



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

Date: October 13th, 2021

Time: 1:30pm to 4:00pm

Location: Zoom Meeting

Facilitator: Paul Marston

Attending: Rachel Wehner, Courtney Phillips, Dave Copeland, Shaina Keseley, Brenda Lageson and Andy Henschel.

Agenda:

1. Introduction:
 - Paul gave a recap of this morning; the discussion included the difference between informal and formal comments, and the advisory committee comments.

2. Comments: below is the table that that the advisory committee member comments in the comment box. The AC discussion is the discussion that we had at the morning meeting. Finally the SC Response/Action column is the discussion that the Steering Committee had to each of the comments provided by the AC. The blue colored cells were added by Paul for the SC to discuss but were not discussed with the AC.

Comment	AC Discussion	SC Response/Action
Drinking water as a separate discussion from groundwater might help elevate the importance and need for groundwater prioritization.	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	Add dialogue to include drinking water as a component to groundwater and add line in outcomes referencing additional arsenic testing county will support. County will coordinate with MDH to add arsenic testing.

	<p>program actions. MDH has money to host arsenic testing clinics and kits. Stearns county has examples of this.</p>	
<p>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)?</p>	<p>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 pg83</p>	<p>Outline the prioritization process better but also make more clear implementation is based on land owner participation.</p>
<p>Think we covered it, but while reviewing was thinking of the recent drought and concerns that go along with that, which with how wet it's been in previous years it's not always on the top of our list of concerns</p>		<p>Make sure general language regarding fluctuations in weather patterns is included and how plan builds resiliency for landscape. Include language describing considerations engineers use when designing for various climate conditions.</p>
<p>This plan does not currently describe the methods for stream stabilization/restoration. Does this measurable goal include ditches and altered watercourses?</p>	<p>Consider more details in dialogue regarding what the specifics will be when it comes to considering methods for restoration and assessment</p>	<p>Expand on what practices will be considered in stream restoration approaches and incorporate natural channel design</p>
<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 measurable outcomes</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>Make sure there is language added to discuss collaboration with drainage authority to identify opportunities in the future (i.e. 3:1 side slopes). Look to work with drainage authority to promote alternative approaches.</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>Consider measuring progress through annual county feedlot reports.</p>	<p>Have target of 3 feedlots and change language to make it clear it is targeting biggest infractions.</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 the existing conditions in</p>	<p>Add existing load and percent reduction</p>
<p>Can a number of in-lake habitat structures be decided upon?</p>	<p>Look to add number but will need to consider permitting and what's achievable.</p>	<p>For in-lake habitat list 10 and add dialogue that number of hurdles exist to get there (permitting engineering design etc.)</p>
<p>Can the group put a number for an outcome in terms of the number of plans?</p>	<p>Look into ways of estimating number of plans to implement to add numeric goal, start with number of resources with invasive</p>	<p>Add detail to what a plan would entail and make numeric goal 1</p>
<p>How many additional wellhead protection areas? Perhaps Jen Ronnenberg can help with an estimate.</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>Add in years 7 -10, call out providing support as needed for phase 2 of the planning efforts</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 targeting stream and river restoration efforts and DNR watershed specialists are available to assist with stream channel monitoring, assessments, and restorations.</p>	<p>See response to comment above</p>	<p>See response to comment above</p>
<p>Has the group discussed the practice Grade Stabilization Structure (410 NRCS Practice Code)? I can envision its applicability</p>	<p>Make sure to clarify in dialogue that the table is not all encompassing. Discuss with SC to add activities and clarify</p>	<p>Make sure to clarify in dialogue that the table is not all encompassing.</p>
<p>Are the activities listed in this table really the ONLY potential activities? Or is it a list of potential.</p>	<p>Discuss with SC to add activities and clarify</p>	<p>Send out completed table to team to get input on practice applicability</p>
<p>In lake Habitat isn't even listed as 1 for habitat. Most of these are missing dots; didn't I send this to you filled in?</p>		
<p>AIS stuff is missing in the AIS section</p>		
<p>Develop co geo atlas: is there a groundwater protection issue we</p>		

can claim?		
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.	Discuss with SC to determine if we should add a map.	Add
What if this was zoomed in to give a clearer picture of the MS4 boundary rather than the entire planning area?	Discuss with SC	Update map
Should there be some discussion about the potential for larger water storage structures similar to what the CRWD is implementing?	See response to comment above	Add dialogue to include discussion of larger scale storage projects with drainage authority as well as moving back to allow more time for BWSR to develop storage program
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?	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.	Dialogue on Albert Lea is more impacted by flooding, will not add tracking planning area wide. See discussion regarding coordinating with drainage authority. Add callout for cover crop storage
What was the stakeholder's survey? If I remember right this was weighted more to get some		Leave as is

