



Type of Meeting: Shell Rock Winnebago One Watershed, One Plan Advisory Committee

Date: Oct 13, 2021

Time: 9:00- 11:00 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams

Facilitator: Paul Marston, ISG

Attending: Dan Girolamo, DNR; Jennifer Ronnenberg, MDH; Emily Zanon, MCPA; Dave Copeland, BWSR; Shaina Keseley, BWSR; Holly Karsjens, CVB; Brenda Lageson, Freeborn SWCD; Rachel Wehner, Freeborn County; Courtney Phillips, SRRWD; Andy Henschel, SRRWD; Rick Mammal, Audubon Member.

1. Introduction

- Paul opened the meeting by thanking the Advisory Committee for their comments. The comments that needed follow up action were discussed and can be found in the comment column. The response/action was the discussion that took place for each comment.

Comment	Meeting Goal	Response/Action
Drinking water as a separate discussion from groundwater might help elevate the importance and need for groundwater prioritization.	Discuss if and how drinking water could be incorporated into discussion	Add more discussion related to drinking water quality and consider adding a measurable issue C3. Action could include compiling information to see what are the biggest threats to drinking water safety/concerns. Feels there needs to be more arsenic testing program actions. MDH has money to host arsenic testing clinics and kits. Stearns county has examples of this.
Need to discuss how projects will be chosen. What tool will be used to cite projects? What tool/approach will be used to choose one project over another (eligibility and ranking)?	Discuss what confusion still remains and how to address.	Possible make a subsection, at a minimum more description on the project selection. Bring in an example of a map from the appendix into the report 83
This plan does not currently describe the methods for stream stabilization/restoration. Does this measurable goal include ditches and altered watercourses?	Consider adding dialogue to add more information on stream restoration approaches and opportunities	Consider more details in dialogue regarding what the specifics will be when it comes to considering methods for restoration and assessment

<p>Implement storage and multipurpose drainage management practices in drainage improvement projects occurring throughout the lifespan of this comprehensive watershed plan to help achieve identified goal and measureable outcomes</p>	<p>Implementation action called out in Table 4.6 to implement 3 water storage practices.</p>	<p>Consider more details in dialogue regarding storage projects in addition to wetlands and cover crops. Currently have it as a line item in watershed wide table. Consider removing it from just fountain lake area as is currently listed and make it open to where opportunities present themselves.</p>
<p>Goal 2, Row #2: consider deleting the number of non-compliant feedlots in each watershed. Feedlot compliance is fluid and so a particular number should not be cited.</p>	<p>Does group want to see number of non-compliant feedlots removed and keep more general?</p>	<p>Consider measuring progress through annual county feedlot reports.</p>
<p>Should there also be the current TP and TSS Levels referenced in the chart to help staff track progress?</p>	<p>Consider adding current loads for reference</p>	<p>Consider adding the existing conditions in</p>
<p>Can a number of in-lake habitat structures be decided upon?</p>	<p>Does SC have idea of specific number of practices?</p>	<p>Look to add number but will need to consider permitting and what's achievable.</p>
<p>Can the group put a number for an outcome in terms of the number of plans?</p>	<p>determine a planned number of invasive species management plans to develop</p>	<p>Look into ways of estimating number of plans to implement to add numeric goal</p>
<p>How many additional wellhead protection areas? Perhaps Jen Ronnenberg can help with an estimate.</p>	<p>Determine number of wellhead protection areas</p>	<p>MDH has 3 active systems and 8 municipal community systems they want to get going. MDH sees support from part 2 of process. Part 1 is internal to MDH which is assessment of vulnerability and delineation of area, Part 2 (1-2 yrs. after pt 1) is land use assessment, potential contaminants. Total of 11 systems will be moving into a part 2, look for notices to participate, some likely will not require much effort. Working with non-municipal systems would be area of support. Consider this where systems with no land use are potentially most at risk.</p>
<p>Regarding 'Inventory of Failing Streambanks', we encourage fluvial geomorphic approach/assessments to build an understanding of channel stability, shape, slopes, substrate, sinuosity and channel processes to help address root cause issues and prioritize stream projects. Guidance is available from the Legacy Evaluation Program (Restoration Evaluation Program, Minnesota DNR) when prioritizing and</p>	<p>Discuss, can add additional dialogue that specifies this would be the approach used.</p>	<p>See response to comment above</p>

