



Attendance:

Advisory Committee Members: Dan Trosen, Jeff Hrubes, Cary Hernandez and Annette Drewes

Policy Committee Members: Jan Miller, Bill Thompson, Nancy Dunnell, Glenda Phillipe and Ed Arnesen

Planning Work Group Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR) and Josh Stromlund (LOW County)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski (HEI)

Other: Dane Lynch (L&WP) and Maranda Dahl (L&WP)

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 9:10 am. Jeremiah Jazdzewski (HEI) is the facilitator. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

Status Update:

Jazdzewski gave an update on completed and in-progress Plan items. Completed items include final draft Plan Section 2, updated and final Plan Section 2 Maps. In-progress items are draft Measurable Goals Table, Measurable Goals outline for Plan Section 3.

Plan Section 2: Analysis and Prioritization of Resource Categories, Concerns, and Issues

Plan Section 2 has been finalized after comments generated from AC and PWG, December meetings, and input text by the PWG. Maps were originally made by Mitch Brinks. Maps now have additional data from PWG comments. They also have been adjusted for consistent appearance. The AC had a discussion whether the sensitivity layer or recharge layer would be better on the Groundwater Map. Both are the basically the same as they are based on same soils data. Currently, the map has the MDA aquifer vulnerability layer, which will work. The Policy Committee will approve this Section in February.

Plan Section 3 – Measurable Goals: Section Structure:

HEI intends to build Plan Section 3 to be a structure for progress evaluation and reporting in eLINK. A new BWSR requirement for Measurable Goals is to include water storage goals in acre-feet and provide standards for water storage, retention and infiltration. Some Measurable Goals will be for one issue along with one Resource Concern and one Resource Category and some will be for multiple issues along with the multiple Resource Concerns and Categories.

A set of Protection/Restoration maps for E. coli, Inorganic Nitrogen, Total phosphorus and Total Suspended Solid surface water parameters across the Planning Regions will be used to show those surface waters that are Above Average Quality, Potential Impairment Risk, Threatened Impairment Risk, Low Restoration Effort and High Restoration Effort.

Draft Measurable Goals Table:

An AC comment was that the Measurable Goals Table issues are not defined by level as seen up to this point. Columns will be added on the end to define the levels. A narrative will be used for each Measurable Goal to provide greater detail the information behind each Goal that includes the short and long-term goals, the basis and reasoning why the metric for measurement was chosen and what Resource Concern and Priority issues are covered by that Goal.

Measurable Goals Excel Spreadsheet Comments

Jazdzewski went over the comments that were talked about during the Planning Work Group January 16 meeting. Measurable Goal (MG) 1 is about the nitrate levels in public/private wells. Chris Parthun – MDH will be contacted to evaluate historical well data and get an idea how much more data needs to be collected to get a good baseline to determine if nitrate is an issue. Actions for this Goal can be working with MDH, continuing sampling, determine how many more samples need to be collected, establishing a baseline and evaluating if this Measurable Goal stays or gets dropped. Public groundwater workshops

can be done. The bacteria (MG2) and aquifer (MG3) goals / baselines can be developed at the same time as the nitrate baseline. MG 4, a Protection-based Goal, will incorporate Planning Regions for sediment based on mid-flow measurements. The stream TMDL for sediment can be used in the Warroad River and Zippel regions for targeting by PTMApp for Best Management Practices, BMP placement with estimated load reduction, cost-effectiveness, and estimate progress made towards goal. The Lake of the Woods TMDL will be used for the phosphorus parameter. For those regions not having an impairment, the Margin of Safety numbers will be used. The Muskeg Bay Region is an example where MOS will be used in the PTMApp. An AC comment was that Zonation need to be included in MGs, because it is far easier to put practices on the ground when the public supports that area. Lake phosphorus goals will be defined by the Lake of the Woods TMDL. Each Planning Region is contributing phosphorus although far less compared to the upstream watershed areas of the Rain River.

The Red Lake DNR will be providing recommendation in their plan soon for the Northwest Angle. Goals may be more on the Protection side.

The lake levels are not influenced by this watershed very much. The actions for lake levels would be more on interactions with the Lake of the Woods Control Board and continuing staying engaged. PWG can provide narrative. Shoreline erosion goal will remain separate from the lake level. AC comment was that changes in land use may make shoreline erosion better (riparian) or worse (development).

