

# Shell Rock - Winnebago River 1W1P Memorandum

**Date:** January 27, 2020

**To:** Shell Rock - Winnebago River 1W1P Policy Committee

**From:** Julie Blackburn, RESPEC (julie.blackburn@respec.com or 651.605.5705)

**RE:** Summary of the Advisory Committee meeting and the Steering Committee's responses to their feedback.

---

This memorandum presents an overview of the December 16, 2019 Shell Rock – Winnebago River 1W1P Advisory Committee meeting, including attendees, agenda, feedback and input received at the meeting. The Steering Committee met on January 16, 2020 to review the feedback received from the Advisory Committee and address comments as deemed appropriate. The changes the Advisory Committee made to the issues and goals are also discussed in this memorandum.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING FORMAT AND PARTICIPATION

The Advisory Committee met on December 16, 2019 from 9:00 am to 10:30 am at the Freeborn County Government Center. There were 22 participants at the meeting, including representation from the Steering Committee. Advisory Committee members were provided notice to the meeting on October 24, 2019. The agenda and a memorandum regarding agenda materials was sent to Advisory Committee members on December 9, 2019.

### Attendees:

/ Courtney Phillips, SRRWD	/ Michelle Stindtman, Faribault SWCD
/ Brenda Lageson, Freeborn SWCD	/ Andy Henschel, SRRWD
/ Chad Billet, Freeborn SWCD	/ Emily Zanon, MPCA
/ Rachel Wehner, Freeborn County	/ Jeff Berg, MDA
/ Julia Thompson, Albert Lea Anglers	/ Jennifer Ronnenberg, MDH
/ Phil Wacholz, City of Albert Lea	/ Sue Miller, Freeborn Highway Department
/ Susie Peterson, Convention and Visitors Bureau	/ Bill Howe
/ Dalton Syverson, City of Albert Lea	/ Dave Copeland, BWSR
/ Jack Korman, Local Farmer	/ Dan Girolamo, DNR
/ Mark Morreim, Drainage Installer	/ Katy Thompson, RESPEC
/ Steve Jahnke, City of Albert Lea	

The meeting had three primary components with the first being introductions and an overview of the plan development timeline and process to date, including a summary of the draft issue statements, desired future conditions (DFCs) for targeted resources, and the draft goals. Most of the meeting time was designated to the Advisory Committee members providing feedback to the Steering Committee using a process called a 'gallery walk'. Advisory Committee members worked in small groups and rotated around the room to discuss and

provide feedback to the Steering Committee on the issue statements, desired future conditions, and goals for the surface water, ground water, and natural resource categories. At the conclusion of the small group gallery walk exercise, each group went back to the resource category they had started at and reported out on the themes and suggestions that were made to that resource category. Following the report out, Advisory Committee members were given four colored dots to place on the issues they felt represented their top two most important and their bottom two least important issues. Before concluding the meeting, the Steering Committee provided information on the next steps in the planning process.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE FEEDBACK AND STEERING COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK

Generally, many of the comments provided are useful considerations for the Steering Committee to review, reflect, on and integrate into the next steps of developing the for the comprehensive watershed management plan (CWMP, aka 1W1P) content. The comments included corrections or recommendations specific to issue statements, DFC's, or goals. Most of the comments appeared to be suggestions on strategies to meet goals and questions for clarification. The Steering Committee added the goal of increasing fish and macroinvertebrate biological index scores as a way to address the Surface Water Quality issue and made changes to some of the verbiage on the issue statements and goals as a result of the Advisory Committee feedback.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE PRIORITIZATION OF ISSUES

The Advisory Committee's priorities nicely aligned with Steering Committee's prioritization. The only issue statement that was not generally aligned was the issue of Surface Water Quantity. The Steering Committee ranked this as one of the top two issues, but it was near the middle for the Advisory Committees' priorities. This may be because the Advisory Committee did not have the conversation regarding the cascading impacts of water quantity and why addressing water quantity issues will result in multiple benefits. Because of this consideration, the Steering Committee did not make any changes to their priority ranking of the issue statements.

		Advisory Committee Voting Results					
Steering Committee Priority Ranking	Category	Green	Blue	Score of High Priority Votes	Yellow	Red	Score of Low Priority Votes
A1	SW1 - Quantity	1		1	2	1	3
A2	SW2 - Quality	5		5			0
B1	SW3 - Erosion & Sediment Control		4	4			0
B2	NR1 - Protect Soil Health	3		3			0
C1	NR2 - Manage, Enhance, Restore	1		1			0
C2	NR3 - Upland & Wetland Habitat		2	2	3	1	4
C3	GW1 - Quantity & Quality	1	3	4			0
D1	NR4 - Fish Habitat	1	1	2	5	1	6
D2	NR5 - Invasive species			0		10	10
E1	GW2 - Protecting GW		1	1	2		2