targeting stream and river restoration efforts and DNR watershed specialists are available to assist with stream channel monitoring, assessments, and restorations.		
Has the group discussed the practice Grade Stabilization Structure (410 NRCS Practice Code)? I can envision its applicability	Discuss with group	Make sure to clarify in dialogue that the table is not all encompassing. Discuss with SC to add activities and clarify
Are the activities listed in this table really the ONLY potential activities? Or is it a list of potential.	Discuss if there is anything more to add or if group wants to change this up.	Discuss with SC to add activities and clarify
Flooding/drainage/storage was noted as a priority, so including map(s) of drained wetlands, and/or NWI, and/or FEMA, and/or public and private drainage systems, and/or hydric soils (or others) may be helpful to include.	Consider adding a map that shows these areas?	Discuss with SC to determine if we should add a map.
What if this was zoomed in to give a clearer picture of the MS4 boundary rather than the entire planning area?	Update map extents?	Discuss with SC
Should there be some discussion about the potential for larger water storage structures similar to what the CRWD is implementing?	Similar to comment above, currently list action in table 4.6 to implement additional storage. Discuss if anything else should be added	See response to comment above
Clarification through additional narrative and/or mapping needed: Is the flooding issue priority for Albert Lea or more broadly? How is flooding related to altered hydrology? What subwatershed(s) and drainage area(s) will be the focus areas? Cover crops are noted as a practice that will be used to 'store water'. Though cover crops provide multiple benefits, water storage impact value is uncertain/variable. Has there been research on this (if so, this should be included in the plan), or is this an activity as part of the plan?	Discuss how to add more clarification to this goal or if it is needed.	Consider more dialogue regarding why Albert Lea is specifically called out. Consider adding a line item to track/identify locations of flooding throughout planning area to open it up to the larger area. Add details on how upland storage relates to flooding, consider discussing/adding practices related to tile outlets/drainage, and connection to selection of locations based on multiple benefits. Add a callout/description of our assumptions to allocate storage to cover crops.
As mentioned above, explain what methodology will be utilized to complete the inventory, and to prioritize and target where this work will be completed. Will you also be incorporating stream biology and ecological functions into the project concept, design,	Discuss what factors will be considered to prioritize restoration projects once potential sites are identified.	See response to comment above

and implementation?		
I think the group could have one more conversation about the wetland restoration goal of 8,630 acres. It seems quite high.	Discuss	If group feels it is achievable will keep
Consider partnerships and engaging in strategic planning to identify groundwater monitoring needs and use trends. Discuss water supply issues, infrastructure, and water availability considerations for decision making. (see page 5 of DNR letter, 05-29-2019)	Does group want to add dialogue and actions related to building partnerships and engaging in planning related to groundwater	Goal is to improve monitoring through coordination with state agencies, consider adding to adding implementation line to make it a goal to improve coordination/enhancements with state
Can the group set a numeric goal for the non-compliant feedlots into compliance outcome? I realize it will be low due to the livestock operations in the planning area.	Given number may vary based on compliance status this may be difficult to do. Discuss if changes should be made.	See response to comment above
A bit vague, list the stream reaches and shallow lakes where you want to implement conservation and habitat projects, enhance resiliency, and limit watershed and watercourse disturbances. What biologically impaired stream reaches (WIDs) will be targeted and prioritized for implementation? Consider natural channel restoration approaches to address water quality, water quantity, biology, connectivity, and geomorphology to improve watershed health, a multi-benefit approach. Will you be focusing on shallow lakes? Which lakes? See DNR Priority Letter for specific lake restoration suggestions.	Discuss how we can provide more details regarding how and what lakes will be selected.	Consider more targeting to identify specific waterbodies where this work will be done
\$5,000 is likely not enough to complete a watershed-wide inventory of failing streambanks. Are you thinking of an online GIS approach? We recommend scaling down the effort and completing a comprehensive field based geomorphic assessment for a higher quality outcome and to help target	Discuss with group	Consider increasing amount of cost
Just tracking changes to MIBI and FIBI isn't really a measurable outcome. Can the group set a desired change in these as an outcome?	Discuss how measurable outcomes could be quantified for this action	Discuss with SC about how to set more benchmarks, reference Cedar. Could consider using the results of tracking to re-allocate implementation efforts, consider adding line item to seek grants to fund biologically monitoring.

