



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

Date: January 13th, 2020

Time: 9:00am to 12:00pm

Location: Zoom Meeting

Facilitator: Paul Marston

Attending: Rachel Wehner, Brenda Lageson, Andy Henschel, Courtney Phillips, Shaina Keseley, Dalton Syverson, Steve Jahnke, Dave Copeland, and Chad Billet.

Agenda:

1. Introduction

- Paul opened up by stating the work that he completed from the last meeting. He mentioned where we are going next and went over the agenda

2. Issue Statement Framework Document

- Paul opened up with the A1 MPCA comment: adding additional water storage goals such as two stage ditches in ditch management. Courtney said to add that in and everyone agreed. What we have listed now is the primary, Paul asked what level of effort do we give these additional projects and how do we include it as a value? The group decided on a number of BMP's vs. acres treated. The language can be encompassing of the project. We want to pursue these projects but they just might be later in the plan. The group decided to describe the projects as a group and not just say individually what they are. There is a 5 year mark that you can make amendments, so BWSR told us don't worry too much and make it realistic, as long as you are making some form of progress toward your goals that's what BWSR is looking for.
- Paul is working with the modeler to determine if the Fountain lake acre/ft. is correct.
- Goal 2 for streams – adjust verbiage for flexibility for compliance changes.
- Nitrate should be added, Paul can put verbiage in the plan regarding the state wide reduction strategy and that the projects will have a nitrogen reduction. This can be tracked using HSPF SAM.
- Under erosion and sediment control we removed urban areas from goal 1. In the measurable outcomes we will add practices that include rural/agricultural practices etc. Such as waterways. We can add verbiage that references the above TSS reductions from other projects.

- Erosion and sediment erosion – goal 2. Shoreline management include habitat, include language that touches on habitat but it is technically addressed in the habitat section of the plan.
- Adding streambank and lakeshore habitat improvements under the “improve degraded aquatic habitat” section D1 then add measureable outcomes regarding score your shore and liner feet of habitat projects.
- No till is added as a goal.
- The group decided if we want to change goal 1 to being more outreach and education focused and removing the withdrawal rates. The group decided to remove it entirely and add education and outreach to a different area of the plan or it be addressed in a different measurable outcome.
- Arsenic testing, it is done in a limited basis. The county could potentially increase the amount of testing of arsenic in the area.
- Remove the 3.0 mg/l nitrate test and instead track it and follow up. Once we get the geologic atlas state that we can be more specific and addressing Jennifer’s concern.
- Talk with Department of Health for setting up a cost share program and some outreach and education. Inform well drillers could help market the cost sharing dollars. Agree to ask the certified drillers to help promote it. Work on the private and not the permitted wells.
- First start with outreach education, if there is too much of a need then start with the prioritization process.
- The group will add in the other lakes that have drawdown potential.
- Wake boarding is an ongoing issue, putting some rules out there on setback from the shoreline but it might be addressed statewide with MAWD.
- Will make sure the clean, drain, dry method is already in place will be added.

3. Implementation Table

- The group wanted the higher priority areas first. So higher acres in the Fountain Lake area in the start, smaller in the years from 7-10. Winnebago would be smaller in the beginning years and more in the later years of the planning document.
- Not concerned on the practices of prioritization per drainage point, but just the pour points themselves.
- Paul pulled up the implementation timeline, he discussed why going over the entire pour point area into a large grouping is more beneficial over breaking out the small areas. Dave recommended adding 3 paragraphs or so in the narrative so that he can remember during the 60 day the reasoning for why that part of the plan is less precise.
- Once it gets into the format of the table, it will be easier to understand.

4. Next Steps

- Planned next meeting.