

be for the whole property and not just the area effected by the invasives and that the plan needs to be from a reputable source. Ty gave the group some examples of simple plans/minimum standards for a plan. Lisette asked who would be available to write these plans. Ty said he would be willing to write them, if he could find time in his schedule. The group stipulated that the plans should be no older than 10 years old.

In section #4, the verbiage of “landowner agreement” was changed to “landowner access agreement (if applicable)” to avoid confusion.

Under “Funding Limitations,” Dale had some concerns about the cost of equipment. Language limiting the cost of equipment was deleted and replaced with “The Venango Conservation District reserves the right to review for approval or denial proposed equipment costs.” Bailey asked if the funding amount per project should be capped at the District’s allocation amount. Ty believed the project funding amount should be capped at less than the allocation amount to allow for more projects and to spread the money around. The group inquired what a reasonable cost for each project would be. Dale said that an invasive treatment project was done through EQUIP. The area was moderately infested and the project cost around \$4,000.00. Dale thought that \$7,000.00 seemed reasonable to him. Ty agreed. Ty recommended a conversation with Smerkar’s and Troyer’s. The group agreed that a single grant application cannot request funding in excess of \$7,000.00.

Ty inquired if state lands were eligible for funding. Bailey said she was not sure, but she would look into it.

II. Project Application and Ranking

Ranking item 4: The group was concerned about lineal projects and how they should be measured for ranking. Ty suggested an additional question to figure out what percentage of the property is infested by invasives. Lisette mentioned aquatic invasives. She thought that, even though the stream or pond they infest may not take up much of a property percentage-wise, was urgent to remove them from the waterway.

Ranking item 5 was stricken from the list.

Ranking items 8 and 9 were stricken as well because they were included in the policy as requirements for application.

Ranking item 10 was stricken because other counties have their own projects.

Under “Funding Procedures,” the group added language to match the “Finance” section of the policy which ensured that the landowner will be reimbursed only after a final certification and completion reporting has been executed.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.