Can the group establish a numeric goal of number of projects, number of waterbodies, or acres of treatment?	Discuss	Consider adding number of waterbodies with invasive identified as a starting point,
Can the group establish a numeric goal of acres treated for invasive species?	Discuss	Discuss with SC
Are ag. Invasive species a concern? -(palmer amaranth or others?)	Discuss	They are a concern, consider O&E on identifying and reporting, discuss with SC
not clear on funding hierarchy – Tier A, B, C all note priority therefore would be priority for funding (and staff time), so what separated A from B & C	Discuss with group how to improve clarity of this dialogue/approach	Make explanation more clear on what the tiers mean
Identifying the Lead LGU is key; however, consider including another column for other entities and organizations involved since partner coordination is important to implement successful projects (or include partners in parenthesis in Lead column) It would be beneficial when working with different divisions of the DNR, such as fisheries, wildlife, eco-waters, or parks and trails	Work with SC to add supporting entities/agencies to additional column	Work with SC to assign appropriate supporting agencies to action items
Just a suggestion to offer out. If an action has no goals for a biennium., perhaps leave it blank rather than enter a 0	Prefer how it is or make it blank?	Discuss with SC
We suggest you use the term "Joint Powers Collaboration" to describe what you plan to have for an organizational structure. The statute is for Joint Exercise of Powers so you are citing JPA language.	Discuss rewording dialogue	Discuss with SC
First sentence should be changed to read "Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan (CWMP)". You should remove specifying any specific partner as a fiscal agent or day to day contact for grant funding. As that is likely to change during the life of the plan. Instead, discuss the fact that within the partnership there will be a fiscal agent and lead contact designated. TAC should be described differently.	Discuss how team wants this described in the plan	Discuss with SC, did not include all possible partners to include as stakeholders
Will the PAC have by-laws? I assume so. It should be mentioned in this subsection. Also, expand on the TAC. It could be more than local and state reps. May be federal, NP, etc.	clarify roles within the TAC and add clarity	Discuss with SC
Any examples of this kind of work that already takes place? Specific ideas that good be cited? Also, the call out box is odd in that	Any examples of collaboration we can highlight in this section?	Discuss with SC

<p>it only cites "other" groups and SRCWMP isn't the right acronym</p>		
<p>Partnership assessment is more about looking at whether or not the planned work activities (projects, practices, and programs) were accomplished. It should generate feedback on staffing, skills, or other capacity issues affecting getting the work done. Should set a time scale-annual or biennial-usually same as work planning (so annually here).</p> <p>The purpose is to generate feedback for continuous improvement that can be used by individual entities participating in implementation partnerships as well as the partnerships themselves. Could tell you whether the same activities should be continued or if adjustments in the implementation approach need to be made. Could have a list of questions the group will answer and discuss.</p>	<p>Discuss further assessment strategies to incorporate into the plan.</p>	<p>Discuss with SC</p>
<p>This needs to be expanded on. Variety of reporting. Are they only referring to grant reporting here? From the PCRs: Reporting: Describe collaborative approaches to provide accountability to stakeholders and to meet annual reporting requirements of local governments, grant reporting requirements, and specific program and financial reporting requirements. Information on required annual reporting can be found on the BWSR website. Consider a periodic 'state of the watershed report,' individualized 'waterbody report cards', or other methods to provide accountability and demonstrate outcomes locally.</p>	<p>Discuss with SC on how they would like to report. Add approach to this section of plan.</p>	<p>Discuss with SC</p>
<p>When I look at Table 6-1 it seems very heavily loaded towards projects in the first two biennium. I think this should be reviewed as it will take time to build momentum. I think this is because of the "other funds" that you know of right now. It makes it seem like those funds are only for this plan's implementation when they are not. Maybe split out as "other funds". Talk about intent to pursue more. Also, WBIF</p>	<p>Discuss if/how we would like to break out funding sources to make this table reflect activities associated with WBIF funds more clearly.</p>	<p>Discuss with SC</p>

<p>should be caveated as anticipated. Some way of calling out secured vs anticipated funds. WBIF may not increase each biennium.</p>		
<p>Wouldn't you want to split out Competitive CWF Grants and call out specifically the WBIF grants?</p>	<p>Could add sentence specifying that table 6-3 includes funding opportunities in addition to WBIF grants?</p>	<p>Discuss with SC</p>
<p>I didn't recall seeing much if any mention of focusing on pollinator population when discussing some of the habitat actions. The BWSR Comment Letter mentions the importance of pollinators.</p>	<p>Do we want to add any dialogue related to pollinator habitat within the existing habitat framework of this plan to touch on this?</p>	<p>Discuss with SC, we have framework discussing native habitat so can add dialogue discussing importance of pollinators.</p>
<p>Is there some precipitation and runoff trend data that can be in the Plan and some more narrative on this trend and the need to factor this in planning?</p>	<p>Consider adding more dialogue in earlier sections discussing how implementation actions listed in this plan will help build resiliency to expected changes in climate trends?</p>	<p>Consider adding more dialogue within plan dialogue regarding this.</p>

2. Next steps

- Paul provided closing comments, timeline and process moving forward were also discussed that includes when the plan will go out for formal comment.