



# Cannon River

## One Watershed, One Plan

“Aligning local water planning on major watershed boundaries with state strategies towards prioritized, targeted and measurable implementation plans”

### Minutes

#### Policy Committee Meeting

April 24, 2019

Rice County Government Services Building  
320 Third St NW, Faribault, MN 55021

**Policy Committee Members:** Brad Anderson (Goodhue County), Kevin Chamberlain (Dakota SWCD), Richard Cook (Rice SWCD), Cletus Gregor (Le Sueur SWCD), James Hedeem (Belle Creek WD), Jeff Beckman (Goodhue SWCD), Mike Slavik (Dakota County), Steven Rohlfing (Le Sueur County), Sandy Weber (NCRWMO)

**Also in Attendance:** Brad Becker (Dakota County staff), Brad Behrens (Rice County staff), Haley Byron (Waseca County staff), Ashley Gallagher (Dakota SWCD staff), Eric Gulbransen (Steele SWCD staff), Beau Kennedy (Goodhue SWCD staff), Holly Kalbus (Le Sueur County staff), Mike Schultz (Le Sueur SWCD staff), Brian Watson (Dakota SWCD staff), Jennifer Mocol-Johnson (BWSR), Kristi Pursell (CRWP), Lee Dilley (Dakota County Resident), Bard Judd (Le Sueur County Resident), Nora Felton (Dakota County Resident)

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair Rohlfing called the meeting to order at 9:02 am.

#### 2. Public Hearing

**Motion by Anderson, Second by Gregor to open the public hearing. Motion carried.**

After a presentation about the planning process and the Plan, the room was opened up to questions and comments. Official response to comments will be submitted to BWSR when the Plan is submitted for 60-day review. The response to comments spreadsheet will also be posted online. Two members of the general public provided comments.

Bard Judd of Le Sueur County, Lake Francis Lake Association asked and stated: That high water levels in the headwater lakes area have been an issue, and she wanted to know what was being done to assess and address this issue.

Lee Dilley of Southern Dakota County generally stated: He commends the group for their work on the Plan. He feels that education is needed especially in regards to soil health. There are extensive opportunities for improving soil health and would like the group to consider regenerative agriculture as a means to healthy soils. One example is the work done by CRWP in

the Rice Creek watershed, where farmers are implementing cover crops. He believes that public dollars should also be used to help farmers implement cover crops.

There were also a few general questions that were not formal comments. One question was in regards to how the groundwater priority areas were determined. Answer was that map has call outs with reasoning; the eastern portion is primarily due to sensitivity (i.e. fast infiltration through primarily sandy soils or karst topography) while the western priority area has groundwater fed lakes. There was a question from a Policy Committee member on the comment letter from Metropolitan Council and wanting clarification on the 8410 rules as it seems they were referring to the entire watershed not just the metro area. Answer is that 8410 rules are the metropolitan surface water management act, and only pertain to the metro counties. Based up on Metropolitan Council comments, NCRWMO still needs to have a discussion on whether its makes the most sense for them to adopt the 1W1P Plan or maintain their own.

**Motion by Weber, second by Hedeem to close the public hearing. Motion carried, closed at 9:40 am.**

3. Approval of Agenda

**Motion by Anderson, second by Slaivk to approve the agenda. Motion carried.**

4. Approval of Minutes

**Motion by Slavik, second by Beckman to approve the minutes of the March 13, 2019 Policy Committee meeting. Motion carried.**

5. Financial Summary and Invoices for Payment

Gallagher mentioned that the amendment for an additional \$12,000 from BWSR has been executed. The amendment as well as the full use of the contingency funds is reflected in the updated budget column.

**Motion by Anderson, second by Beckman to recommend approval of invoices for payment. Motion carried.**

6. 60-Day Comment Summary

All of the comment letters were included in the Policy Committee packets. There were a total of 162 comments received from 12 different organization or agencies. To assist with review the comments were grouped into three categories: comments requiring TAG decisions (14%), comments related to checking numbers (12%) and comments that were grammatical/clarifying in nature (74%). There were also only 5 comments related to meeting Plan Content Requirements. Efforts will be made to address all comments, and ensure the Plan Content Requirements are met.

