

## JD2 Project Team Meeting Notes

**Meeting Date:** February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022

**Meeting Time:** Noon

**Facilitator:** Sarah Boser, SRWD

**Location:** SRWD Office (642 Lincoln Road, Sauk Centre, MN 56378)

**Attendees:** Adam Hjelm (SRWD), Adam Ossefoort (Todd County), Deja Anton (Todd SWCD), Ken Rutten (Douglas SWCD Supervisor), Bruce Magnus (Osakis Lake Association), David Zerr (SRWD Board), Janice Hauri (Landowner), Danielle Anderson (Douglas SWCD), John Maile (DNR), Jon Roeschlein (SRWD), Shawn Papon (USFWS), Paul Hartmann (SRWD Board), Randy Neumann (Todd County Commissioner), Representative John Poston, Emily Siira (DNR), Susan Capitola (Landowner), Tom Anderson (JD2 Drainage Inspector), Troy Bednarz (Landowner), Sarah Boser (SRWD)

Guests: Steve Malz (Landowner)

Boser started the meeting at noon and introduced Representative John Poston, who gave a brief presentation on the bonding process, and what the legislative representatives need from the team to create a bonding bill. A project and project plan are needed to move the project to a bonding bill. Then a committee hearing in the house and senate would be needed. Next the capital investment committees would come on site during their tour to view the project site. This process does take time, and this group will not be ready for bonding this year (2022). Poston also thanked the team for their participation and dedication to this cause. Poston and Ingebrigtsen are both retiring, but will work with the new Senator and Representative to transfer project and team data to help this partnership and project stay supported. Currently, they are looking at ways to fund this project in phases, which may include bonding funding, but also may include other funding sources.

Next, Boser introduced an exercise for the team members to share their primary concerns that they are bringing to team meetings to assist with meeting preparation and facilitation, to ensure that each person's concerns are acknowledged and addressed throughout this process. Boser logged these concerns in a spreadsheet that is located in the Project Team file on the SRWD server. ***The Team could use this list to develop a checklist to use throughout the process as a way of ensuring that concerns would be addressed by the project concepts being considered.***

Next, the Team talked through options for a feasibility study – do we evaluate all of the existing concepts and suggestions from the team? Do we pick a handful of options to evaluate? Boser asked the team for feedback on how they would like to move forward with the feasibility study. Boser reviewed some of the project concepts that had been discussed at the first Project Team meeting. Zerr recommended picking five concepts, and completing a feasibility on those five, and turn them over to Representative Poston for a bonding bill. Boser asked if there were five concepts the team felt more strongly about moving forward? Hartmann said that if the team was going to do a feasibility study on all concepts, that he would like to add a concrete ditch concept with weirs in place to easily remove sediment from the concrete.

The team revisited the plan they had established at the January meeting, to gather sonar data, develop a sediment sampling plan, and use that information to start a feasibility study that evaluates all of the existing concepts to determine which concepts are the best to move forward with. Boser asked for feedback from the team on whether they would support finding funding other than bonding funds to complete these steps, and then once the team has a project or two to move forward with, go for bonding funding at that time. If we would go that route, we could apply for USACE funding through their planning assistance grant, which would provide 50% cost share. The other 50% could come from One Watershed, One Plan funding/watershed based implementation funding (this would likely not be the full 50%), or it could come from SRWD levy or other sources. Several members of the team voiced agreement on this path forward, as long as every effort is made to use grant funds to cover the costs. It may not be possible to obtain 100% outside funding, but chances are good that if we work with the USACE, we will have at least 50% covered and the other 50% we will work to get as much covered by outside sources as possible.

Boser/SRWD staff will continue to work with Representative Poston and sediment sampling experts to put together a funding and sampling plan. Partners on this include a sediment expert from UW Stout, USGS staff, and Science Museum staff.

The team discussed the potential for a full scale Crooked Lake restoration, and what that would do to JD2.

Next Boser provided a draft, estimated timeline for the group on what the next steps for the team could look like, to complete the steps outlined (sonar survey, sediment sampling, and feasibility study). Neumann mentioned that it is possible that the drainage authority could get a landowner petition to clean out JD2, which could impact work the group is trying to accomplish. Boser asked Anderson and Neumann to explain what the process would look like if the drainage authority received a petition for a repair on JD2 – how long the process would take, what the legal requirements would look like for the drainage authority. The drainage authority would have time to provide the Project Team a notice that they have received the request and or petition for repair/maintenance, which would allow the Project Team to work with the drainage authority to complete the work in a way that is supportive of the work the Project Team is doing, and try to incorporate water quality and quantity practices as well.

Boser proposed skipping the March meeting to allow staff to compile as much information as possible prior to the April meeting. The Team agreed that it made sense to skip the March meeting, and Boser will send an email update in March instead, and the Team will meet in April.