes
November 26, 2012

Board members in attendance:

Charlene Eylea
Yvette McCulley
Ed Saehler
Dawn Synder

Board members absent:

Kevin Baskins

CEP monitor and assistant, and secretary for meeting:

Susan Salterberg

REAP CEP administrator in attendance:

Tammie Krausman

Others Attending:

Lynn Alex	Chris Gurley
Carl Bendorf	Lora Kanning
Andrew Batt	Kathy McKee
Rebecca Christoffel	John Nichols
Ron DeArmond	Jim Pease
Jean Eells	Tina Popson
Lynne Gardner	Anne Shimerdle

1. According to the board's policy of chairs serving in alphabetical order, Yvette McCulley called the November meeting to order at 1 pm, introduced herself and the organization she represents. Then all the guests introduced themselves. Next, the board members, REAP administrator and the Monitor and Assistant introduced themselves and indicated the organizations they represent.
2. Dawn Snyder explained that Anita O'Gara, representative to the CEP Board from the Iowa Conservation Education Coalition, has resigned, and Ed Saehler, representing ICEC, scored grants for this round. She thanked O'Gara for her vision and leadership.
3. Tammie Krausman, REAP Administrator from the Department of Natural Resources, then provided an update on the Request for Information for Monitor and Assistant. Krausman explained that the University of Northern Iowa has been monitoring and assisting the CEP Board for several years, and that it was time to see if others might be interested in this contract opportunity. Krausman indicated that a Request for Information would be emailed to the CEP listserv in late November or early December.
4. The Board announced that the next Review of Proposals meeting would be held June 4, and the winter teleconference would be held February 5 at 9:30 am. Both meetings are open to the public.
5. The Board explained that, effective for the May 2013 grant round, the Perpetuate a Good Idea grant application program is being replaced with a CEP Mini-Grant Program. The mini-grant program, Charlene Eylea explained, would be for smaller grants of \$3,500 or less, and would use

a simpler grant application form. Elyea made a motion to approve the new Mini-Grant Program and form and Snyder seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Krausman then clarified the CEP matching funds policy that no matching funds are required for grant applications, though proposals showing partnerships likely will be more competitive than those without.
7. Elyea made a motion to discuss the Iowa Rivers Revival – Master River Stewards Program. Ed Saehler seconded it. McCulley asked about the number of requests that the program has received. Jim Pease explained that several people from the Cedar River watershed inquired, as well as other people asking about the program for a total of 6-10 requests. Elyea indicated that she liked the ripple effect of the project by having others do some of the work. McCulley asked if this project could possibly work with the Living with the Floods project in Iowa City. Pease indicated that one of the partners is Mary Skopec, who also works with the floods project, so he'll ask her about it. Other questions included who might be an on-going facilitator for this program and transferability of the current project. Elyea indicated that transferability can be done in a variety of ways. Elyea made a motion to fund the project, Snyder seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.
8. Elyea made a motion to discuss the Cass County Conservation Board's Outdoor Educational Classroom Nature Trunks. Snyder seconded it. Elyea indicated that she was impressed that Cass County's outdoor classroom is used about 120 days of a 180-day school year. McCulley then stated that she likes the idea of the pre-trunk survey but questioned the methodology. Laura Kanning indicated her hopes for the survey. McCulley asked what parts of the project align with the core, and Kanning indicated that it would align with science and inquiry and 21st Century Skills. She hopes to work with a middle school teacher and the science curriculum coordinator. Several board members liked having the principals involved. Snyder made a motion to fund the project, Elyea seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
9. Kevin Baskins joined the meeting via teleconference for the next discussion and vote because Saehler and Elyea abstained because of conflict of interest. Snyder made a motion to discuss the Iowa Conservation Education Coalition Midwest Environmental Education Conference, and Baskins seconded it. McCulley applauded the action steps, which were clearly outlined. Snyder appreciated the incorporation of Next Generation Science Standards and Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM). McCulley liked that early childhood educators are being pulled into the project. She also liked using data to drive their future programming. McCulley made a motion to approve and Snyder seconded. Motion passed 3-0, with two abstentions.
10. McCulley made a motion to discuss the Pottawattamie County Conservation Board Ecological Immersion Program at Hitchcock Nature Center project, and Elyea seconded it. Elyea indicated that the program would have a great multiplier effect with the train-the-trainer component. Snyder asked how this would be different from the Master Conservationist Program. Tina Popson indicated that the project would go deeper—such is the reason for the use of the word *immersion* and that participants will be outside 100% of the time. McCulley asked how the trainees will be involved as volunteers once they complete the class. Eylea encouraged Popson to document and transfer information about how the volunteers are used. Saehler asked how they might sustain the program. Popson says they will charge a fee each year, and they may charge more in the future. McCulley asked if Popson might video this, and Popson indicated willingness to explore that. Elyea made a motion to approve funding, Saehler seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
11. Snyder made a motion to discuss the University of Iowa Investigating Shelter, A Midwestern Wickiup. Elyea seconded it. McCulley asked about the professional development component. Lynn Alex said they will be using a national model, but create the midwestern curriculum. McCulley loved the idea of performance-based evaluation, and asked how this might be done. Alex then talked about one example where students would role-play. McCulley asked about

