

# Cannon River 1W1P

## Technical Advisory Group

### Meeting #10 Notes

July 18, 2018

9:00am – 12:00 pm

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

**Technical Advisory Group:** Spencer Herbert (*MDA*), Cole Johnson (*City of Northfield*), Shaina Keseley (*BWSR*), Mark Duchene (*City of Faribault*), Todd Piepho (*DNR*), Kristi Pursell (*CRWP*), Emily Resseger (*Met Council*), Justin Watkins (*PCA*)

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

**Advisory Staff:** Camilla Correll (*EOR*), Jenny Mocol-Johnson (*BWSR*)

#### ❖ **BWSR Plan Content Requirements**

- A quick review of Plan Content requirements was provided by BWSR. Requirements have been reviewed with the TAG at previous meetings. These requirements are in statute. BWSR has to make sure our Plan meets the statutory Plan Content Requirements.

#### ❖ **Present Draft Plan**

- Many sections have been reviewed throughout the planning process, however now these sections are all pulled together in a Draft Plan. The Draft was projected on the screen, and provided electronically to the TAG the morning of the meeting for participants to pull up on their own screens.
- A few comments on the Draft were noted:
  - Currently not formatted, it is easier to receive all comments and edits first, then work on formatting. The final document will also have more pictures, so if anyone has ideas for pictures while they are reviewing, they can make note of that and share those pictures.
  - Terminology was cleaned up in the Draft Plan, such as using Comprehensive Plan or Cannon River Watershed Planning Area, etc.
  - Captions and references will be updated before going out to the TAG for review.
- **Acknowledgements-** Currently does not list all county or SWCD Board members but rather lists them as a whole. No one expressed any concern with this. The list for the Advisory Committee was developed from those that attended the Open House or a Water Conversation, and does not include those who were invited but did not attend any planning meeting.
- **Acronyms, Glossary and Executive Summary-** Each of these sections was presented, while reviewing individually, people can add to these lists if anything is missing. Executive Summary will be completed before it goes out to the TAG for review.
- **Analysis and Prioritization of Issues and Concerns-** The TAG has seen this section and worked through it many times. This section defines the process we took. The section includes some graphics we have seen throughout the process, like the funnel and the layering scheme for identifying hotspots. A new table was added for summarizing all of the public engagement meetings. There is also a table that summarizes the priorities by tier and watershed management component, and this table helps narrow down priority areas even further.
- **Issues, Goals and Implementation Activities-** This is another section the TAG has been working on for a while and has seen at multiple TAG meetings. The new portion is 'Local Priorities'.
  - The BCWD and NCRWMO both intend to adopt this Comprehensive Plan as their own, and therefore they have certain plan content requirements that need to be included in this section. They will have their own

implementation schedules. It was noted that they should have their own amendment process for their sections that does not require the full Cannon River Watershed approval. There was a comment from BWSR that these sections may need to be update in order to meet the 1W1P Plan Content Requirements, which could include more measurability in the goals. There has been communication with BWSR on what is required and we believe we have achieved that. However even though the Cannon River team has asked BWSR, no formal requirements list has been provided. BWSR will provide reference on what is needed.

- There was also discussion on what the definition of 'local priority' is. The planning partners have always anticipated a section like this to capture activities that are not plan priorities but that they still intended to do. Eventually 1W1P Plans will replace County Water Plans, so they should cover all aspects of operation. LGUs would not pursue watershed based funds for these activities. Examples include no-till drill rental, tree sales, or collaboration with an active Lake Association that is not in a priority area. Having this section of the Plan to point to could be helpful if someone questions what activities can be done on their lake if it is not in a priority area. Furthermore, including local priorities allows the watershed to track activities occurring that may help further 1W1P goals. Decision: A general statement of what defines a local priority will be added and staff will populate the text if they have local priorities.
- **Targeted Implementation Schedule-** The group liked how this section laid out the decision process that could be used in the future for further prioritization or for determining if a new activity is a priority. Formatting and content of accounting for local funds section was discussed. The discussion was spurred by comments received from BWSR during review before the TAG meeting, and their confusion with the table and process. It was asked if BWSR wants to see 'shifting' of dollars and the response was no. It was asked of the group if we should add dollars from CRWP budget and the response was then we wouldn't know where to draw line on non-profits, just include local water plan authorities. There was discussion on what was included in federal dollars and the response was in 2017 it ended up only being EQIP that LGUs had some involvement in. Some questioned the final numbers and its was pointed out that the table only takes a percentage of certain grant dollars based upon the counties land area in the planning area and some programs may be in counties just not active in the snapshot 2017 year the activity was based on. Decision: Add more description on the process used for gathering data, and further describe federal dollars, or format table to communicate this better.

