

Sauk River One Watershed One Plan Meeting on April 29th, 2020 via Zoom

AC Present: Cole Loewen, Kyle Weimann, Deja Anton, Holly Kovarik, Nathan Hylla, Dennis Fuchs, Danielle Anderson, Adam Ossefoort, Scott Henderson, Craig Wills (had to leave early), Ralph Hanson, Leah Hall (late due to another meeting), Karen (late due to another meeting), Sarah Boser

BWSR Present: Jason Weirnerman, Brad Wozney

PC Present: Steve Notch

Consultant Present: Julie Blackburn

Started meeting with introductions. Reviewed ways to communicate via the Zoom meeting: video, audio, chat window, raise hand feature.

Julie provided an update on the plan for the meeting. Also provided an update on the Policy Committee meeting – Sarah sent an email to the PC regarding their meeting preferences and capabilities as it relates to COVID-19. Their responses will be compiled, and Sarah will work with Julie and BWSR to determine the best path forward.

Kyle and Nate from Stearns SWCD provided an update on their work within the implementation tables. Stearns SWCD still has some final items to address, then send the entire document to other members of the AC for review and discussion.

Comments from others on Stearns SWCD presentation:

1. Cole: The categories on the summary table could be organized by priority resource concern?
 - a. Kyle: Good idea Cole. The table could be presented based on resource concern as well.
2. Brad: So even small scale urban Stormwater BMP's like rain gardens will be handled by SRWD?
 - a. Cole: Or the cities themselves?
 - b. Nate: Just cities. Individual landowners can still get assistance through the SWCD. Need to continue that discussion.
3. Brad: Great work Stearns crew!
4. Cole: How do we translate this table based on WMD to the watershed scale as a whole?
 - a. Julie: Need to ensure that we are incorporating priority issue statements as well.
5. Deja: This is an amazing analysis and I commend Stearns SWCD for this work. However, I would not define this as an Implementation Table. We need a functioning table that outlines realistic priority attacks (a plan and capacity). I think Julie is getting to this as I am typing.
6. Steve: Do the other 1W1P have this much detail to what would appear to me to be an almost "unachievable long-term projects"?
 - a. Julie: This plan contains the most science-based implementation and information, which opens a lot doors for making improvements within the watershed and that this is important to focus on the water quality and needs of the watershed as a whole.
 - b. Steve: Thanked Julie for clarification.
7. BWSR still has some concerns about watershed wide activities still within tables, but a much better focused and targeted table.

8. Kyle: it has been a shift in thinking and prioritizing for the SWCD to think in this capacity, the programs they typically work with (such as EQIP) do not prioritize in this way, and it is important to acknowledge this.
9. Cole: We have acknowledged in previous meetings that the primary concern within the watershed is altered hydrology. Though the individual practices will help with this, the main CIP projects will be what really make a difference in this way. How do we nest CIP within the implementation tables?
 - a. Discussion on how to combine the table Stearns SWCD has created with CIP and original implementation table.
10. Brad: Something else to think about. Climate resiliency is in the mission statement. How will the implementation activities advance that important topic?
 - a. Julie and Cole provided some insight in how this is addressed throughout a variety of implementation activities.
11. Cole: updates to regulatory table – how to navigate this with policy makers as the table is written with exploratory items instead of “we are committed to implementing all of these items”.

Julie will follow-up with Stearns SWCD on how to move forward with their implementation table and she will circle back with the group afterwards.

Education and Outreach Table:

1. Two-pronged approach: basic outreach to all citizens, increased knowledge/awareness of watershed/water quality and a targeted approach to the people that are going to make a difference.
 - a. Prioritize, Target and Measure Framework
2. Julie walked through the Education and Outreach Framework developed by Jason Weinerman. Cole provided a link related to some of the discussion regarding the change/shift in the education/outreach needed in the watershed:
<https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/invasives/ais/prevention/behavior-change.html>
3. Dennis provided Steps to a Community-Based Social Marketing project include:
 - a. Selecting desired behaviors
 - b. Identifying barriers to and benefits of people performing desired behaviors
 - c. Developing strategies
 - d. Pilot-testing strategies
 - e. Broad-scale implementation and evaluation
4. Cole emphasized the importance of CBSM (Community Based Social Marketing) steps
5. Julie requested feedback on taking this two-pronged approach:
 - a. Cole: down with it 😊 - has done research on this and the level of investment is warranted if we want to see these long term goals achieved. The better we understand barriers and benefits, the better we can tailor our programs. Also understands that it is a lot of work to do this well.
 - i. Gave the example of DNR AIS behavior change work.
 - b. Brad: Seems that the Stearns SWCD has been tracking landowner willingness to a degree – do we see this complimenting that work? How could we use this information?

- i. Nate: Motivated Cooperator Index – haven't used it extensively, as they are using a targeted approach for outreach (ie – letters to a specific huc 12).
- ii. Kyle: Have done some GIS analysis and seen clusters, when someone sees their neighbor doing something they are also more likely to do something, can see these hotspots via the GIS analysis.
- iii. Dennis: Do an after-the-project review with the landowners to assist with changing and developing their programs.
- iv. Deja: Todd does similar, the interest level and enthusiasm of the landowner affects to a 15 point degree the priority ranking. Todd SWCD has done breakfasts in targeted areas- That works greatly. We do holistic visits as well-- not just a feedlot visit, for example- it is a holistic visit- shares all headaches (and successes) a landowner may have with their land to see if we can find ways to help. I think the education is key. There are few landowners that we can't find a way to approach a fix of some sort- just by building a relationship. The trust comes from sharing of similar backgrounds-- your educators have to be one of "them". Funding is a big initiator.
- v. Holly: Funding and timing and often our biggest barriers.
- vi. Brad: to Leah – does TNC use anything like this?
 - 1. Leah – not really
- vii. Julie to Scott – how do we handle the folks that aren't choosing to do the right thing even after we have talked to them for years? Too cynical to provide much.
 - 1. Discussion about documenting information and findings, spinning our wheels trying to change people that don't want to change, spending money on outreach for people who don't care until it impacts them.
 - 2. Julie – breath of positivity – what will things be like if we DON'T do this?
 - 3. Jason: This could be a really long term project. I think in terms of MADD and the smoking cessation efforts. Those have taken decades but there has been real change to people's attitudes and behaviors in the general public. No longer is it okay to drunk drive home from the bar.
- viii. Deja: For some reason I can't unmute, I back Scott, If the public learned that we spend grant money trying to figure out their lack of stewardship or "document the findings- gov't speak", many would be furious. We know the barriers, accept them, at the same time help grow the successes one landowner at a time. I liked the two pronged approach-- just maybe not the analysis of barriers part.
- ix. Kyle: Consistency overtime is essential – 7 contacts with a consistent message are needed to get someone to really think of something and make changes.
- x. Holly: I think it would be most beneficial to us all to have that marketing and outreach plan to help us sell conservation. I would also somehow tie it to the work that Mae Davenport is doing.
- xi. Cole: Being concerned about time, money and effort is a legit concern, eats a lot of resources. The results would warrant the time and effort in the long run.

- xii. Steve: I think too that this will start out as a slow moving vehicle that could pick up steam as people start seeing results. But it will be decades long to see people get on board and it might be a generational shift at some point to occur.
- xiii. Brad: Is the ultimate goal attempting to establish a "better" working relationship/trust with landowners/influencers? Is the current approach working for each organization?

Julie will send out the framework Jason developed and request feedback on it within a week or so.