primary resources, and Alex indicated that all of the resources are primary. Elyea made a motion to approve funding, Saehler seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

12. Elyea made a motion to discuss the Iowa Young Birders proposal and Snyder seconded it. Snyder asked Carl Bendorf about the field trips that have already been conducted and how they have been funded. Bendorf indicated that they have been volunteer-run. McCulley then asked about his reference to a “model” field trip. Bendorf then explained that their field trip protocol is anecdotal at the present time, but has been working because kids and parents keep coming. He then explained a little about what their trips look like, including start time and a focus on asking questions rather than shooting out the names of birds. Bendorf indicated that they want to refine and test this field trip model. McCulley praised several components of the Iowa Birders proposal, including the fact that they will evaluate mid-year and adapt as needed. Iowa Core is about “understanding and applying.” She indicated that they are a little short on the “apply” part, and wondered if they can enhance that. Elyea commented that this is a great opportunity to open the door to a lifelong activity. Elyea made a motion to approve funding, Saehler seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
13. Snyder made a motion to discuss the Iowa Public Television Iowa Outdoors project and Elyea seconded it. Three IPTV representatives were at the meeting, including Andrew Batt, Chris Gurley, and John Nichols. McCulley asked how they will use the programs in formal education settings, specifically if professional development was planned around the programs. Batt indicated that they disseminate the DVDs to teachers. Snyder asked if they have had success in the past with focus groups, and Batt indicated that they have had great success. Elyea asked about other sources of funding, and emphasized that they are doing a great job reaching lots of audiences. Snyder made a motion to fund the project and Elyea seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
14. Snyder made a motion to discuss the Iowa State University Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management Field Notes project, Elyea seconded. McCulley loved the idea that they are highlighting Iowa research. McCulley asked how they will help teachers use the publication as a piece of their instruction. Rebecca Christoffel indicated that they have a website, and she has asked two Ames science teachers to help with the middle and high school pieces of this project. She gave several other examples of how they may be able to help teachers. McCulley advised that ISU be very careful about the teachers they work with on STEP and Next Generation Science Standards, and Christoffel indicated she would contact McCulley for assistance. Elyea liked that it addressed alternative career paths. Christoffel indicated her desire to incorporate some of the Nature Mapping components into this program. Eylea made a motion to approve funding, Saehler seconded, and motion passed unanimously.
15. McCulley then asked how much money was available. Tammie Krausman indicated that \$4,821 remained.
16. Snyder made a motion to discuss the Blank Park Zoo Using the Zoo as an Integrating Context to Improve Student Achievement project. McCulley abstained because of conflict of interest. Eylea asked Blank Park Zoo representatives Kathy McKee and Anne Shirmerdle if they could use \$4,821 for any part of the project, and they said they needed a minimum of \$12,000 to do the work. After the Board discussed the project, they encouraged Blank Park Zoo to reapply during the next grant round.
17. Elyea made a motion to move the \$4,821 to the June 2013 round; Snyder seconded it, and the motion passed unanimously.
18. The Board next talked to five other grant applicants about their projects.
19. The meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

REAP CEP Board Teleconference

Meeting Minutes, August 29, 2012

Board members in attendance:

Kevin Baskins

Charlene Elyea

Anita O’Gara

Ed Saehler

Dawn Snyder

Board members absent: Yvette McCulley

Board member in training: Ed Saehler

Others present:

Tammie Krausman, Iowa DNR REAP Administrator

Susan Salterberg, University of Northern Iowa/REAP CEP Monitor and Assistant

Designated Chair Charlene Elyea called the meeting to order at 10:40 am. Susan Salterberg served as secretary.