The phase 2 study by the WRWD for in-channel stream assessment will be useful in implementation planning as the 1W1P moves forward. The plan is to use this assessment across the watershed area.

Storage goals can be done by entire watershed or by planning region. WRAPs will help with this goal. AC expressed that flooding areas could be a concern.

Wetland Compensatory Mitigation is currently being done as this area is going through a watershed plan update. This may be useful in the priority wetlands goal.

PTMApp Data Screening:

Omitted for time.

Implementation:

Ordinances, Rules, and Statutes will be tied to Goals and issues.

Actions Table: Version 2.0:

Omitted for time.

What's Next:

Based on the AC approval, the MG Structure and Table will move forward. HEI will redraft MG Table based on PWG and AC comments. AC needs to focus on MG that time did not allow for today. DNR Staff will look at the Habitat Goals. Chris Parthun will be contacted about the GW Goals. The Drainage Authorities will be contacted about the Ditch System Goals. Jeff Pelowski will be contacted about the Septic Goal(s).

Next Meetings:

The AC will meet March 21, 2018 at the Public Safety Building in Warroad, MN.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.



Attendance:

Advisory Committee Members: Annette Drewes, Dan Trosen, Todd Miller, Jeff Hrubes and Cary Hernandez

Policy Committee Members: Bill Thompson and Nancy Dunnell

Planning Work Group Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Scott Johnson (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR) and Josh Stromlund (LOW County)

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 10:06 am. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

Welcome

The task for this meeting goal is going through each of the Measurable Goal to discuss, define metrics, and come to consensus.

Measurable Goals:

MG 1-3) Ground/Drinking water: Chris Parthun (MDH) is working on these Goals and will be providing input for drinking water. This will change the language for the 1W1P. HEI had used the MDA fertilizer goals. Instead, it is suggested to utilize MDH guidance document: *Establishing Measurable Goals for Nitrate in Drinking Water*.

MG-4) Sediment load reduction: Move Short Term Goals (STG) to Long Term Goals (LTG). Set percentage of LTG for STG. Mike Hirst will check the Bostic and Zippel Planning Region numbers with recent studies for goal numbers. HEI will need to look at numbers from Warroad River study (phase 2). Need to use PTMApp to generate location and numbers.

MG 5) Phosphorus load reduction: Numbers seem high for most Planning Regions. Dissuasion between HEI and RESPEC amounts for MG 4 & 5 with respect to sediment bound phosphorus and dissolved organic phosphorus to ensure numbers are in the ball park. Bogs will drive up total phosphorous numbers. HEI will need to put in a justification statement: xxx amount are natural occurrences. Need PTMApp for short term goal. Move STG to LTG. Utilize PTMapp in setting STGs.

MG 6) Interactions with LWCB: Recommendations are to take out “annually” and put in “attend as necessary to keep lines of communication open”.

MG 7) Watershed storage: The Warroad River Planning Region number is high. The hydrology study can be used to define a good number. Number for soil health storage is needed. More information is needed on background of numbers. PTMApp may help. Desktop numbers can give decent numbers. HEI should show the Advisory Committee where these numbers come from so that the AC can decide if they are legit (Terrain Analysis, Hydro DEM, etc.). Look into utilizing the 1/8 inch across the entire watershed in the interim for STG if WRAPS numbers are not realistic. Set LTG as “reevaluate based on work completed and newer data (H/H Study).

MG 8) Wetland restoration / creation: Remove MG 8. This MG will be an action under MG 7. Get rid of “creation”. Add preservation or enhancement. Value based wetlands.

MG 9) Stream restoration: Numbers are too high (too unrealistic) and the people who generated these numbers are now gone. DNR will use desktop imaging to find Planning Region needs and appropriate locations. DNR will look at alternatives for a better MG. DNR will work on this MG. Also consider the restoration of bays in this MG.

MG 10) AIS – Lakes – Streams: LOW SWCD will get the numbers of hours and inspections. This MG is good

MG 11) Shoreland Restoration/Protection: This MG needs work and is assigned to everyone to work on. First part of goal: look specifically at developed area. Revise to say, “Restore or protect xxx feet/miles of shoreland along impaired waters to reduce loss of habitat, shoreland erosion and impacts from drainage and runoff.”

