

Sauk River One Watershed, One Plan	Policy Committee Meeting #14	Date: August 27 th , 2020
		Time: 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
		Location: Remote meeting via Teams, log-in information below

Facilitator: Geoff Kramer/Julie Blackburn/Sarah Boser/Cole Loewen **Note taker:** Sarah Boser

Invitees: Policy Committee Ken Rutten, Jerry Rapp, Cody Rogahn, Gary Reents, Randy Neumann, Tom Williamson, Steve Notch, Chuck Uphoff, Bill Becker

Invitees: BWSR Jason Weinerman

Consultant / Julie Blackburn, Geoff Kramer

Other Holly Kovarik, Scott Henderson, Cole Loewen, Sarah Boser

- Objectives:**
- Transition update
 - Discussion on plan draft
 - Next Steps

Pre-work: • Submit draft plan comments to Sarah by Friday, August 21st, 2020

Please bring: 3 ring binder, agenda and supplemental information

Agenda Items

Topic	Purpose	Lead	Time allotted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Introductions, review meeting purpose & agenda Motion to approve – Commissioner Rogahn, 2nd Tom Williamson, passed all in favor ✓ Assign note taker – Sarah and Cole, Julie, Geoff as able ✓ Review minutes from last meeting – Commissioner Uphoff asked if there were any changes, none stated – Motion to Approve – Tom Williamson, 2nd Ken Rutten, passed with all in favor 	INFORMATION	CHAIR	10 min.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Discuss PC Questions/Comments/Concerns with draft plan Mr. Uphoff – didn't have time to go through entire plan, but did review majority. Quite pleased! Overall simple to read and understand. Rogahn – no questions. HK – would like reach 73 added. Commissioner Rogahn would agree. Reents – not overly concerned about winter feeding, beneficial for soil, is a priority in the county. JW – could be added as an appendix as an area of local concern, would not qualify for watershed based funding, but would be an option for competitive funding. Will bring to AC for discussion. Rutten – boundary discussion, JW sent BWSR link to SJ. Uphoff – decrease in water flow seems difficult, JB clarified and noted the goal is to have discharge remain the same going forward, but to do so will require increasing water storage 	DISCUSSION/DECISION	Sarah/Julie/Geoff	30 min.

<p>given increases in precipitation; will re-write this. Uphoff – do two stage ditches actually help with storage. JB and GK explained that yes, they do, even though it is temporary. Uphoff – page 134 wetland banking – great mechanism to spread throughout the plan. JB – can add more language on this, but also clarified that wetland restoration is the strategy, and wetland banking is one potential mechanism to achieve restoration; will develop this mechanism language more in the plan. TW – 142 “targeted landowners” change to voluntary or partnering landowners (Nuemann agrees with change, Uphoff just be simply landowners) All agree to change to just “landowners”. The other item is greenbelts – would like that removed. SJ provided clarification on greenbelts vs regulatory components of greenbelts. Cole clarified that counties could also enforce the regulatory component of this through 103B. No further comments/discussion from PC. SJ clarified that since there was no additional discussion or direction from the PC, greenbelts would be left in the plan.</p>			
<p>✓ Discuss any substantial concerns brought forward by the AC Summarized the meeting and the new plan of attack. Kudos to Julie/RESPEC on plan, easy to read/follow. Kudos to AC and PC for reading and providing feedback.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION/ DECISION</p>	<p>Sarah/Cole</p>	<p>20 min.</p>
<p>✓ Review draft Joint Powers Collaborative Agreement, discuss questions/concerns Cole provided a summary of the draft agreement, highlighting key points within the document. Some clarification questions asked by PC members throughout. Discussed the option of having a reserve fund for the partnership. Commissioner Nuemann mentioned wanting to talk through this with County and SWCD boards. Others agreed. Cole asked PC to indicate whether it was comfortable with the agreement, sans reserve fund component, such that he could move forward with drafting the agreement with Stearns County attorney; noted the agreement will come back to the PC for additional review, including discussing a potential reserve component. PC comfortable with agreement as is (sans reserve fund component): CR = yes, CU = yes – does think each member should discuss reserve funds with their boards, KR = no, JR = No, GR = yes, RN = no, TW = no, SN = yes, BB = yes – CR: does not think we should have to wait 4 years to make a change to plan coordinator and fiscal agent, Cole will flag this item for further discussion. According to by-laws, only need 5 yes votes, so motion carries.</p>	<p>DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Cole/Sarah</p>	<p>60 min.</p>

Encouraged those that voted no to contact Sarah or Cole with recommended edits ASAP.			
✓ Transition Update Geoff provided updated.	INFORMATION	Geoff/Sarah	5 min.
<p>✓ Next Steps/Timeline Review Uphoff is interested in going right into public comment. JR – how many public meetings and where? CL provided options, need at least one, each county could have their own meeting/hearing. BB – agree to move forward. JB – clarifying that moving forward with public comment means there will not be substantive change to the plan at this point. CR asked when meetings to approve plan/approve JPC agreement. CL – roughly April, May, June 2021. CU – when should we start the 60 day comment period? CU recommends starting right after Sept. 30th. SN - agrees. GR –agrees. KR – agrees, JR – when will today’s meeting be in the hands of the county attorney? CL and SJ provided clarification, JR voted yes, CR = yes, GR = yes, RN =yes, TW – yes, SN – yes, BB – yes, CU – yes.</p> <p>✓ Chair noted that next PC meeting will be after Sept. 30th unless a member calls for a meeting.</p>	INFORMATION	Cole	10 min.

Adjourn at 11:29am.

[Join Microsoft Teams Meeting](#)

[+1 605-937-6140](#) United States, Sioux Falls (Toll)

[\(844\) 594-6237](#) United States (Toll-free)

Conference ID: 542 450 346#

[Local numbers](#) | [Reset PIN](#) | [Learn more about Teams](#) | [Meeting options](#)

Process Norms

- Follow Robert's Rules of Order
- Everyone will contribute to the conversation
- Strive for consensus and support the final outcomes/decisions
- Decisions will be based in sound science
- All voices count. All opinions are valid, but offer reasoning behind your thinking
- Ask clarifying questions to seek further understanding
- Note-taker is to capture highlights of the discussion and decisions made, but not detailed minutes

Preparation Norms

- Meetings will start / end on time
- Members will complete pre-work, read materials, and be prepared to meet
- Request additional information prior to meeting if necessary
- Clear deadlines for assigned tasks to members will be determined; strive to meet them (both in developing materials and responding/providing feedback)

Communication Norms

- Be respectful and promote open communication
- Listen to understand
- Respect each other's opinions
- Stay on topic and pay attention
- Silence phones and exercise proper meeting decorum