Tammie Krausman gave an overview of the Request for Information (RFI) procedure for a Monitor and Assistant to the Board, and encouraged the Board to provide feedback to her on the draft RFI sent to them last week. Tammie noted that Susan Salterberg, REAP CEP Monitor and Assistant until June 2013, did not receive the RFI, and Tammie asked the Board not to communicate with Susan about this so all applicants were on a level playing field, as much as is possible.

Anita O’Gara then outlined her proposal for an alternative to the existing Perpetuate a Good Idea grant program. She indicated her goal was to create a way for people less experienced to apply for grants, and to make the entire process simpler, in part to respond to feedback from recipients who were surveyed by the Board earlier this year.

Susan Salterberg shared comments from Yvette about the proposal. Yvette suggests a \$5,000 maximum for the smaller, simpler grants. She expects some type of outcomes data, even if qualitative. She suggests the application form have a question to determine whether the proposal is a brand-new project or an existing project, and she would like to encourage, but not require, data supporting the likely impact (outcome) of the project.

The Board discussed the pros and cons of requiring impacts data, and decided that they would reduce the expectations for measured outcomes by changing the grant application to ask what the applicant expects the intended audience to know or do at the conclusion of the project, and to ask them how they will show if the desired impacts occurred. The Board also changed the scoring for each category.

Dawn Snyder made a motion to approve that up to 10% of grant dollars available per year be set aside for the simpler grants, that the Board not be required to spend all of that on simpler grants. She also indicated the grants would be for a maximum of \$3,500 and that the following additional criteria proposed by Anita serve as the guidelines for this simpler type of grant:

- When scoring, keep the two kinds of grants separate
- Create a ranking list for each kind
- Board opens discussion of grant proposals with a motion to approve up to \$_____ in total grants during the round
- Board moves to discuss ‘simpler grants’ first, and then moves discussion from top-ranked down
- At some point, a board member will move to table the remaining ‘simpler grants’ until top-ranked regular grants can be discussed
- Motions begin again on regular grants – from top-ranked down
- As funds run low, board members can move to discuss grants of either kind as a block before voting approval of any of them

Motion passed unanimously.

Next, the Board reviewed important dates to remember, and Dawn suggested the Board work session start at 9:30 am, Nov. 26th. Dates to remember are as follows:

November 1, 5 pm—REAP CEP Grant Submission Deadline

Monday, November 19, 5 pm—Deadline for scores

Monday, November 26, 9:30 am—Board work session

Presentation/Professional Development (11:30 am or noon); and Review of Proposals meeting (1 pm) **Location:** Webster County Extension Office, Ft. Dodge

The Board then discussed the results of a REAP CEP Board survey submitted to all members of the REAP CEP Google Group. The survey was sent out by the DNR to 155 people, and received 61 responses.

In response to the survey results, the Board suggested that the DNR and Susan review the midterm and final report form formatting to correct any glitches, and they discussed how to better handle grant applicants who participate via teleconference. Tammie volunteered to check with DNR Information Technology professionals and Iowa State Extension about technology options for the November meeting.

Anita expressed surprise that there were a few comments about the same grant applicants getting money year-after-year. She volunteered to write a newsletter article to say farewell as a Board member, and include the reasons that some grant applications are funded year after year. She indicated that there are reasons some applicants get grants repeatedly, saying that are effective at securing meaningful impacts, and they are focusing on the core of CEP—training of educators.

Susan volunteered to ask Yvette to write a short article about the Department of Education’s change in priorities related to environmental education to help address several survey comments.

Anita indicated that the Board needs to think about how to use technology to the best advantage over the coming years.

The Board then decided to spend part of the next Review of Proposals day getting videotape footage of grantees sharing what impacts resulted from their grants, and what their advice is to other applicants. Tammie volunteered to secure a DNR Communications person to tape these, in the hopes these can be placed on YouTube and used in future REAP marketing efforts.

The Board then discussed creating a policy for reporting. Anita made a motion, contingent on Tammie and Kathleen Moench, who is with DNR grant management, working out a midterm payment policy, that grants that are more than one year in length must submit a report every six to nine months, at the discretion of the Monitor in consultation with the REAP Administrator, and that grants that are less than a year must submit a midterm half-way through the project. All grantees would submit a final report at the conclusion of their project. Dawn seconded the motion; motion passed unanimously.

