

**Meeting of the Policy Committee for Root River, One Watershed One Plan**  
**Wednesday, June 3, 2015, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**Meeting Minutes**

In attendance: Glen Hahn, Steve Connelly, Marcia Ward, Jerry Mueller, Dana Kjome, Duane Bakke, Leonard Leutink, Tim Gabrielson, Jim Kellogg. Others present: Sheila Harmes, Rich Enochs, Margaret Lyngholm, Dave Walter, Dan Wermager, Daryl Buck, Joe Smentek, Tom Gile, Skip Langer, Jennifer Ronnenberg, Donna Rasmussen

1. Chair Bakke opened the meeting at 9:04 a.m.
2. Approve Agenda: Motion to approve the amended agenda made by Steve Connelly; seconded by Jim Kellogg; passed unanimously.
3. Approve minutes of the 5/4/2015 meeting: Motion to approve minutes made by Tim Gabrielson; seconded by Jerry Mueller; passed unanimously.  
Introductions were made by those in attendance.

4. Old Business

a. Establishing the Priority Resources of Potential Concern – Planning Work Group Recommendation

Mark Deutschman, HEI, gave a status update. Financially, \$58,000 has been spent of their \$146,093 budget. A draft plan should be ready by September/October for review by the Policy Committee. Key decisions are needed in order to move forward: setting priority concerns and a governance structure. Next big pushes within HEI are to develop a solid internal draft of the plan, draft measurable goals, finish descriptions of initiatives, and finish funding needs and sources.

Mark described the prioritization process of categorizing the resource concerns as A (4), B (7), or C (11) based on the preferences from all the groups: public, Advisory Committee, Planning Work Group and the local water committees. BWSR requires that priorities be identified. Since things change, priorities will be subject to evaluation annually, and there will be an annual planning process during which priorities can be modified based on current events. Advisory Committee recommendations differed from the local/public; however, the resource concerns and priorities tend to overlap creating a need for good communication between the various groups. All can be measured, there are just differences in how they are measured.

Concerns maps will be done for each resource in the plan to show where the concerns are in the watershed. His example for groundwater shows public drinking water supplies and springshed boundaries.

The Policy Committee reviewed the recommendations for priority resource concerns categorized as A, B, or C. Jim Kellogg moved to accept the recommendations for priority resource concerns; Tim Gabrielson seconded the motion. It was noted during discussion that the Policy Committee should indicate their preferences before voting on the motion. The members indicated their preferences on the matrix provided. There was also some discussion on flooding issues and drinking water. Chair called for the vote, which passed unanimously. The preferences of the Policy Committee aligned with those recommended.

b. Targeted Implementation Plan Structure – A Concept

Mark reviewed the concept for targeted implementation: Resource→Resource Concern→Issues→Strategies→Metric→Actions→who will do it, when will it be done,

where will it be done, with what initiatives, funding needs and funding resources. He showed an example of a measurable goal using groundwater. Each Resource will have a goal and protection and restoration strategies. In order to reduce overlapping strategies, the strategy will be listed followed by the issues that they address.

c. Governance Concepts for Targeted Plan Implementation

Larry Kramka, HEI, showed a table with the various options for governance. Key questions are 1) What does the system of governance need to do for us? and 2) What are the outcomes from collective decision-making? Some considerations are the ability to receive competitive grants and how to generate revenue for local match; the desire for consistency across the watershed for education/outreach, ordinances, etc.; landowner expectations for consistency across county boundaries; efficiencies for sharing staff; central administration, fiscal management, and reporting; and potential for large capital projects. The options on the table include Lake Improvement Districts and Watershed Management Organizations, which our project would not be eligible to form, but they do have characteristics that might be considered for a new type of governance structure if we want to go that route later. For example, "Watershed Lite", could adopt limited rules for rural development. If we want to track collective accomplishments and to evaluate and modify watershed priorities, the LGUs need to continue to work together in some form. That can begin by using one structure and then change into another later. The consensus of the group was to go forward as a group. The structure will likely be one of the options on the table. More discussion is needed at the next meeting regarding governance structure.

5. New Business

- a. Action Item: approve payment of HEI Inc. invoice #0024756, dated May 05, 2015 for \$12,750.20: Motion by Tim Gabrielson to approve the invoice; seconded by Glen Hahn; passed unanimously.
- b. Action Item: approve May 29, 2015 Financial Report : Motion by Tim Gabrielson to accept the Financial Report; seconded by Glen Hahn; passed unanimously.

6. Next meeting

- a. Review dates for upcoming meetings: Monday, July 6<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday, August 5<sup>th</sup> are agreed upon.
- b. Agenda items: Governance structure discussion. Karin Sonneman, Winona County Attorney, is willing to be available to answer questions. The August meeting may be a good time for her to attend.

7. Adjourn: Motion by Tim Gabrielson to adjourn; seconded by Jerry Mueller. Meeting adjourned at 11:54 a.m.

Upcoming Meetings of the Policy Committee:

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

**August 5, 2015: Policy Committee meeting** **NOTE CHANGE TO WEDNESDAY**

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