

Planning Workgroup for Root River One Watershed One Plan
Monday, March 2, 2015, 12:00 PM
Fillmore County Office Building, Rm 108, 902 Houston Street, NW, Preston

In attendance: Jennifer Ronnenberg, Dave Walter, Adam King, Steve Lawler, Brein Maki, Sheila Harmes, Dean Schrandt, Justin Hanson, Bev Nordby, Donna Rasmussen, Tom Gile, Mark Deutschman, Skip Langer

1. Facilitator for the Day – Sheila Harmes called the meeting to order at 12:43 pm.
2. Summary of Meeting Purpose (Deutschman): The next step is to take the Priority Concerns back to the Policy Committee and determine other decisions to be made by the Policy Committee as well as make plans for the public kickoff meeting.
3. Discuss A-Team Operation (Ronnenberg)
 - a. Information distribution roles and responsibilities: Brein is leaving her position with SWCD. The consensus is that Winona SWCD should remain as the fiscal agent. If that is not possible, Winona County will be approached about taking on that role; Fillmore SWCD is also an option. Sheila will take Bree's place on the Operations ("A") Team.
 - b. Decision making
4. Confirm draft schedule and set future meeting dates (Ronnenberg): It was decided to keep the same meeting dates as the Policy Committee. Mark will revise the timeline with the new meeting dates and bring it to the April 6th meeting.
5. Draft Stakeholder Plan (Deutschman)
 - a. Review and comments:
 - b. Purpose and use: The plan outlines the roles, intent of the committees and the conduct of the Advisory Committee. All affected communities should be included on the Advisory Committee. One option with the large number of people on the committee list is to divide into two committees of technical and non-technical (community) groups (e.g. ag, tourism, Chamber-have a couple of slots for each and ask Policy Committee to fill the slots). The Policy Committee will adopt the Stakeholder Plan. Local water committees can also be utilized for input, so those local committees should meet within the next month and a half to provide input into the priority concerns.
6. Status updates
 - a. Agency letters are due March 9. Mark will summarize their comments.
 - b. Information request for IWM, Stressor ID, and HSPF results from MPCA has been made by Mark.
 - c. Public meeting status: Mark will prepare a 15-minute presentation about the planning process: what it is/what it is not, planning boundary, why the plan is being done, what are the outcomes. He can prepare a webinar for later use in other venues. Maps are great for the public to better understand the watershed. Mark can print maps 54" x any length. He needs to know what we want for the meeting as far as layout and features to show: priority concerns example maps, puzzle pieces of the watershed (e.g. counties, HUC 10s), trout streams, land use, impaired streams, karst, springsheds. Have people mark where they live on the map with a pin or sticker. Maps that are

foam-backed or laminated can be used multiple times. The Lanesboro Community Center is not available April 8; the consensus is to check on the availability of Fountain's Community Center.

7. Plan Related Discussion Items

- a. Revisit and Confirm Planning Definitions: May want to remove "priority" from terms until ranking is completed to avoid the misperception that priorities are already determined.
- b. Preliminary Plan (Working) Outline: The plan outline follows the matrix format. Mark will start on quantitative goals and measures. Section 5.1.2 are other things to get done but LGUs are not the lead; other entities will lead. Section 5.2 includes the counties' statutory requirements (feedlots, septic systems, WCA, etc.) that are ongoing. A condensed version of the outline will be brought to the Policy Committee for approval. The section on rules and regulations needs to be clarified for the Committee to avoid misconceptions related to watershed district rules. Flooding, infrastructure and capital improvements may be included. Information about flood control structures should be sent to Mark (e.g. East Willow Creek, Stewartville PL566, Spring Valley PL566). Tom mentioned that MPCA (contact Justin Watkins) has funding for inventorying existing practices. Inventories that have been done in Houston County (after 2007 flood), Winona County (ponds for cleanout program), Field to Stream Partnership, Fillmore's mapping project, and eLINK summaries should be sent to Mark.
- c. Confirm planning regions for organizing the plan (Action: Decision on Boundary): The planning regions can be by major tributary or by HUC 10 boundaries, which is how the WRAPS is organized, or other geographical boundaries that make sense. A decision about the planning regions is needed very soon to be able to run PTMapp.
- d. Discuss Priority Resources, Priority Concerns, Issues Affecting Concerns Draft Matrix: The matrix is based on information from our local plans. It will change through time. Add columns for prioritizing concerns. The issues will shape the implementation plan. Could rank using high, medium and low rather than numerical rankings to avoid issues with future implementation and funding if ranked in numerical order and applying for funding for a "lower" priority. Resource definitions will be added. Homework for the Workgroup is to make additions/changes to the matrix by March 13 and send to Jennifer.

8. Summary of Meeting Decisions:

Mar will draft a presentation for the public meeting and identify the streams for protection. Workgroup members should compile a list of maps for the public meeting. Local data mentioned above, plan outline comments and matrix comments should be submitted.

9. Next meeting, facilitator(s), agenda items: March 17th at 9 am in the Conservation Building in Preston. Jennifer will facilitate. Winona staff will bring snacks.