

Meeting Agenda
Bois de Sioux and Mustinka Watersheds
1W1P Steering Committee Meeting
04/02/2020 at 9:00 am
by conference call and screenshare

Member Organizations

Big Stone County
Big Stone SWCD
Grant County
Grant SWCD
West Otter Tail SWCD
Otter Tail County
Stevens County
Stevens SWCD
Traverse County
Traverse SWCD
Wilkin County
Wilkin SWCD
Bois de Sioux Watershed

Committee Representative

Danny Tuckett **[Absent]**
Joseph Otto
Greg Lillemon **[Absent]**
Jared House
Brad Mergens
Kyle Westergard
Bill Kleindl **[Absent]**
Matt Solemsaas
Lynn Siegel **[Absent]**
Sara Gronfeld
Breanna Koval **[Absent]**
Craig Lingen
Jamie Beyer

Designated Alternate

Darren Wilke

Ben Underhill

Bruce Johnson **[Absent]**
Bruce Johnson **[Absent]**

Don Bajumpaa **[Absent]**
Linda Vavra

CC:

BWSR	Pete Waller
BWSR	Henry Van Offelen
HEI	Jeremiah Jazdziewski [absent]
HEI	Rachel Olm
Grant County	Reed Peterson [Absent]
Moore Engineering	Chad Engels
Moore Engineering	Tara Ostendorf

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 am.

Welcome and Updates: Upon motion by Mergens, seconded by House and carried unanimously, payment of the HEI Claim in the amount of \$23,071.06 and the Minutes of February 6, 2020 and March 5, 2020 were approved. The most recent financial report was reviewed, and the current timeline. We have both an internal review and the 60-day review included in the schedule. In both cases, comments solicited will be tabulated and will be presented and consider by the committee before any plan revisions are done. At the pace we are at, we are running ahead of our August goal for the 60-day notice to begin. According to our own documents, our 13 entities will approve the plan prior to submission to BWSR, but their approvals are not required prior to the 60-day review.

Local Board Alternative: Beyer had asked the Committee by email how folks would prefer to proceed with a replacement for the local board review that was canceled for March 25th. Responses were mixed between a live session and a recorded session, so Beyer suggested that we do both. Gronfeld suggested that we coordinate a live session and record it. HEI offered to help with the recorded session, and the

technology behind the call-in session. Waller recommended Van Offelen to help. Beyer will send out possible dates.

Revised Section 3: Measurable Goals: The SWCDs will work on the groundwater short- and long-term goals. Underhill requested the inclusion of an explanation of “flow zone,” and requested a further description of the reductions column in tables – is this amount to be reduced to or to be reduced by? Members also requested that “0” be converted to N/A, and that N/A be clarified as not available or not applicable. Van Offelen advised that our plan should clearly and repeatedly state that we are targeting at the field edge, but measuring at the resource point. Field edge measurements make the benefits larger because you aren’t accounting for the natural decay that drops out on the way, but it also makes existing conditions exaggerated, too. BdSWD was asked if 23 miles is too large a number for stabilized channels. Engels expressed concern that impoundments are only listed under the altered hydrology goal, but are an extremely important tool to alleviate peaks causing Public Flooding and Private Flooding goals. Committee members reviewed the Stormwater goal, but were unsure of “minimal impact design standards” vs. “stormwater management plans.” Van Offelen advised the group that we need to be prepared to respond to the high number of high priority planning regions. Committee members discussed the following potential justifications:

- These watersheds are unique, in that 82% of the Bois de Sioux River Watershed and 84% of the Mustinka River Watershed acres are used for agricultural purposes. The remaining acres are urban development, wetlands, grasslands, forests, and open water.
- Drainage areas in the upstream areas are less dense; altered hydrology, in terms of the flashyness of drainage systems, tends to be less of a problem
- We have larger drainage problems where water moves slowly – Big Stone and Stevens Counties
- These watersheds are experiencing a dramatic increase in precipitation.

Draft Section 4: Implementation: Olm advised committee members that this is the most important section. The short-term goals are Level 2 funding (current + \$500,000). Engels commented that as the plan is written now, prioritization for funding is happening within each of the six action tables (this project and practice is prioritized vs that project and practice), instead of prioritization by planning region. No comments were made in response.

Beyer and Engels requested that the capital improvement projects be moved to each planning region, and be given the same content considerations as the PTMApp Projects and Practices received – with nutrient reduction descriptions, and accurate goal impacts. The group discussed incorporating the water quality components of the CIPs into the regional planning areas. Engels agreed to provide water quality information to HEI to be incorporated into section 4. The group discussed what the definition of “components” of a CIP would be and stated that it needed to be more clear.

Internal Review Process: Olm asked committee members how they wished the review processes to be completed. As it is laid-out now, there would be an internal review process for the Steering + Advisory Committees, then an internal review process for the Steering + Advisory + Policy Committee; once those are completed, then the plan would be released for the 60-day comment period.

HOMEWORK

- 1) Finalize plans for the local board review session.
- 2) SWCDs put together groundwater quality and quantity short- and long-term goals

- 3) Everyone please read the 5 planning region “At a Glance” single sheets, and please forward to HEI local knowledge and descriptions of each planning region (Section 4).
- 4) Engels and Klostreich will forward to HEI the CIP nutrient and sediment reduction stats for CIP projects and geo-location info for each project, so that they can be put in the correct planning region. They will also update the relationship between the CIP’s and our goals (direct, indirect, etc.).
- 5) Waller, Beyer, and Engels agreed that \$2,000 for a “clean water component” on ditch retrofits is too light. Engels will provide a cost per mile for clean water components.
- 6) Waller will verify whether there is a deadline for implementation order to receive funding. Beyer asked that he verify the grant agreement – that there may be a clause requiring adoption and implementation.
- 7) All committee members must present their Section 4 comments on or before April 17th. The CIP revisions will be provided to the committee as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

NEXT MEETING DATE: MAY 7TH, AFTERNOON