Part One of this MG: Mike will review the number of miles of current rip rapped shoreline to fill in the xx.

Part Two: Change Protection of shoreland xxx acreage:

Issues:

- Could say public land is protected so no net loss of public lands?
- Are we looking at 1,000 feet from lake and 300 feet from stream?
- Or are we looking at riparian areas only?
- Have to have development and growth built in
- What should we base these numbers off of?
- Link to adjacent impaired waters

MG 12) Lake/river accesses: Change to “maintain or improve existing accesses”

MG 13) Habitat protection/restoration: Remove MG 13. MG 13 will be merged with MG-11. The word “Acquire” is not favorable language to utilize in this planning area, change to utilize easement programs (SFIA, CRP, RIM, etc.). The original issues statement was for lake.

After thought (Mike Hirst): If we lump MG 13 with MG 11 are we missing other habitat goals for non shoreland areas?

MG 14) Altered peatlands: Remove MG 14. This goal will be added as an action item under the storage goals in MG-7.

MG 15) Tile Drainage: Inventory is difficult. STG = develop an inventory system to collect tile drainage information. LTG = tile inventory.

MG 16) Inspection and maintenance of ag drainage systems: This MG would be voluntary by landowner. Put this goal under MG 21 for field walkovers. For judicial ditches: STG1: inspect ditches every 5 years, STG2: Complete/Update Ditch Inventory/Drainage Modernization for the entire watershed (incorporating MG 18). LTG: Reevaluate after 10 years.

MG 17) BMPs and CPs: Remove MG 17 because these are action items.

MG 18) Ditch Modernization: LOW and RC are done with the ditch modernization. Discovered big holes in benefited areas in Roseau County after Ditch Modernization was completed. Have an inspection/inventory to check for any new ditches that have been added on in RC. This goal should be lumped with MG 16.

MG 19) SSTS Inspections: Reduce number of non-compliant systems by ____%. What percentage of systems are currently non-compliant? Josh Stromlund and Jeff Pelowski will have to go over this goal. Actions could be to encourage community systems, have township by township inspections, and/or have inspections during property transfer.

MG 20) Education/Outreach Events: Change to PWG to set annual curriculum or education themes and set annual goals (three topics). Prioritization and coordination should be done on an annual basis by the partnership for education / information / radio ads, etc.

MG 21) Field Walkovers / Shoreland Visits: Change “Field walkovers” to “Contacts.” Field walkovers will be an action item under MG 21. Contact XX% of landowners/shoreland owners about programs.

MG 22) New technology/tool staff trainings: Change to: “The partnership will set training needs on an annual basis.”

MG 23) Watershed wide approach for ordinances & permits: This is an aggressive goal. County Boards will need to decide. Move the STG to the LTG. Add “to address water quality concerns” at the end of the sentence.

Other Consideration: The AC may have MPCA run Scenario Application Manager (SAM) on the watershed to get some other comparable numbers for measureable goals.

Actions Table:

The revised Actions Table handout was distributed.

What’s Next:

The Measurable Goals Table will be modified for review at the next Advisory Committee Meeting. The Actions Table will be the main item at the next AC Meeting. Submit Action Table comments/additions by Friday, March 16 to Mike Hirst.

Next Meetings:

The next AC will meet March 21, 2018 from 10 am to 3 pm in the small meeting room at the Public Safety Building in Warroad, MN.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:06 pm.



Attendance:

Advisory Committee Members: Annette Drewes, Todd Miller, Jeff Hrubes, Phil Talmage, Cary Hernandez, and Brian Ketring

Policy Committee Members: Jan Miller, Glenda Phillipe, Nancy Dunnell

Planning Work Group Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR) and Josh Stromlund (LOW County)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski (HEI) teleconference

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 10:05 am. Janine Lovold is the note taker. Jazdzewski discussed the instructions for going over the Actions Table and then left the meeting.

Welcome

The task for this meeting goal is going through each of the Actions Items to see if that action is needed or changed. The Lead Entity(ies), Partners and Timeline will also be defined. The Planning Regions will be considered at a later time.

