

# Cannon River 1W1P

## Technical Advisory Group

### Meeting #9 Notes

June 20, 2018

9:00am – 12:00 pm

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

**Technical Advisory Group:** Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Emily Resseger (*Met Council*), Brad Rademacher (*City of Owatonna*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), 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*)

#### ❖ Current Programs and Funding

- At that last TAG meeting there was discussion on local funds, and how does current funding compare to what the Draft Implementation Table is showing. Information on existing programs and budgets was gathered from the LGUs to help accomplish this task. There was discussion on consistency of landowner match for state cost-share, county drainage, and federal dollars. Follow-up with a few people will be needed to make these categories consistent. Summary indicated that in 2017 there was 3.4 million in match/local/federal dollars and 1.2 million in state dollars within the watershed. This helped confirm that the 2.5 million a year in the implementation plan is comparable.

#### ❖ Targeted Implementation Schedule

- A brief overview on the draft language and the draft table was provided. This table/schedule is a road map and it is adaptive. More detail and further prioritization will occur during work planning with tools such as PTMapp.

#### ❖ Review Sub-group Calls

- At the last TAG meeting, members volunteered for more focused discussions on the implementation activities. Six conference calls were held with members and EOR in order to further review and fill in the implementation table. A participant of each call provided an overview to the group of what was accomplished.
- **Groundwater** – MDH staff put a lot of work into reviewing and refining the activities and costs. Activities that overlapped with others, like soil health or Agricultural Leaching Loss, were moved in the Landscape Concern tab in order to avoid double counting of an activity. The overlap is described in the table and the text of the Plan.
- **Shoreland and SSTS** – Some thought after the call that maybe an activity on feasibility studies for SSTS should be added. There was discussion as to whether that should be a plan or local priority, and it depends on the area. Decision: Add language to D-1 activity to incorporate feasibility. For shoreland, there were changes to help prioritize the inventories, and anything related to buffer law was removed.
- **Ag and Soil Health** – Eliminated activities that were too general and were replicated with more detailed activities elsewhere. Removed any language on 'regulation' and incorporated conservation plans, soil loss compliance through BMPs etc. Nutrient management and manure management are too different and were separated. Added activities to target feedlots and grazing. Combined a number of activities related to perennial cropland or vegetation.

- **Socioeconomics** – Many activities were combined, and dollar figures were added. Terminology still needs to be changed to maintain consistency, such as ‘Planning Area Wide’.
  - **Drainage**- Many of the activities were developed during the initial drainage meeting, however before the call extra effort was put in to gather dollar estimates from past projects or engineer estimates. The Multipurpose Drainage Management plans will be important, especially since ditch improvements ‘must address water quality’ but that does not mean anything has to be implemented.
  - **Flooding and Climate Resilience** –The majority of this call was spent filling in dollar estimates. Activities related to climate were combined and simplified.
- ❖ **Implementation Table Summary**
- EOR assigned a category to each activity and was then able to summarize the activity by activity type (Monitoring, Feasibility, Projects, etc.). The activities were also summarized by watershed management component. A powerpoint presentation displayed a variety of graphs depicting the summarized activities. The same presentation will be provided to the Policy Committee. Overall the group was comfortable with the way the activity category percentages turned out. They feel the Policy Committee wants to see projects and the activities reflect that. In total there are 69 activities and 20 of those are projects. There were a few suggestions for updating the powerpoint prior to the Policy Committee meeting, such as adding more dollar figures, switching order of slides and updating percentages. There was discussion on the activity of converting cropland to perennial cropland or vegetation. This activity is very large, but it is also factoring in the costs of easements, which is why it is so high. Some concern over ‘converting cropland’ but it was also mentioned that it doesn’t have to be land retirement, but perennial crops would work too. Dollars in this activity could always be shifted in work planning if similar benefits are achieved with other activities.
- ❖ **Plan Implementation Programs Section**
- Draft section of the Plan was presented. This section will assess existing programs or any potential for new programs. Activities currently do not require the creation of new programs, but rather work within and modify existing programs. Sub-section on Incentive Programs needs clarification from local staff, including filling in ‘x’ on tables and adding programs. We need more direction from Policy Committee before sections pertaining to governance structure can be completed, or creation of new programs. There may need to be a ranking of applications process for placing priority on projects in priority areas. Could even include increasing cost-share percentage. This section also discusses plan verses local priorities.
  - Another sub-section is Capital Improvements. BWSR presented a draft guidance document. There was discussion as to why we even need to have CIP in our plan. The definition of CIP varies greatly across the state. Frustration was expressed with BWSRs process that continues to develop new policy and new guidance documents when we are nearing Plan completion. Decision: Keep a broad definition of CIP in the plan.
  - Remaining sub-sections include operation and maintenance, regulation and ordinances, and monitoring.
  - This entire section will continue to be refined.
- ❖ **Plan Administration and Coordination Section**
- This section will also require more work after the Policy Committee provides guidance on organization structure and what abilities they want a JPB to have or not have.
- ❖ **Next Steps**
- Next meeting will be **July 18<sup>th</sup>**, 9am at the Rice County Government Services Building.
  - **Homework:** Ashley will coordinate with staff on the programs and budget table, and EOR will continue to refine the plan.