<p>lakes a higher score. I would like to see more justification/reasoning for the ranking included in the plan or what went into the ranking</p>		
<p>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, and implementation?</p>	<p>See response to comment above</p>	
<p>I think the group could have one more conversation about the wetland restoration goal of 8,630 acres. It seems quite high.</p>	<p>If group feels it is achievable will keep</p>	<p>Triple check methodology math and background to confirm</p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Spell out that there will be continued efforts to monitor wells and report to state agency, coordinate future efforts through collaboration with DNR as needed.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>See response to comment above</p>	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Consider more targeting to identify specific waterbodies where this work will be done</p>	<p>Be more specific in what lakes are considered (consider DNR priority lakes but not exclude other lakes if priorities arise).</p>
<p>\$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</p>	<p>Consider increasing amount of cost</p>	<p>raise up to \$10k</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Expand on how information will be used but it is not our intention to add more monitoring</p>

	fund biological monitoring.	
Can the group establish a numeric goal of number of projects, number of waterbodies, or acres of treatment?	Consider adding number of waterbodies with invasive identified as a starting point,	If invasives are detected work to manage. Nothing currently planned
Can the group establish a numeric goal of acres treated for invasive species?	Discuss with SC	
Are ag. Invasive species a concern? -(palmer amaranth or others?)	They are a concern, consider O&E on identifying and reporting, discuss with SC	Add discussion about invasive threats and how to react if/when presence is detected. Tie into invasive species management plan
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	Make explanation more clear on what the tiers mean	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 assign appropriate supporting agencies to action items	Include for "obvious" ones, for groundwater MDH, in lake habitat DNR
Just a suggestion to offer out. If an action has no goals for a biennium., perhaps leave it blank	Discuss with SC	leave as is

rather than enter a 0		
Mud, Goose, Eberhart and Church should have a priority?		Add mud and goose then add Eberhart and Church as priority wetland waterbodies for habitat as identified by stakeholders.
City is listed as regulating septic and feedlots?? The county takes care of septic within the city...		
SWCD might also check the box for wetland management and invasives? Which is done on land enrolled in programs/easements through the SWCD. Also SWCD is a TEP member for WCA, not sure if that is worth mentioning		
"Track nitrate testing results". We're tracking all results		
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 with SC	Rachel will check to see if it is an issue, if not we will call it a JPC. If it is an issue we will look to remove reference to MN statute in first paragraph if not in MOA, Courtney to check.
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	Discuss with SC, did not include all possible partners to include as stakeholders	Add dialogue to clarify that they are fiscal agent at time of planning. For TAC include other stakeholders (audobahn, lake associates, public, etc.)

described differently.		
<p>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.</p>	Discuss with SC	Cite it in the dialogue
<p>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 it only cites "other" groups and SRCWMP isn't the right acronym</p>	Discuss with SC	Reach out to SC members to see if there are examples
<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). 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</p>	Discuss with SC	Add dialogue to describe self-assessment and gaps analysis of why goals may not have been achieved and incorporate.

<p>be continued or if adjustments in the implementation approach needs to be made. Could have a list of questions the group will answer and discuss.</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</p>	<p>Include dialogue about annual watershed report, public meetings; coordinate with Courtney to get information on this to build out.</p>
<p>When I look at Table 6-1 it seems very heavily loaded towards projects in the first two biennium's. 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</p>	<p>Discuss with SC</p>	<p>Use \$322,128 for each biennium for WBIF, add * to WBIF and call out subject to legislative approval/allocation, look to clarify secured vs unsecured</p>

<p>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 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>Discuss with SC</p>	<p>Could split out</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>Discuss with SC, we have framework discussing native habitat so can add dialogue discussing importance of pollinators.</p>	<p>Include more here, add dialogue</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 within plan dialogue regarding this.</p>	<p>City of albert lea adopted climate adaption plan, reference in plan. Also look at referencing DNR climate information</p>

3. Next Steps:

- Dave was going to provide language on the IFI and IBI scores for the Cedar.
- Shaina was is going to look at the reporting framework
- Courtney is going to look at the MOA for Statute language and send out the comments to the Policy Committee.