Action Items:

The Advisory Committee went over Action Items 1 – 55, 89 – 92, 98 – 99, and 113. Mike Hirst updated the Table as the Advisory Committee made comments. The Advisory Committee would have liked to see Action Items grouped together differently, such as by Measurable Goals.

What's Next:

A doodle poll will be sent out regarding potential meeting dates for the second half of April.

Next Meetings:

The AC will meet April 10, 2018 at the Public Safety Building in Warroad, MN. A second April meeting will be determined by the Doodle Poll results.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.



Attendance:

Advisory Committee Members: Annette Drewes, Todd Miller, Norval Parsley, Dan Trosen and Brett Mason (DNR Area Hydrologist)

Planning Work Group Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR) and Josh Stromlund (LOW County)

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 10:00 am. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

Welcome

Roundtable introductions were made. The task for this meeting goal is going the rest of the Actions Items. The Lead Entity(ies), Partners and Timeline will be defined. The Planning Regions will be considered at a later time.

Action Items:

The Advisory Committee went over Action Items 56–88, 93–97, 100–112, 114–130 and seven new proposed Action Items from Chris Parthun (MDH). Three of the new ones were repeats of already identified Action Items.

Next Meeting:

The AC will meet April 26, 2018 in Warroad, MN. Location and time will be sent out later. The goal for this meeting will be to go through the revised Measurable Goals and Actions.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm.



Attendance:

Advisory Committee (AC) Members: Annette Drewes (DNR), Todd Miller, Jeff Hrubes (BWSR), Dan Trosen (City of Warroad), Phil Talmage (DNR Fisheries), Cary Hernandez and Chris Parthun (MDH via teleconference)

Planning Work Group (PWG) Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR), Josh Stromlund (LOW County), Kayla Bowe (Red Lake DNR) and Scott Johnson (WRWD fiscal agent)

Policy Committee (PC) Member: Ed Arnesen (LOW County)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski (HEI via teleconference)

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting to order at 10:17 am. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

Update

Jazdzewski gave an update on completed work since January, work currently in progress, and what items need to be finalized.

- Plan Section 3: All committees have reviewed and provided comments for the MG Table. The PWG will need to provide HEI the final MG Table and reasoning narrative behind each goal. The final draft will then be sent to all committees for final review and comment. Plan Section 3 is over budget by \$1300.
- Plan Section 4: The AC and PWG worked on the Actions Table in April. The AC meeting today will need to decide on the outline for this section, a structure for implementation planning for Planning Regions and a process for tying the implementation programs to the actions and the planning region section. The PWG will need to provide a final Action Table to form the basis for the Targeted Implementation Schedule in Section 4. The data produced by PTMApp will need to be reviewed by PWG and AC to get a core data set that will be used.

Measurable Goals (MG) Table:

MG 1: Ground Water: Nitrates and Bacteria

- a. Keep water quality and quantity separate.
- b. Keep practices like well sealing, SSTs practices as actions.
- c. Prioritized public well testing can be omitted as MDH already monitors these.

MG 2: Ground Water: More data Water Quality

- a. Metric: Better Communication and Data Sources
- b. Just keep the sentence for the STG: Seek more data.
- c. Communication, well testing network, info to distribute
- d. Public well testing can be omitted as MDH already monitors these

MG 3: Ground Water: More data Water Quantity

- a. Arsenic more of an education/awareness piece

MG 4: Stream TSS/sediment reductions

- a. Need PTMApp data to define LTG and STG
- b. Different Percentages based on zonation? STG
- c. LTG add the Bostic and Zippel
- d. NWA unknown or natural instead of None
- e. Add the BZ assessment to the metric or basis

MG 5: Stream total phosphorus reductions

- a. Need PTMApp data to define LTG and STG
- b. Giant asterisk because there are questions to these numbers. How much is coming from ditch section of bogs, how accurate is the model?
- c. Should the AC define different percentages based on zonation? STG
- d. Get more information from MPCA and RESPEC if they are going to break up these values or treat them as watershed wide?
- e. NWA change unknown to natural instead of None
- f. Is there a data gap to ground truth these numbers from MPCA / RESPEC?

