

Cannon River 1W1P

Technical Advisory Group

Meeting #8 Notes

May 16, 2018

9:00am – 12:00 pm

Rice County Government Center
320 Third St NW, Faribault, MN 55021

Technical Advisory Group: Cole Johnson (*City of Northfield*), Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Melissa King (*City of Faribault*), Peggy Obear (*PIIC*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Emily Resseger (*Met Council*), Bob Stark (*Red Wing*), Justin Watkins (*MPCA*), Brad Rademacher (*City of Owatonna*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), Jennifer Ronnenberg (*MDH*), Spencer Herbert (*MDA*)

Planning Work Group: Brad Becker (*Dakota County*), Brad Behrens (*Rice County*), Haley Byron (*Waseca County*), Ashley Gallagher (*Dakota SWCD*), Eric Gulbransen (*Steele SWCD*), Beau Kennedy (*Goodhue SWCD*), Holly Kalbus (*LeSueur County*), Josh Mankowski (*LeSueur County*), Steve Pahs (*Rice SWCD*), Glen Roberson (*Goodhue SWCD*), Mark Schaetzke (*Waseca SWCD*), Mike Schultz (*LeSueur SWCD*), Brian Watson (*Dakota SWCD*).

Advisory Staff: Camilla Correll (*EOR*), Meghan Funke (*EOR*), Jenny Mocol-Johnson (*BWSR*), Julie Westerlund (*BWSR*)

❖ Example Plan

- An example Plan from Lake Superior North was presented to provide a big picture view of where we are currently with our plan and the direction we are headed. We are to the Programs sections and will still have to add administrative section.
 - There was discussion on the Implementation Table in the Lake Superior North Plan. Question: can we eliminate project lead since we will be operating under a Joint Powers Board (JPB)? Answer: Possibly.
 - There was also discussion on Project Partners. There was some concern that this could become out of date during a 10 year Plan. BWSR assured that this is understood, and they would not make you only partner with those listed. Language could be added to the Plan to indicate the flexibility.

❖ Priority Areas

- An overview on the prioritization process was provided, including presenting of the maps and layering of information (zonation, non-point priority funding plan, HSPF, etc.) that was used to select priority areas with multiple benefits. Potential areas to be added were discussed:
 - Etter Creek/Lower Vermillion River- meets the criteria established for other priority areas. PIIC would support this. Many though this area was already included because it is part of the Lower Mississippi River Bottoms priority area. It is in that priority area, but the decision to make it a Tier 1 stream would also highlight the drainage area to the stream as priority for certain activities. Decision: Include the stream and call it the Lower Vermillion River as this matches with the impairments in the area.
 - Comment was made that better maps are needed for people to identify where are the priority areas, streams and drainage areas are within the watershed.
 - Pine Creek- Discussion on whether it is a Tier 1 stream. It is a trout stream but it is also ditched in the upper portions in Dakota County. Rice creek is also a ditched trout stream. Decision: Pine and Rice are currently not Tier 1 and it should remain so. Activities related to Pine will stay in the table until it is decided how to address them or move them.
 - Waseca Lakes- They are part of the Lakes Priority area and important to the wetland, shoreland and groundwater goals. There was discussion on creating Tier 2 lakes, but the idea did not move forward. Correction to the Priority Area Lakes was made, Dudley and Kelly are one basin. Decision: Lakes Area will become more defined in the activities, especially those related to shoreland.

❖ **Draft Issues, Goals and Implementation Activities**

- The word document will still need to be rectified with the updates made to the Implementation Table. A section on local priorities has been added for Belle Creek Watershed District and North Cannon River Watershed Management Organization. These sections will be developed with Beau and Ashley. This topic lead to discussion on Plan priorities versus local priorities.

