

Meeting of the Policy Committee for Root River, One Watershed One Plan
Monday, May 4, 2015, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Fillmore County Office Building, 902 Houston Street NW, Room 108, Preston, MN
Meeting Minutes

In attendance: Glenn Hahn, Matt Flynn, Marcia Ward, Paul Schollmeier, Dana Kjome, Duane Bakke, Leonard Leutink, Tim Gabrielson, Jim Kellogg

1. Open meeting: Chair Bakke opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m.
2. Approve Agenda: Moved by Jim Kellogg to approve the agenda; seconded by Glenn Hahn; motion carried unanimously.
3. Approve minutes of the 4/6/15 meeting: Moved by Tim Gabrielson to approve the minutes; seconded by Leonard Leutink; motion carried unanimously.
4. Old Business
 - a. Action Item: Approve the Stakeholder Involvement Plan: Mark Deutschman, HEI, reviewed the purpose of the plan to define the roles and responsibilities of the committees and to ensure and encourage contributions to the process that are positive and constructive by the Advisory Committee. It was suggested that in addition to posting information on the websites that whatever goes onto the websites also be emailed to the Advisory Committee contact list to be sure the information is available to them. The makeup of the Planning Work Group was also discussed; it is mostly SWCD staff with some county staff. Other county staff has involvement through the Advisory Committee. Leonard Leutink moved to approve the Stakeholder Involvement Plan; seconded by Tim Gabrielson. There was further discussion regarding the definition of “acceptance” on page 3; the primary mechanism will be by consensus to gather input from the stakeholders. It will be important to get information out to the stakeholders as the targeted implementation plan is developed. The motion passed unanimously.
 - b. Perspectives on Public Meeting: Jennifer Ronnenberg reviewed the comments compiled from the April 8th kickoff event; we received one comment card in the mail while the rest were submitted at the event. There were 87 signatures on the sign in sheet although some people did not sign in so the actual number is higher. There were no new issues identified that were not on the matrix. Public input will help the Policy Committee determine priorities. Most of the dots were placed in drinking water protection and flooding categories. An updated matrix was made for today’s Policy Committee meeting showing where the agency comments are being addressed in the matrix.
5. New Business
 - a. Action Item: Approve payment of HEI Inc. invoice #0024208, dated April 3, 2015 for \$13,055.13: Moved by Matt Flynn to approve payment to HEI; seconded by Dana Kjome; motion carried unanimously.
 - b. Response to Agency Comments: The letter acknowledges the agencies’ comments, and the matrix will be attached showing that their concerns are being addressed. The letter also reminds them that it is the Policy Committee that ultimately decides the priorities in the plan. The matrix will also be emailed to the stakeholders. Marcia Ward moved to accept the draft letter and have it signed by Chair Bakke; seconded by Matt Flynn; motion carried unanimously.
 - c. Updated Resources, Concerns and Issues Table: Mark Deutschman presented PowerPoint slides that reviewed the process used to introduce a topic to the Policy Committee, then to discuss and debate the topic, then to make a decision over a series of three meetings, ideally. He also reviewed a flow chart of the One Watershed, One Plan process. The Committee requested that all the slides be sent to them, including the flow chart to use as a guide as they work through the process.
 - d. Summary / presentation of type of data available for developing Targeted Implementation Plan: Drew Kessler, HEI, explained using a presentation, the parallel project going on to develop the Prioritization, Targeting, Measurable Application (PTMapp) with funding from BWSR to the International Water Institute through the Red River Watershed Board. The tool is to be used by

LGUs to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Fund Accountability Act to ensure that Clean Water Funds result in measurable improvements in water quality. The desktop version will be ready for use in June. The Root River and the Red Lake River have been chosen as pilot areas to test the tool. It is not required that the results be used, and there may be a need for further analysis. He showed examples of how the tool can be used, such as identifying sources and loads of sediment, phosphorus and nitrogen; or peak discharges. Even though local staff can often identify where practices are needed, the tool can justify why the practice is needed in a certain location. BMP and conservation practice treatment costs can be calculated, for example, \$/ton of sediment reduced to determine where the most reductions can be achieved related to the cost. HEI applied for a grant to compare the tool's calculations to actual monitoring data in the Root, but the project was not funded. The main implication for the application for the Policy Committee is *to identify locations of priority resources of concern* on the landscape and in identifying issues and what is practical for achieving water quality goals based on the costs. Justin Hanson from Mower SWCD remarked that having this information available to landowners in the Turtle Creek Watershed was well received because it helped explain to the landowner why it's a priority. The data can also be used for funding requests. Priorities need to be identified within the next six weeks or so to be able to begin developing the targeted implementation plan. One of the emerging issues could be the need for stable and consistent funding (such as a block grant) to implement the watershed plan. The tool can show progress toward meeting the water quality goals which improves grant application rankings.

- e. Targeted Implementation Plan Structure: Mark showed a draft structure with these categories: General Operations, Statutory Obligations (shoreland, feedlots, etc.), Cost Share (e.g. for urban and rural BMPs, sinkhole protection), Education/Information/Outreach/Data Programs, and Capital Projects (flood control structures, dams, etc.). These can be modified, such as changing Cost Share to Financial Incentives to include low-interest loan programs or property tax incentives. Some statutory obligations are not necessarily required that the counties do, such as feedlots, which can be regulated by the state. Things such as soil health could fall under more than one category.
- f. Thinking About the Future – Structure for Plan Implementation: It is necessary to begin the discussion about how to move forward as a group to do implementation. Mark showed examples of the types of governance models that could be used to make decisions about implementation and funding. This decision will affect how the implementation plan is developed. He has other documents which describe local water governance options. This topic will be covered in more detail by Larry Kramka at the June meeting with a discussion of the pros and cons of each. Marcia Ward noted that this information should be run by the county attorneys and MCIT. A consensus is needed by July. Mark will make available the slides with this information to be sent to the Policy Committee.

Tom Gile informed us that Steve Lawler will be leaving BWSR for a position with the Mower SWCD in mid-May. Tom will be the primary contact with BWSR until the position is backfilled.

6. Next meeting

- a. Review dates for upcoming meetings: June 3rd is the next meeting, which is a Wednesday. It was suggested to get the meeting packets out earlier in order to allow more time to review the materials. The goal is to have them out one week prior to the meeting.
- b. Agenda items: Items will be based on this meeting's discussions.

7. Adjourned at 10:37 a.m.

Marcia Ward, Secretary