

# MEETING NOTES

## One Watershed One Plan

*May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 9am-noon Advisory Committee Meeting #6*

*Meeting Location: Sauk Centre City Hall*

---

### Advisory Committee Members Present:

---

Brenda Postels (UMN Extension); Leah Hall (TNC); Mark Hough (DNR – sub for Nicki Blake-Bradley); Anna Bosch (MPCA); Tara Ostendorf (BWSR); Brad Wozney (BWSR); Becky Schlorf (Stearns Environmental Services – sub for Cole Loewen); Holly Kovarik (Pope SWCD); Danielle Anderson (Douglas SWCD); Karen Voz (MDH); Ralph Hanson (Pope County LRM); Dennis Fuchs (Stearns SWCD); Scott Henderson (SRWD); Sarah Boser (SRWD)

---

### Others Present:

---

Julie Blackburn (RESPEC); Steve Notch (Stearns County Commissioner, Policy Committee Member); Chuck Uphoff (Stearns SWCD Board Supervisor, Policy Committee Member); Matt Bruyette (Stearns SWCD Supervisor)

---

### Notes from Meeting:

---

The meeting started with a presentation from Julie to clarify the planning process roles and responsibilities, as well as provide a framework for the planning process.

#### Roles Defined:

1. Julie writes the plan
2. Partners:
  - a. Develop the content that Julie utilizes to write the plan.
  - b. Decide what need to go to the Policy Committee for decision.
  - c. Reach out to Julie as needed for additional information/summarizing of information, explanation and guidance.
  - d. Provide feedback to Julie about what we need to develop the content of the plan.

#### Planning Process Overview:

1. Setting up goals to ensure that our action steps align with our overall goals.
2. This is an iterative planning process!
3. Some of the plan requirements from BWSR include:
  - a. Must contain/address projects: permanent protection, BMP/incentive (potentially including tax benefits?), capital improvement
  - b. Must address programs: regulatory/land use management, outreach and education, monitoring and assessment, operation and maintenance
4. Implementation Plan Process:
  - a. Determine priority issues
  - b. Draft goals for priority issues
  - c. Identify opportunities to address goals
  - d. Evaluate achievability o meet goals

- e. Prioritize issues/goal statements for each resource (surface water, groundwater, habitat, etc.)
  - f. Target for multiple benefits
5. Talked through the public input process and the meetings that were held.
    - a. Advisory Committee took the information gathered through the public input process and refined the issues/issue statements.
    - b. Now starting to develop goals.
    - c. Drafting goals for priority issues (this is what we are doing with the logic models)
      - i. Discussion on when in the process do we eliminate the issues we don't view as a priority and/or don't want to spend additional time developing.
        1. When the plan is said and done, we need to be able to explain why we didn't address an issue – whether it be because it wasn't something we could do anything about, it wasn't feasible, don't have the authority, etc.
    - d. HSPF is the model established for the SRW, MPCA uses it as the benchmark
      - i. RESPEC has developed an HSPF interface for resource professional to use.
  6. Developing priority schemes: this is something models and tools cannot do – human input/knowledge/experience is essential in this process.
    - a. Discussion on how to do this using the example of high priority lakes, different ways that we could prioritize within that issue statement.
      - i. Areas with landowner buy-in
      - ii. SRWD Lake Ranking process
      - iii. Making sure process is specific to protection
      - iv. Looking at active LIDs (Lake Improvement Districts) and lake association as a factor
        1. How to quantify if they are willing to make changes on their property or if they only want others to have to change
      - v. Shoreland ordinance as a criteria, consistency between agencies on this
      - vi. Property tax on lakeshore (Bemidji University Research) – cost benefit analysis accommodates this to an extent
  7. Yellow Medicine WD prioritization example.
  8. Models can inform what you are doing using data, but human input based on experience and knowledge should be the deciding factor.
  9. Identify opportunities to address the goals within issue statements.
  10. Worthington Wells program example
    - a. Pheasants Forever, Outdoor Heritage grants, fundraising
    - b. Easements and land acquisition = 150 acres into protection

The last hour or so was spent developing goals for issue statements in the small groups.

---

### Homework:

---

Continue working on the four issue statements that were distributed during today's meeting within small groups (each small group should set up a meeting, Skype call, etc. to finish these), send all information/issue statements to Julie by Wednesday, June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

---

### Upcoming Meetings:

---

Wednesday, June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from 9am-noon

Wednesday, July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019 from 9am-noon