

BUFFALO-RED RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT

BARNESVILLE, MINNESOTA 56514

1303 4th AVE NE
Email: general@brrwd.org

PO BOX 341

PHONE 218-354-7710
Website: www.brrwd.org

BUFFALO-RED RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT

One Watershed, One Plan Policy Committee/Planning Team Meeting December 20, 2018

The One Watershed, One Plan (1W1P) Policy Committee held a meeting on Thursday, November 28, 2018, at 11:30 AM in the Buffalo-Red River Watershed District (BRRWD) office, located at 1303 4th Avenue NE, Barnesville, MN.

Policy Committee members present were Jerome Flottesmesch, Becker Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Supervisor; Barry Nelson, Becker County Commissioner; Randy Schellack, Clay SWCD Supervisor (Alternate); Ross Aigner, Wilkin SWCD Supervisor; Jay Leitch, BRRWD President; Peter Fjestad, BRRWD Vice President (Alternate); Rick Drevlow, West Otter Tail SWCD Supervisor; Frank Gross, Clay County Commissioner (Alternate) and Wayne Johnson, Otter Tail County Commissioner.

Planning Team members present were Matt Jacobson, Water Planner/Scientist, Bruce Albright, BRRWD Administrator, Erik Jones, BRRWD Engineer, Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI); and Brett Arne, Board Conservationist, Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR).

Others present were Gerald L. Van Amburg, BRRWD Manager, and Henry Van Offelen, Clean Water Specialist, BWSR.

Policy Committee Vice Chair Jerome Flottesmesch called the meeting to order at 11:35 AM and asked the group to introduce themselves.

The Policy Committee reviewed the 1W1P financial status and discussed the current billings. Matt Jacobson, HEI, explained that the BRRWD is the fiscal agent for the 1W1P process. Bruce E. Albright, BRRWD Administrator, noted that current billings to date include Manager vouchers and HEI invoicing. The group discussed allowable costs for the BWSR grant. Jacobson pointed out that expenses and per diems for the Advisory and Policy Committee members are considered in-kind expenses for each local government unit (LGU) and are not permitted under the grant agreement. Albright noted that for past Planning efforts, the BRRWD paid mileage for non-agency committee members. Leitch estimated that approximately four individuals would fit into that category. Albright explained that when the BRRWD signed the BWSR grant agreement in July 2018, we already had approximately \$18,000 in 1W1P expenses, which can't be covered by the grant. Albright and Leitch agreed that the BRRWD Board should consider mileage for non-agency committee members at their next meeting. Albright plans to have a full accounting of the bills, including mileage costs, from the BRRWD for the next Policy Committee meeting.

The Policy Committee discussed the Draft Plan Section 1 Introduction, which the Advisory Committee recommended for Policy Committee approval at their meeting held earlier today. **Approved.**

The group discussed the Public Kickoff Meeting plan and logistics. The Advisory Committee also recommended Policy Committee approval of the meeting proposals. Wayne Johnson was concerned that certain regions might be over represented at the Kickoff meeting, and we may receive skewed comments on the issues form. He encouraged the Committees and Planning Team to be aware of this possibility and weight the public comments accordingly. Johnson also thought that the Emerging Issues question on the Kickoff

meeting Issues form shouldn't include suggestions or examples. Flottesch wanted to be sure that the public understands that the Committees have developed a list of issues for which we are soliciting public input at the upcoming Kickoff meeting, and that there will be further opportunities for public input as the process moves forward. **Motion** by Johnson to approve the Kickoff Public Open House plans, as recommended by the Advisory Committee, with the provision that notices stress that the event is an open house from 6:30-8:30 PM, not an actual meeting. **Seconded** by Leitch. Jacobson noted that the language has been changed from "meeting" to "Open House" on the public notices. Leitch asked about the cost of a newspaper insert instead of an actual print advertisement. Albright will investigate that idea for future use. Jacobson noted that advertisement costs are allowable under the BWSR grant agreement. **Approved.**