❖ **Future Vision**

- Plan vs Local Priorities
 - BWSR has some guidance in the Plan Contents Requirements version 2.0 that was passed out at the meeting. We are not held to version 2.0 since it came out after we started planning, but we are meeting it anyways. Local priorities can be included as either a narrative or a table. BWSR is also working on two more documents that could help with this task and will send those out. Developing the Implementation Programs section may also help determine how to proceed.
- Workplans and BWSR Grants
 - Examples from the Root River and Yellow Medicine watershed were provided. Emphasis was made that these are pilot workplans on a pilot watershed based funding program. Workplans are done in eLink just like the competitive grants and includes attachments.
 - Assurance measures- discussion on how BWSR will have to respond to legislature and there will be measures to track this.
 - Root River- Information in workplan included potential project numbers, and pollutant reduction estimates. Categories included all Agriculture Practices lumped together. They did not have priority areas in their Watershed Plan so significant time was spent on this. It was also mentioned that this was intentional in the Root Plan but it does not seem to be playing out as planned. Other categories included Project Development, technical Assistance and grant Administration.
 - Timeframe – Workplans would be done every 2 years and last for the 3 year grant period. Comments were made that this process should be kept simple and that workplans could potentially be a lot of work if doing them 5 times in a 10 year Plan duration. Having an Implementation Table with the right amount of detail will help ease this process. BWSR is still determining the right level of detail for the workplans.
 - Key Milestones- A schedule of milestones for the 3 year grant period will also need to be developed. It was mentioned that Yellow Medicine may be running SAM every year but this is not confirmed and would likely not be needed.
 - Yellow Medicine- Categories are more general and include Equipment, Technical Services, Administration and Priority BMP Implementation. They have smaller Priorities developed, similar to our Plan.
 - Other Workplans- SWCDs and Counties will continue to do annual workplanning.

❖ **Implementation Programs**

- There was a brief overview that an Implementation Programs section will need to be drafted. This was somewhat covered earlier when discussing Plan versus Local Priorities. BWSR will provide further guidance on this section.

❖ **Draft Implementation Table**

- Full Time Equivalent (FTE)- This was helpful to help people understand and enter information, but too difficult to sum. FTE will be converted to dollars and only dollars will remain in the table. General assumption that a staff person with benefits, space etc. is \$80,000 a year, so a .1 FTE would equate to \$8,000.

- Overlap- Any overlapping activities will be placed in only one spot in the Implementation Table in order to avoid counting dollars multiple times. Many from the Resource Concerns tab now reside in the Landscape Concerns tab. Overlaps will also be explained in the narrative.
- Color coding and goals- A handout was provided on the meaning of colors within the Implementation Table. Blue is monitoring activity, green is potential local priority, orange requires group discussion and purple is an education activity that could be moved.
- Resources Tab – Edits made directly to the table as discussion occurred.
 - Monitoring- Discussion about what a sufficient monitoring schedule is. BWSR Watershed Based Funding cannot be used for monitoring but that does not mean we should exclude it from the Plan. This led to greater discussion on funding sources and how to indicate this in the plan.
 - Funding sources- Discussion on whether we should try and limit our total budget. Budget shows the need for dollars, could also be interpreted by the general public in a negative way and the Plan will have to be presented so that the assumption is not that Watershed Based Funding pays for everything. A pie chart would be a good way to convey information to Policy Committee and general public. Action: Need to gather information on local money currently spent in the watershed. This is same as items previously discussed and BWSR can provide further guidance. Discussion on how to show funding sources in the implementation table, asterisk or footnotes was discussed. Decision: Change ‘other funding sources’ column to ‘potential funding sources’ and list Clean Water Funds with all other options.
 - Monitoring continued- Does not have to just be staff, look at the citizen monitoring program to determine where monitoring is already occurring on Tier 1 lakes. More discussion is needed on what a sufficient schedule and scale is. Probably not going to see the changes we want to see in 10 years. State has invested dollars in tools and models because they recognize that it is too expensive to monitor everything. BWSR is not expecting water monitoring data as proof of Plan success. Decision: Monitoring seems to be a Tier 1 issue and activities could be combined into creating one plan for all monitoring activities.
- Remaining Priority Concerns- Members volunteered to provide more detailed input on activities. EOR/Ashley will coordinate with members, refine the table and bring back to the next TAG meeting.
 - Groundwater- Jennifer Ronnenberg
 - Ag Runoff and Soil Health- Spencer Herbert and Steve Pahs
 - Flooding and Climate Change- Cole Johnson, Jenny Mocol-Johnson
 - Shoreland and SSTS- Josh Mankowski, Holly Kalbus and Jenny Mocol-Johnson
 - Drainage- Mike Schultz and Steve Pahs
 - Socioeconomics- Emily Resseger and Brian Watson

❖ Next Steps

- Next meeting will be **June 20th**, 9am at the Rice County Government Services Building.
- **Homework:** Review and provide input on contents of the draft Implementation Table. Ashley and EOR will reach out to those who volunteered to help fill the implementation table.