

## Meeting of the Advisory Committee for Root River, One Watershed One Plan

Wednesday, April 29, 2015, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Chatfield Public Library, Intersection of Hwy 52 and Hwy 30 in Chatfield

### Meeting notes

In attendance: Jennifer Ronnenberg (Fillmore SWCD), Donna Rasmussen (Fillmore SWCD), Bev Nordby (Mower SWCD), Justin Hanson (Mower SWCD), Jeff Hastings (Trout Unlimited), Margaret Lyngholm (Friends of the Root River), Drew Kessler (HEI), Pete Fryer (SE SWCD Tech Support), Sheila Harmes (Winona Co), Jake Overgaard (Winona Co. Extension), John Boyum (Fillmore SWCD), Tim Connolly (USFWS), Rich Enochs (Trout Unlimited/National Trout Center), Chris Graves (Fillmore Co./MACPZA), Tom Gile (BWSR), Caroline Van Schaik (Land Stewardship Project), David Schmidt (The Nature Conservancy), Nicole Lehman (MN DNR), Pat Bailey (MN Dept. of Health), Kevin Kuehner (MN Dept. of Agriculture)

1. The meeting was opened by Jennifer Ronnenberg.
2. Introductions were made. Emails sent out recently with the agenda were not received by most in the group. This will be investigated to avoid that problem again.
3. Review agenda: Agendas and meeting minutes are being posted for the Policy Committee and the Advisory Committee on the Fillmore SWCD website: [www.fillmoreswcd.org](http://www.fillmoreswcd.org).
4. New Business
  - a. Brief overview of the One Watershed, One Plan process was presented by Jennifer. This process is a way to focus priorities to best utilize finite resources/funding. The Advisory Committee has input into how implementation happens.
  - b. Review the Draft Stakeholder Plan: This outlines how groups are involved in the planning process.
    - i. Roles and responsibilities of Advisory Committee were reviewed. Discussion will follow on how to make the Advisory Committee functional given its potential to be a very large committee. The most recent list of Advisory Committee contacts will be posted on the Fillmore SWCD website.
  - c. Discuss anticipated schedule: Priorities that will be in the plan need to be established by June. Input from the public has been received via the kickoff open house and comment cards, and through future online surveys (to be developed) and each county's local water management committee. Fillmore's committee has met, and Winona and Mower are meeting in the next two weeks. Dodge, Houston and Olmsted will be contacted to find out if their committees will be providing input. There will be ongoing opportunities for input plus up to four public hearings next spring. Future Advisory Committee meetings and input will be scheduled at key points as it is needed while the plan is being drafted.
  - d. Discussion and input on the Draft Resources, Concerns and Issues matrix
    - i. Review draft document: Drew Kessler, Houston Engineering, reviewed the format for the resource concerns matrix which will form the framework for the targeted implementation plan.
    - ii. Action: Mark preferences on the matrix: Each attendee was provided with two dots for indicating their preferences for priorities on the matrix. These results will be compiled with those from the public kickoff and the Planning Work Group. The Policy Committee will determine the priorities based on these results and recommendations from the Planning Work Group.
    - iii. Review results from April 8<sup>th</sup> public kickoff open house: Jennifer had a handout summarizing the comments from the open house, which was the starting point for public input. There were 87 people who signed in; some people did not sign in so the actual number is higher. It was advertised on the radio and through news releases to the local

media. KTTC and AgriNews covered the event in addition to local papers. The presentations at 5:00 and 7:00 generated good questions from the audience.

- iv. Discuss definitions of protection and restoration: The definitions were drafted by Houston Engineering with the intent that input from the Advisory Committee could help to refine them. Protection is aimed at protecting what is not degraded (impaired) to keep it from becoming degraded. The key question is how to define what needs to be protected. There is a definition for anti-degradation, so these definitions should be consistent with that. There was also a question whether all the criteria need to be met in #8 or if that could be changed to “meet most” or “several”. We need to evaluate whether or not there are actually resources in the watershed that meet the criteria, such as the exceptional water quality criterion in 8.a. There was also discussion about the use of the term “self-sustaining” in 8.b. The question was raised regarding why focus so much on public lands since all the land use in the watershed has an impact. One reason given is to build out from those public areas to the surrounding landscape to protect the public resources by improving land use on private lands around those areas, all of which has an impact downstream. Climate is another factor to consider. In other parts of the state, lakes are a rallying point for water quality protection/restoration. How can we define areas within a river system that can rally support? What would trigger special consideration (specific contributing areas, known loading, specific goals)? Identify those rallying points for protection and have good criteria attached to locations on the landscape, especially for practices that can provide multiple benefits.

## 5. Next meeting

- a. Review dates for upcoming meetings: How does the group function in future meetings? Two options: 1) continue to meet as a whole group and funnel recommendations back to the Policy Committee through the Planning Work Group, or 2) form subcommittees that can meet directly with the Policy Committee. It was the consensus of the group to continue to meet as a group to sort through the details and then bring recommendations back to the Policy Committee. Subcommittees could be formed if there is a need identified. We will forward the Policy Committee meetings agendas and minutes to the Advisory Committee.

Feedback on the voting process: It would have been helpful to have had the matrix information prior to voting, which would have happened had not the emails failed. There was also the question about how much more will the Policy Committee be informed by the voting process.

Jennifer will send out possible dates for a June meeting. Evening meetings may be a possibility to get more non-governmental organizations represented. There were no ag representatives today, probably due in part to the good weather for planting and possibly the email glitch.

- b. Agenda items: Topics will be based on the stage in the planning process.

## 6. Adjourned shortly after noon.

### Upcoming Meetings of the Policy Committee:

May 4, 2015: Policy Committee meeting: review of Priority Resources/Concerns/Issues

June 3, 2015: Policy Committee meeting: review of Goals/Preparation for Implementation Schedule

July 6, 2015: Policy Committee meeting: review of Goals/Preparation for Implementation Schedule

August 3, 2015: Policy Committee meeting

September 14, 2015: Possible Policy Committee meeting: Review of Draft Implementation Schedule

October 5, 2015: Policy Committee meeting

November 2, 2015: Review/Approval of Draft Plan Document and Reassess the Formal Agreement

February 15-March 1, 2016: Public Hearing Meetings and Response to Summary of Public Comments

June 2016: Approval of Final Plan Document and Submission to BWSR