The next item the Policy Committee consider was the draft Issues Table, which the Advisory Committee recommended for approval today. This 30 issues list will be utilized for the prioritization process. Johnson asked if this was the final Issues list or could it change after we receive the public input. Jacobson explained the Advisory Committee compiled this list of 30 issues for public comment at the Open House. Albright explained that once the public comments have been reviewed and incorporated, then the Committees will finalize the Issues list and move forward with prioritization. Flottesch commented that the more generic the issues are, the easier it will be for us to group and prioritize problems. Jacobson said the prioritization process will further refine the issues list.

Ross Aigner commented that the issues list could be narrowed down to 15 or 20 items if one of the priorities was to assure that all waterbodies met Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements. Brett Arne, BWSR, explained that the issues list represents building blocks to reach the desired outcomes. Van Offelen, BWSR, commented that the prioritization process will narrow down the issues.

Leitch commented that the public should be asked to comment about their top issues even before they see the issues list. He also thought we should gather demographics about the responders. Johnson agreed that the public should get as little guided direction as possible when logging their comments on the issues form. Jacobson suggested that we could adjust the form language, asking for the top issues without exposing the public to the Issues Table until they have filled out the form. Johnson made a motion to approve the draft Issues Table as recommended by the Advisory Committee with the understanding that the public will be made aware that the list reflects potential issues and is not finalized until their input is incorporated. **Approved.**

Barry Nelson, Becker County Commissioner, asked if oil pipeline concerns, such as catastrophic spills/leaks are included in the issues list. He noted that there may be an encampment of protestors along Trunk Highway (T.H.) No. 34 in Becker County that could also cause problems. The group suggested that new pipeline installations and aging pipelines could be added to the Emerging Issues list.

Johnson reported on a recent Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) meeting in southern Minnesota. The discussions regarding the stresses of developing the 1W1P yielded one important recommendation. People who have had experience with the 1W1P process strongly recommended that the Plan include some mechanism for dispute resolution. Johnson also noted that the BWSR representatives at the AMC meeting recommended that the Counties still have their own Water Plan in addition to the 1W1P. He commented that he brought up these issues because it's important for us to be aware of the pitfalls other watersheds in the State are experiencing with the 1W1P process. Van Amburg commented that there are some counties officials who are fearful of losing control, but he pointed out that the reason behind the 1W1P is to include all ideas/issues in one plan to address problems as a united front.

Regarding the BWSR's Versions 1.0 and 2.0 1W1P requirements, Johnson thought we should go with the Version 2.0. In 5 years, when we update the Plan, the 2.0 version will be standard. Arne commented that there isn't that much difference between the two versions. The group thought that it would be best to

incorporate the most current version now. Arne noted that the Committees shouldn't be too focused on the BWSR's content requirements. Most of them will be met as we work through the 1W1P process. Arne explained that he and the plan writers are responsible to make sure that the Plan follows BWSR requirements. Jacobson said that most of the requirements are built into the workplan, and the differences between Version 1.0 and 2.0 are insignificant. Most of the Plan work so far, has met the 2.0 requirements.

Nelson asked if the potential restriction on fall nitrogen application should be indicated on the maps. Jacobson thought it could be added when we start developing maps for the implementation activities in Plan Section 4. Albright said we could investigate how applicable it is to the whole watershed.

Johnson commented that we should limit the number of copies we print of the high-resolution maps. Nelson suggested the maps could be displayed on a monitor for public viewing. Jacobson has incorporated an interactive map of the Planning Regions into the public presentation. Albright said that we do have the technology in the office to provide specific information if any of the attendees request it, and the maps are also on the BRRWD Website.

The group had a brief discussion regarding electronic meeting attendance and the need for a quorum.

There being no further business to come before the Policy Committee, Vice Chair Flottemesch adjourned the meeting.