

**Meeting Agenda**  
**Bois de Sioux and Mustinka Watersheds**  
**1W1P Steering Committee Meeting**  
**04/27/2020 at 10:00 am**  
**by conference call and screenshare**

<u>Member Organizations</u>	<u>Committee Representative</u>	<u>Designated Alternate</u>
Big Stone County	Danny Tuckett	Darren Wilke <b>[Absent]</b>
Big Stone SWCD	Joseph Otto <b>[Absent]</b>	
Grant County	Greg Lillemon	
Grant SWCD	Jared House	
West Otter Tail SWCD	Brad Mergens	Ben Underhill
Otter Tail County	Kyle Westergard <b>[Absent]</b>	
Stevens County	Bill Kleindl <b>[Absent]</b>	
Stevens SWCD	Matt Solemsaas <b>[Absent]</b>	
Traverse County	Lynn Siegel <b>[Absent]</b>	Bruce Johnson <b>[Absent]</b>
Traverse SWCD	Sara Gronfeld	Bruce Johnson <b>[Absent]</b>
Wilkin County	Breanna Koval	
Wilkin SWCD	Craig Lingen <b>[Absent]</b>	Don Bajumpaa <b>[Absent]</b>
Bois de Sioux Watershed	Jamie Beyers	Linda Vavra

**CC:**

BWSR	Pete Waller
BWSR	Henry Van Offelen
HEI	Jeremiah Jazdziewski
HEI	Rachel Olm
Grant County	Reed Peterson <b>[Absent]</b>
Moore Engineering	Chad Engels
Moore Engineering	James Guler
Moore Engineering	Tara Ostendorf

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am.

**Projects and Practices Table:** Van Offelen and Waller spoke about the Projects and Practices Table, in which funding was allocated by planning region land area and the actions were allocated by the SWCD's. Van Offelen stated that dividing funds based on land area does not reflect goal or resource priorities. The watershed brought forward their concern that only \$32,000 was allocated for the 10-year period to be used for capital improvement projects, even though these projects include clean water fund enhancements and are completed collaboratively with SWCD and counties. Beyers asked whether allocating 90% of the 10-year funding to two actions is reflective of the plan's priority goals – and that she feels the current plan draft is not clear on what goals are a priority.

**Capital Improvement Projects Table:** Engels presented the watershed's Capital Improvement Projects table, which describes the corresponding planning regions, anticipated construction years, and estimated clean water fund grant eligibility (reduced to a 50-50 cost share assumption). The JD #11 retrofit and Lake Traverse Water Quality Improvement projects will receive \$663,775 for this year,

which is a stark contrast to the current plan allocation of \$32,000 for a ten year period. The capital improvement projects are completed collaboratively with counties and soil and watershed districts. The watershed’s concern is that the competitive grant dollars will decrease as 1W1Plan implementation grant funding increases, and this loss in project base funding will compromise the watershed’s ability to complete projects that feature significant water quality enhancements. During the kick-off meetings, 48% of respondents identified inadequate drainage as a top concern – and the competitive grant dollars are an important incentive to initiate and complete projects that directly address inadequate drainage and increase water quality.

Engels noted that seven of the projects listed in the table (Samantha & Elbow Lake, Big Lake, Mustinka Corridor, Redpath Impoundment, Western 32, Moonshine Lakebed & 24/13, and Eldorado Projects) have flood damage reduction as a primary purpose, and to support these projects, the watershed will seek non-1W1Plan funding.

There are twelve other projects that include features that increase water quality, with features that are Clean Water Fund eligible, and there is one project placeholder for future drainage system retrofits:

PLANNING REGION	PROJECT NAME
Lake Traverse & BdS River	Judicial Ditch #11 Main Wilkin County Ditch Sub #1 Wilkin County Ditch #35 Lake Traverse Water Quality Imp. Project #1 Doran Creek Rehabilitation
Rabbit River	Judicial Ditch #6 Judicial Ditch #12 Main Judicial Ditch #12 Lat 1
Lower Mustinka and Twelve MC	Traverse County Ditch #37 Main Traverse County Ditch #8 Twelvemile Creek Rehabilitation
Upper Mustinka River	None
Twelve Mile Creek Headwaters	Fivemile Creek Rehabilitation
Not Specified	Miscellaneous 103E Ditches

The watershed leverages funding from its own Construction Fund, related assessment districts, and the Red River Water Management Board to complete these projects.