Anita made a motion to adjourn, Charlene seconded and motion passed unanimously.

REAP CEP Board Minutes Teleconference March 2, 2012

Board Members Attending:

Kevin Baskins
Charlene Elyea
Anita O’Gara
Dawn Snyder

REAP CEP Coordinator Attending:

Tammie Krausman

CEP Monitor Attending:

Susan Salterberg

- 1) According to the Board’s policy of chairs serving in alphabetical order, Dawn chaired the teleconference and called the meeting to order at 9 am.
- 2) The Board first discussed what role Tammie can play in representing them for amendment requests. Anita moved that Tammie be authorized to extend grant deadlines by up to six months, and that she inform the Board by email when she authorizes amendments. Timeline amendments for more than six months must go to the Board for vote. Charlene seconded. Motion passed unanimously. **Tammie and Susan will create documentation to determine whether to allow an amendment.**
- 3) Next on the agenda was the Call for Information for a CEP Monitor and Assistant. Tammie acknowledged that she and the Board appreciate the work of the current Monitor and Assistant (Susan Salterberg, University of Northern Iowa). She explained, however, the need to periodically determine if other organizations or individuals might be interested in this contract offering. Therefore, **Tammie has been and will continue working with the Department of Natural Resources Legal Counsel to draft a Request for Information (RFI).** When this is published, anyone interested in applying for the contract position may indicate their interest to the DNR. If there are a significant number of interested parties in the RFI, then the DNR will publish a Request for Proposals for the REAP CEP Grant Monitor and Assistant Position.
- 4) The Board then agreed that on June 6 from 11:30-12:50, a networking potluck and reception will be held for those interested in conservation education in Iowa. It will be held at the Webster County Extension Office after the CEP Board’s work session and before the Review of Proposals meeting. The goal would be for grantees and others in conservation education to share who they are and what they do, as well as what they might need from other organizations in the state. **Anita volunteered to send the Board a copy of a handout idea** that could be altered for use by REAP CEP. **Those in attendance agreed to provide main dish items for the potluck. Susan will work other details out with a board member or with Tammie.**
- 5) The Board then reviewed the CEP Perpetuate a Good Idea mini-grant program. Susan provided a summary of Perpetuate a Good Idea grant projects that had been funded in the past five years, since inception of the program. The summary is shown below. Several Board members indicated that they hear comments from those receiving grants and those considering applying that the mini-grant program is too much work for the amount of money granted. Other Board members mentioned that some of the applications aren’t addressing the original intent of the mini-grant program. After much discussion, Anita moved to discontinue the Perpetuate a Good Idea grants while reserving the right to actively seek grant applications that replicate specific successful grant projects around the state. Charlene seconded this. Discussion continued. Motion failed. Anita commented that she believes a \$1,000 grant is a “mini-grant,” but \$5,000 grants are significant funds and expectations should be higher. Kevin indicated that he would like to see the Board show stronger leadership and guidance on projects they would like to see replicated, and that the Board might consider providing a waiver if they believe a project doesn’t need an evaluation component

because prior grants have already proven the success of the project. Kevin also suggested a survey be developed and sent to those grantees that were awarded Perpetuate a Good Idea grants in the past five years. The survey's purpose, in part, would be to determine how effective this program has been in the eyes of the grantees, and garner other information about expectations for evaluation, etc. **Susan will draft a survey and submit it to the Board for review.** She recommended it be sent to grantees by a Board member or by Tammie. The Perpetuate a Good Idea grant program will be offered for the May round, but at the June work session the board will revisit whether it needs to be discontinued or revised.

6) The Board next discussed cost share policies and other financial information. Tammie had raised the question that, if Board members score grant applications higher that have a strong cost share component, should not that cost share be required, auditable documentation in the final report or final financials? Kathleen Moench, who reviews grantees' financials for seven REAP program grants--including REAP CEP, joined this part of the meeting. She advised that this be required auditable documentation. **Tammie, Kathleen and Susan will meet to discuss roles regarding the financial review and processes, and present a proposal to the Board on cost share and related matters at the June work session.**

7) The Board reviewed and accepted the Review of Proposals meeting procedures document that Susan drafted. These procedures will be followed, and explanations made, by chairs as they conduct Review of Proposals meetings.