There was some questions and discussion on comments. Policy Committee wanted to know how questions about priority areas were being address. The process for selecting priorities was robust and only so much can be accomplished in 10 years. In all cases except the Waseca Lakes,

the priorities will remain as they are. The Waseca Lakes area had some weight of evidence for becoming a priority area in the beginning of the planning phases, however it was not carried throughout the Plan very well. For these reasons, Waseca Lakes will be better addressed as a priority area. There was also discussion on 8410 rules, NCRWMO may choose to not adopt the 1W1P Plan, however still be a participant in the CRWJPB. In the St Croix 1W1P, metro entities are choosing to maintain their own plans but participate in the greater 1W1P Plan.

#### 7. Public/Private/Non-Profit Collaboration

The Cannon River 1W1P was approached at the end of 2018 by the non-profit Environmental Initiative about exploring a potential partnership, similar to what has formed in the Cedar River Watershed in Mower County. A video of the Cedar River Watershed Partnership was presented. There have been a few meetings to discuss the potential partnership, and the draft mission, vision and draft goals were included in the Policy Committee packet. The group just selected the name Cannon River Agricultural Collaborative. The work area would be the entire watershed, but it's recognized that there are overlaps and potential targeted work could occur in the sub-watersheds of Prairie Creek, Rush Creek and Medford Creek. There was a question about what the collaborative would do. They are still working towards activities, but it could even be as simple as sharing resources and learning about the work of others. This in turn could help all of us provide better services to the farmers. Communication can also lead to better coordination of financial resources.

#### 8. Implementation Vision

##### A. Purpose, Mission and Vision

A list of options was included in the Policy Committee packet. The Policy Committee did not need to make final selections. There were two options for the purpose, one was presented at the last meeting and was pulled from the JPA, the other is a simplified version that focuses on more on plan implementation than on creating the plan. The Policy Committee prefers options #2. There were four options for the mission that incorporated input from the last Policy Committee meeting. The option in bold was crafted by the full PWG. After some discussion there is preference for option #3, however Policy Committee would like to see agricultural and urban communities from option #4 incorporated as well. The options for vision were reviewed; once again the bold option was crafted by the PWG. The Policy Committee likes option #1; however the use of future generations should be in either the mission or vision, not both. The PWG will word smith the selected options and bring back to the Policy Committee.

##### B. Cost-Share Policy Structure

A presentation on cost-share policy options was provided. There are essentially three different options: sub-agreements, CRWJPB approve all projects, or combination of the two with a threshold that is either a ranking number or dollar amount. There was discussion on the options. Many Policy Committee member felt they did not want to meet monthly, therefore support an aspect of sub-agreements where local Boards have approval authority. It was pointed out that the workplan will lay out who is getting money and where/how it will be spent, which would then be formalized in sub-agreements. Sub-agreements could be templated by attorney to ease process of entering into sub-agreements. The SEMNWRB

used sub-agreements effectively for many years. BWSR made a point that money should not just be divided equally. It was also noted that there will need to be consistency in ranking and reporting. The staff envisioned developing one ranking form and one reporting tool to be used by all entities. Reporting could be on a quarterly basis and should document match as well. After discussion the Policy Committee supports the combination with threshold approach. There was some discussion on the dollar value of \$50,000 for a threshold. Suggested as a project over \$50,000 falls into a different category for BWSR, also what Scott WMO uses. The \$50,000 was supported by staff and Policy Committee.

9. Timeline Update and Next Meeting

It was suggested the Policy Committee meet on June 5<sup>th</sup>. At this meeting they would approve the Plan for 90-day review. This is slightly delayed from the previous timeline, however it was noted that BWSR Board does not meet in July and therefore delaying had no impact on final timeline and allowed for more time to respond to comments. Policy Committee will meet on June 5<sup>th</sup>, location to be determined.

10. Adjourn

**Motion by Hedeem, second by Slavik to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.**

Respectfully Submitted,



Galen Malecha, Secretary

Cannon River Watershed 1W1P Policy Committee