As evidenced by the capital improvement project table, the watershed continues to see a need for stream restorations. Lillemon had heard that a project on 5-Mile Creek may take 3 – 4 years; Beyer confirmed that there are many statutory requirements associated with project permitting, landowner notifications, and setting up assessment districts, and that this is likely the fastest a project could be constructed. Engels spoke on the success of the Buffalo Red Watershed’s Wolverton Creek Project, but

emphasized that this project took a significant portion of the administrator's career to develop and complete; subsequent projects will likely be completed more quickly with their lessons learned, but these projects are a long-term commitment.

Lillemon stated that Grant County's approach has been to start with projects at the upper elevations, and work downward. Engels clarified that the location of the watershed's projects reflect its authority; the watershed is not the drainage authority in Big Stone, Otter Tail, and Grant Counties. Gronfeld asked about the final plan's relationship to workplan funding. Van Offelen stated that every 1-2 years, the implementation team will create a workplan that describes how funds are to be used; the plan will guide spending, but is not prescriptive. Mergens relayed interest in using funds to offset administration costs for RIM and CREP. House asked what committee members thought of a proposal to budget 40% of funding to capital improvement projects and 60% to other projects and practices. Van Offelen stated that all entities should carefully consider for themselves what actions should be funded under 1W1Plan grants and what actions should be funded by an entity's own base/capacity funding.

Beyer relayed concerns that the plan's 12 goals are not prioritized, and understands now the complaint that there is little prioritization of planning regions within the 12 goals. Beyer asked if the committee would consider prioritizing goals, offering that for the purposes of this plan, the Vulnerable Groundwater Protection and Stormwater Management goals could likely be rated lowest:

1. Vulnerable Groundwater Protection
2. Sediment
3. Unstable Channels
4. Public Flooding
5. Private Flooding
6. Altered Hydrology
7. Stormwater Management
8. Ditch System Instability
9. Ditch System Inadequacy
10. Soil Health
11. Bacteria Loading
12. Nutrient Loading

House and Gronfeld discussed budgeting \$0 under Scenario #2 for Goal #1. Van Offelen recommended that, instead of using surface-water driven planning regions, that drinking wells be made the priority resource, and that the goal's priority not be bound by any planning region. House asked if committee members could restrict two planning regions per goal that could be classified as "High Priority."

Gronfeld recommended that, during implementation, individuals are identified to provide technical expertise and others provide ecological expertise.

Van Offelen relayed that PTMApp can provide recommendations on how much of a load reduction is desired, or how much money you want to spend. In our case, the latter was selected.

Committee members returned to the discussion whether a 40-60 split would be a starting point to fund capital improvement projects and programs and practices actions. Engels offered that, if we considered using sediment and nutrient loading as a basis for dividing funds amongst planning regions, that the dollars allocated for capital improvement projects and actions for those planning regions would be different depending on that planning region's high goal priorities.

### **In Summary:**

House summarized the meeting's preliminary conclusions:

- 1) We should look for a method other than land area for appropriating funds between each of the five planning regions.
- 2) We need to prioritize our twelve goals, and narrow-down the number of high priority planning regions.
- 3) We need to better understand that anticipated outcomes for our actions and capital improvement projects, and examine which give us the biggest bang for our buck.
- 4) This plan gives us an opportunity to focus on collaborative projects between entities.

### **HOMEWORK**

- 1) Consider how we should appropriate funds between the five planning regions with reasons that can be stated clearly in our plan (sediment, nutrients, both, something else.....?).
- 2) Thinking of the Bois de Sioux and Mustinka River Watersheds as a whole: look at our twelve goals and pick what your board would feel are our top two priorities *for the purposes of this plan*. [I am not advocating that we only have two priorities, this is just a starting point, and we are anticipating a diversity of opinion here. Please avoid priorities that cannot be funded with plan dollars (for eg, flood damage reduction).]
- 3) For each of the goals, with the exception of groundwater protection, please identify some of the "high" priority areas that could be made "medium," keeping in mind our Scenario 2 funding limitations.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

**NEXT MEETING DATE: MAY 7<sup>TH</sup>, AFTERNOON**