#### ❖ **Plan Implementation Programs Section**

- This section was provided as a paper copy since it had not been reviewed before, and BWSR had a number of comments on this section during review before the TAG meeting. General comments from BWSR included expressed in an email bfore the TAG meeting included wanting more on local priorities, address items that intend to Plan after the Plan, project future program needs not just an inventory of current programs, and better connection to Plan goals. Some of BWSRs general comments were unclear; therefore staff requested BWSR's more detailed comments that lead to the general comments. Changes were made to the Draft Plan before it was brought to the TAG meeting in order to start to address these general comments. One of the larger changes included adding more description on programmatic gaps under each program type.
- **Data Collection and Monitoring-** In response to BWSR's comments, discussion started on the monitoring plan activity. There is not the time or money and all the players are not at the table in order to develop a monitoring plan now. BWSR responded that this would then be explained in the Plan and that there are also some aspects that can be included right now that will help start the monitoring plan in the future, such as summary of existing sites or data. Comment that this is already in WRAPS and/or Land and Water Resource Inventory. Response was to put it in this section to make reference easier later on. It was noted that the other planning activities are for SSTS and Shoreland.

- **Incentive Program** - The table can be modified to have more general incentive program types such as 'Stormwater BMP Cost Share'. Discussion on future of programs included that LGUs have expressed no need to create new programs right now, but rather operate within existing programs. BWSR would like to see more here, as there are gaps identified. There is language in the draft on how existing programs could utilize a prioritization and ranking process. Decision: Include description of process that would be taken to create or modify a program.
- **Capital Improvements**- There was a lot of discussion on what the definition of capital improvement is. There is a difference between a capital improvement projects and a capital improvement plan. Capital improvements need to be addressed in the 1W1P Plan because there is a watershed district in the planning area. Some view a capital improvements plan to only be applicable if the entity has taxing authority. It was stated by BWSR that there are other ways it is defined in state statute. Due to this perceived link to taxes, listing all of the project examples in a CIP might not be supported. All of these project examples could be accomplished under incentive programs. Decision: Layout process for determining what a CIP might be in the future if it is needed. Remove examples of CIPs but keep BCWD CIP as this is applicable.
- **Operation and Maintenance**- There was discussion on O and M being different for CIPs. There is a required 25 year lifespan instead of the typical 10 years. It was asked if this is what is limiting projects to be considered CIP projects and the response was it's a consideration but not the determining factor. It was suggested to look at Crooked Creek example for both definitions of CIP and O and M.

#### ❖ **Plan Administration and Coordination Section**

- This section largely reflects direction given by the Policy Committee for becoming a Cannon River Watershed Joint Powers Board (CRWJPB). Direction given for the current draft of the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) is that the CRWJPB would not have taxing authority, no land use authority and no staff. They would be able to enter into contracts and collect member dues. The CRWJPB would be transparent and allow for a 'sounding board' for citizens. The Technical Advisory group (TAG) would essentially stay the same but become a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in order to follow structure from Board to committee. It was mentioned that a Board was started in the 2000's in response to a legislator promising state dollars but fell apart shortly after creation. This could be looked at for some guidance on what to include or not include in a JPA. There was discussion on if some members back out and if the Plan is still valid. The response from the group was yes it should still be valid it is just up to the individual to have an approved BWSR Plan if they want to receive funds. There was discussion about BWSR's comment on what funds will be needed. It was stated that that's what the implementation schedule is. BWSR would like to see more of a comparison of dollars. Legislators would like to see 1W1P replace BBR which is why more is needed. The graphs presented to the Policy Committee that break down the Implementation Schedule could also be added to the Plan.

#### ❖ **Review Process**

- Updates will be made to the Draft Plan and it will be posted end by end of week or early next week (July 23<sup>rd</sup> or 24<sup>th</sup>). The TAG will have until August 8<sup>th</sup> to submit comments. EOR will pick up edits and have the Draft Plan available for the Policy Committee by August 15<sup>th</sup>. Policy Committee is scheduled to meet September 5<sup>th</sup>. At this meeting it is anticipated that they will approve the Draft Plan to go out for 60 Day review.

#### ❖ **Next Steps**

- Next meeting will be **November 21<sup>st</sup>**, 9am at the Rice County Government Services Building.
- **Homework:** Comment on the Draft Plan by **August 8<sup>th</sup>** and EOR will make changes by **August 15<sup>th</sup>**.