8) **Susan volunteered to work with Anita and Tammie with a goal to create several short videos that provide impact evaluation training for applicants.** The videos would highlight components of the amplification process Anita has presented about at several CEP meetings, and be placed on the website.

9) The agenda item, "Tips for grant writers," will be tabled until the June work session.

10) **Susan volunteered to email the Board with rationale for a survey to grantees** so they have an opportunity to provide feedback that could be helpful to the Board in making decisions on various aspects of the CEP.

11) The meeting adjourned at 10:40 am.

Perpetuate a Good Idea History

Year & # funded	Total \$ awarded by year	Organizations/projects funded
2011 (3)	14,728	Trees Forever, Metro Arts, Guthrie Ctr. Elementary
2010 (3)	9,290	Wapsi Wild videocasts; PCCB and North Liberty Park Packs
2008 (3)	14,950	Kindernature (Little Sioux Valley), Growing in the Garden (Louisa Co. Ext) and SOAR
2007 (7)	27,067	KinderNature (Dickinson CCB), Ida CCB Homeschooling, KinderNature (IPTV), LCCB Park Packs, Agren Prescribed Burning Resource Binders, Trees Forever Growing Futures, Loess Hills Prairie Seminar
TOTAL: 19 funded	\$71,177 (~3.4% of grant funds awarded during this 5-year period). Average grant: \$3,746	5 were Park Packs, generally funded at \$1600-2800.

REAP CEP Board Minutes

June 6, 2012

Board members in attendance:

Kevin Baskins
Charlene Eylea
Yvette McCulley
Anita O’Gara
Dawn Synder

CEP monitor and assistant, and secretary for meeting:

Susan Salterberg

REAP CEP administrator in attendance:

Tammie Krausman

Board member in training in attendance:

Ed Saehler

Others Attending:

Chris Anderson	Kari Lammer	Danelle Schmielau
Carl Bollwinkel	Kim Poam Logan	Marcy Seavey
Rebecca Christoffel	Joyce Hammen	Jane Shuttleworth
Ron DeArmond	Karen Hanson	Mark D. Wagner
Julie Delaney	Matt Mancuso	Denise Wasko
Jean Eells	John Mazzello	Kathy Wine*
Barb Ehlers	Jeff Moneith	Emily Haase*
Ed Gruenwald	Anthony Santigo	Wayne Johnson*

*Participated via teleconference.

1. According to the board’s policy of chairs serving in alphabetical order, Kevin Baskins called the June meeting to order at 1 pm, introduced himself and the organization he represents. Then other board members introduced themselves and indicated the organizations they represent.
2. O’Gara proposed that, starting with the November 2012 grant round, the CEP Board not base grant application scoring on cash or in-kind match. She proposed a change to the Budget section of the application, so it is worth 5 points. She also suggested that the “sustainability” section be moved from the Budget section to the Action Steps/Partner & Staff Qualifications/Transferability section and that section of the application be valued at 30 points. Dawn Snyder made a motion to implement the steps O’Gara outlined. Elyea seconded it, and motion passed unanimously.
3. Attendees then introduced themselves.
4. Snyder indicated that \$318,500 of funds was available for the June grant round. She and O’Gara then explained how scoring and ranking take place, and that the Perpetuate a Good Idea proposals are reviewed first. Elyea suggested that, of the \$374,825 requested from applicants, the Board award approximately \$178,500 in the June grant round. This would allow about \$140,000 for the next grant round. O’Gara then explained that the board would be willing to discuss grant proposals not funded, if applicants want input.
5. The Board announced that the next Review of Proposals meeting would be held Monday, November 26.
6. O’Gara made a motion that Thor’s Outdoor Science Lab be discussed. Snyder seconded it. Elyea mentioned that she liked that this place-based type of education. McCulley

asked about the supplies line item. McCulley applauded the organization's robust efforts to address the Iowa Core for all students. O'Gara appreciated their efforts to address inquiry-based learning. Snyder moved for approval, McCulley seconded, and motion passed unanimously.

7. Elyea made a motion to discuss the Young Investigators proposal, and Snyder seconded it. Elyea and Snyder indicated that they liked the team approach, and O'Gara said she liked the partnerships. McCulley asked about Project Approach. Nature Connection's Denise Wasko explained the approach. After discussion, O'Gara made a motion to approve and Elyea seconded. Motion passed unanimously to fund the project.

