

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

August 21, 2015, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Room 108, Fillmore County Office Building, 902 Houston St. NW, Preston, MN

Meeting Notes

In attendance: Donna Rasmussen (Fillmore SWCD), Mark Deutschman (HEI), Rachel Olm (HEI), Don Farrow (Fillmore County EDA), John Boyum (Fillmore SWCD), Scott Winslow (MN Corn Growers), Adam King (Dodge SWCD), Matt Drewitz (BWSR), Dean Thomas (Fillmore SWCD), Tom Gile (BWSR), Daryl Buck (Winona SWCD), David Schmidt (TNC), Shaina Keseley (MPCA), Caroline Van Schank (LSP), Sheila Harmes (Winona Co.), Pat Bailey (MDH), Nicole Lehman (DNR), Tim Connolly (USFWS), Tom Pyfforoen (MSCA), Jeff Hastings (TU), Jennifer Ronnenberg (Fillmore SWCD), Matt Feldmeier (Houston Co. Farm Bureau/Root River SWCD), Pete Fryer (SE SWCD TSA #7)

1. Open meeting: Jennifer Ronnenberg opened the meeting at 9:06 a.m.
2. Introductions were made.
3. Approve Agenda
4. New Business
 - a. Plan Status Update and Overview: Mark Deutschman, HEI, reviewed the schedule for completing the plan, which should be completed as scheduled. Sections 3,4, and 5 of the plan are the “meat” of the plan. It is assumed at this time that the current MOA-type structure will be used for implementation. The plan is based on local priorities and tied to state clean water funding. Priorities for other organizations are still being incorporated into the plan even if they are not among those at the local level. Still need to identify the roles and responsibilities to get those done. A question was asked about how to define flooding since it can vary by scale. Mark responded that flooding is looked at by the damage that is done to ag land, transportation infrastructure and to communities. There are different magnitudes of flooding that cause different types of problems. Flood prone areas with historic damage are being mapped. Structural practices are not the only solution; the plan can include creative local solutions for all types of storage to modify the amount of water leaving the landscape.
 - b. Opportunities for Providing Comments on the Draft Plan: Opportunities for input include the prioritization process, protection strategies, measurable goals, implementation program initiatives, identifying science gaps, delivery of conservation programs, policy needs for effective implementation, identifying capital improvement projects, the implementation process (governance, administration, budget), and roles and responsibilities (e.g. MOA). The plan is a road map of how to accomplish goals, and lays the framework for grant proposals. Non-governmental organization goals are incorporated into the plan; need to identify how they mesh with local priorities.
 - c. Process for Incorporating Advisory Committee Comments: High level comments should go to the Policy Committee for the August 31st meeting. Details and markups will come later.
 - d. Discussion about Draft Plan Content: Sections 1, 2, and 5 are ready for review.
 - i. The maps were discussed. Due to the amount of information on each one, it gets difficult to interpret them. It was suggested to break down the watershed with a map for each HUC10 and put separate resource concerns on each map. This gets to be a large number of maps, so a map book in the appendix may be more feasible. The data to make the maps will also be made available so areas can be zoomed in. Mapping livability and sustainability will be a challenge and may not be feasible; instead may just include explanations of what those priority resources involve.

- ii. Emerging issues include climate change and how to address it locally; funding delivery that is different from existing methods to ensure implementation (e.g. block grants); collaboration with NGOs linking their goals to the initiatives in the plan.
 - iii. The research section includes something about mapping Drinking Water Supply Management Areas (DWSMAs) and Wellhead Protection Areas (WPAs) which is led by the state; how might the local plan enhance this?
 - iv. Land acquisition is something that could be added in section 5.1.1 (Types of Assistance).
 - v. The table of practices is not all inclusive, and the title/introduction should indicate that, e.g. "...including but not limited to..."
 - vi. Education and outreach needs to be expanded to include such things as civic engagement, which goes beyond traditional one-time contact educational programs.
 - vii. In the Capital Improvements list, the last two items present the idea of identifying a HUC10 and all the practices needed for restoration and protection and then applying for all the funds needed as a whole.
- e. Responsibilities as Organization Representative: Take information back to the organization and build consensus for comments to bring back to the planning process.

5. Next meeting

- a. Confirm topics for discussion at future Advisory Committee meetings: The consensus was that plan review be the priority for the next meetings using the same format.
- b. Review dates for upcoming meetings: Next meeting is Monday, September 21st at 9:00 a.m. to review section 3 of the plan. Comments should be submitted within three weeks after the meeting.
- c. Agenda items

6. Adjourn: 12:15 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings of the Policy Committee:

October 5, 2015: Policy Committee meeting

November 2, 2015: Policy Committee meeting

November 30, 2015: Policy Committee meeting

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