

Root River 1 Watershed 1 Plan  
Planning Workgroup Meeting Notes  
May 4, 2015  
Rm 108, Fillmore County Office Bldg. Preston

In attendance: Donna Rasmussen (Fillmore SWCD), Daryl Buck (Winona SWCD), Justin Hanson (Mower SWCD), Tom Gile (BWSR), Sheila Harms (Winona Co.), Adam King (Dodge SWCD), Dave Walter (Root River SWCD), Jennifer Ronnenberg (Fillmore SWCD), Drew Kessler (HEI), Mark Deutschman (HEI)

1. Facilitator Dave Walter called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. The meeting agenda was reviewed and approved.
2. Confirm meeting dates / potential conflicts: June 3<sup>rd</sup> will be the next meeting following the Policy Committee meeting. It may be necessary to hold a late May meeting to develop a recommendation for prioritization to present to the Policy Committee on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. The consensus was to have a conference call for the PWG.
3. Old business
  - a. Draft resource / concern matrix: Mark cleaned up the terminology and spelling. The soil health discussion brought up how to present multiple benefits for both water quality and quantity. We need to resolve how to end up with the priorities and make a recommendation to the Policy Committee. Take the votes from the public, Advisory Committee, Local Water Management committees, Planning Work Group, and others; could weigh the votes for specific groups; or the PWG could use its collective knowledge and experience to qualitatively decide. Mark will combine all the scores. With 20+ potential resources of concern, they might be categorized as high (~8), medium (~8) and low (~8) or A, B, C. Low can still be done but LGUs won't necessarily take the lead. Annual plans and reviews can be used to adjust implementation to fit specific circumstances.
  - b. Planning region recommendation: The consensus is to use the HUC-10 scale as the planning regions. The Root River, Upper Iowa and Mississippi-Reno boundaries will be divided into three separate sections in the plan.
  - c. Stakeholder Involvement Plan: The Policy Committee approved the plan.
  - d. Public meeting post mortem: Input from the Local Water Management committees is needed as soon as possible. Houston County is meeting Thursday. Dodge's meeting is unknown; Adam can check with Dean; could also combine with Mower's meeting. Send results to Mark by May 22nd. Mark recommends that we plan for another public meeting prior to the public hearings. A draft implementation plan should be ready for this proposed meeting. This will be discussed more later.
4. New business
  - a. Planning Work Group prioritization exercise: Each person got two dots to indicate their preferences for priorities.
  - b. Agency comment letters: Donna will prepare the letter for the Chair to sign. Mark will send the matrix to be included as an attachment with the agency priorities marked.

- c. Update on questionnaire status: An example of an online public survey was reviewed that addresses flooding. Others will be developed for the “A” priorities, with a secondary purpose of finding specific locations for potential implementation practices. If someone does not want to fill it out online, we can offer to have them come in and help them fill it out. We will also consider surveys that allow comments as each of the planning components move forward, ie: priority process, goals setting, implementation plan.
  - d. Concept framework for measurable goals: include a metric to determine if the goal is being met or if progress is being made. Can be measured in reductions in pounds of sediment, phosphorus or acres of practices or acres treated, for example.
  - e. Protection strategy: the concept was reviewed by Mark and there was discussion of some of the ideas that the Advisory Committee had, such as special recognition for state and federal lands, county parks. Should we include those reaches on the cusp of being impaired or barely impaired that, with a little effort, could meet standards? It was suggested to add WMAs.
  - f. Structuring the targeted implementation plan: Mark showed a possible structure with the categories: Statutory Obligations, Cost Share (or Financial Assistance), Education/Information/Outreach/Data Programs, General Operations, and Capital Projects. He will work on definitions and additions. Mark and Tom will contact MPCA for a list of streams considered to be the top five and those close to being impaired for protection.
  - g. Discussion of topics affecting plan content and direction: HEI is beginning to write sections of the plan not dependent on the prioritization process. Emerging issues include climate change and administration and policy affecting how plans are funded.
5. Summary of meeting decisions: next meeting will be facilitated by Daryl Buck; treats by Root River SWCD.
  6. Meeting adjourned