8. Snyder made a motion to discuss the Listening to the Prairie Educational Initiative, and McCulley seconded. Elyea abstained because of conflict of interest. O'Gara asked about shipping the display back to the Smithsonian at the end of the project and also asked about the content. Hartman Reserve's Ed Gruenwald addressed the questions. O'Gara suggested farm partners be included, and McCulley suggested the Future Farmers of America also be involved. Gruenwald indicated that the latter connection had been made since the application was submitted. McCulley also appreciated that the education focused on "how ecosystems work," which is an important big idea to get out to the public. McCulley also liked that the survey was the price of admission. O'Gara suggested that, in the follow-up survey, they add a question about whether viewers did something differently as a result of the project. O'Gara made a motion to approve and McCulley seconded. Motion passed 4-0, with one abstention.

9. Elyea made a motion to discuss the Kids on the Byway project, and Snyder seconded it. Elyea indicated she really hopes others on the byways will be able to use some of the information, and Prairie Rivers of Iowa's John Mazzello explained. O'Gara indicated that the outcomes and number of days of some of their events was a little vague. Elyea questioned travel expenses and Mazzello clarified the expenses. McCulley then asked Mazzello if they plan for others to replicate the process. McCulley suggested that the organization use an existing model, eii, rather than create a new process. McCulley also asked about the term, "deep impact," which was used in the application, and Mazzello gave several concrete examples. Snyder made a motion to approve funding, McCulley seconded, with the caveat that the applicant contact eii. Motion passed unanimously.

10. O'Gara made a motion to discuss the Iowa Project WET Preservice Workshops, and Elyea seconded it. McCulley asked about the fact that they weren't able to hold some workshops in the past because students didn't enroll. Marcy Seavey from the Iowa Academy of Science indicated that the students don't know the value of it until after the workshop, so it was difficult to get students to sign up when they were asked to pay a small fee. O'Gara then asked about the college/university partnerships, and Seavey indicated that they have partners. O'Gara made a motion to approve funding, and McCulley seconded it. McCulley indicated she would really like to see new colleges involved to expand capacity. Motion passed 4-0, and Snyder abstained because of conflict of interest.

11. The Board decided to discuss the next two applications before voting to approve either, since they tied in scoring. Snyder made a motion to discuss Wildlife of Prairie Roadsides by environmental issues instruction, and Elyea seconded it. McCulley asked about locations—Pleasant Hill and Mt. Vernon. O'Gara asked a couple of questions about teaming and who might be participating in the workshop. Barb Ehlers from eii fielded

the questions. O’Gara asked about the budget and asked Ehlers to send an email to Susan Salterberg, grant monitor, when they learn whether their Department of Transportation grant is awarded.

12. O’Gara made a motion to discuss the Dubuque County Historical Society’s Turtles! Project, and McCulley seconded. Snyder asked about several budget discrepancies. Wagner indicated that the budget sheet was correct, and the narrative had a few mistakes. O’Gara also asked about the management of the exhibit. Elyea indicated survey questions were focused on students, not adults. O’Gara indicated that their outcomes were explained, but the sample questions shown did not reflect the suggested outcomes. Snyder pointed out that, at this time, the project is over before evaluation results are in. O’Gara indicated that she wants to know the exhibit is rotating successfully.

13. O’Gara made a motion and McCulley seconded funding of the Wildlife of Prairie Roadsides, and motion passed unanimously.

14. McCulley made a motion that CEP fund the Dubuque Historical Society’s grant, with the stipulation that the education specialist at the Mississippi River Museum work with a Department of Education evaluation specialist. O’Gara added that the specialist also needs to work with Salterberg, REAP CEP’s monitor, on evaluation. The Board also stipulated that the Museum evaluate a minimum of three sites, and the Board recommended the display be exhibited two months per site. The grant agreement timeline needed therefore to be extended about seven to eight months. O’Gara seconded the motion with stipulations, and the motion passed unanimously.

15. Kevin Baskins then indicated that \$176,373 has been obligated, and the Board discussed next steps.

16. O’Gara made a motion to discuss the West Pottawattamie Soil and Water Conservation District project and Snyder seconded it. After a discussion, O’Gara made a motion to fund the project and Snyder seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

17. O’Gara made a motion that the CEP Board stop funding. Snyder seconded it, and motion passed unanimously.

18. Snyder made a motion to adjourn the meeting, O’Gara seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.