MG 6: Water levels on Lake of the Woods

- a. Ok

MG 7 & 8 & 14 Water Storage goals

- a. HEI admitted that these values were based off of Red River Valley figures and never set for this watershed.
- b. Running PTMApp it looks like 3,700 acre feet of storage for the watershed would be achievable without the soil health features.
- c. Set an 1/8 of an inch over the watershed (southern portion, excluding the lake and NWA) would yield 3,500 acre feet of storage as an interim measure to make reductions.
 - i. Many of the BMPs from PTMApp included were on state land.
 - ii. Request HEI to screen out public lands
 - iii. Annette will follow up with Brent (Mike send a follow up email: can someone look into the FEMA mapping to see if there were hydrology calculations that went into those maps)
 - iv. Henry Van Offland, Chad, Phil Talmage, sit down and discuss a realistic goals
- d. LTG: Need more information on stream systems and lake. Flows for targeting reductions
- e. Detention study? Use PTMApp to obtain favorable locations
- f. Historic flood damage – property / water system: need these locations to target implementation
- g. Are we trying to reduce peak flows, or have 5 – 10 year flood protection level or get stream stability?

MG 9: Stream Restoration

- a. Get more info from AC, Phil, Annette, Brent, WRWD,
- b. Ask HEI does this include the Bostic Ditch grade stabilization? What does this include?
- c. Sounds like there is some going on in the next year or two in the WRWD projects:
 - i. Bull Dog Run
 - ii. Cedarbend – 2 miles

MG 10: Aquatic Invasive Species

- a. OK

MG 11: Sensitive Shoreline Protection/Restoration

- a. Jeff Hrubes comment: This is counting so it is an action. Consider changing to: Reduce amount of sensitive shoreline at risk.
- d. Current STG is an action. Redefine STG
- b. Change % to prioritized zonation or needs based
- c. Split the MG into two:
 - i. Lakeshore
 - ii. Stream
 - 1. Get information from

- a. GIS - % undeveloped in private ownership also include the FEMA layer as sensitive resources
- b. Brent Mason: Permit request info
- c. Lambertson's Rock site example

MG 12: Public Accesses

- a. Ok remove "d" on improve(d)

MG 13: Habitat Protection

- a. Chris Parthun: Tim Byer –state managed forestlands in known GW recharge areas
- b. No net loss of public lands, but there are exceptions – Ed Arnesen
- c. Could get some forest areas and look at private and public parcels
- d. Need to finalize these numbers no real solution regarding these amounts and how to finalize
- e. Take Jeff's approach to 11? And make it a bit broad and not a counting game

MG 15: Tile Drainage Inventory System

- a. OK, WRWD is going to start implementing a permitting system for tile

MG 16: Flood Damage Reductions and Drainage Maintenance

- a. Remove the inspection as that is drainage authority
- b. Maintenance as an action
- c. Focus on inventory and maintenance for flood damage reductions
- d. Multi-purpose drainage management –
- e. Increase storage, put in side water inlets, buffer strips

MG 19: Septic Systems

- a. Ok, 10% for 10 years
- b. Could be the opportunity for Josh's TWP by TWP inspection program

MG 20: Education

- a. OK

MG 21: Contacts and Cost Share

- a. Need feedback from PWG on # of contacts and % enroll in CS

MG 22: Training of local staff

- a. OK

MG 23: Ordinances

- a. OK

Next Steps

MG

1. Mike will make edits to the MG table and send out information and input request on the remaining items to be finalized.
2. Input will come back by May 11th
3. PWG will meet at May 15th to finalize MG table
4. The specific numbers may still get tweaked during the PTMApp run or anything else that might change them in the meantime while we are working on the plan.

Plan Section 4

1. Request will go out to the AC members (especially those that have worked with other 1w1ps to submit ideas for how they think that the plan section 4 should be organized.

2. PWG meets on May 15th and discusses and decides how plan section 4 should be outlined and structured to be able to implement it.
 - a. Thoughts or ideas:
 - i. Utilize planning boundaries to split up the actions table
 - ii. Utilize a watershed wide approach for some actions/MG
 - iii. Maybe put ongoing type work in section 5

Actions Table:

1. When we know how the section 4 will look, then the action table can be finalized
2. In the meantime, it can be sent out as is. And should be brainstormed what actions are missing.

Comments on WRAPS

1. WRAPS information was not fully vetted for this planning areas regarding water storage. Water storage goals were based off of the Red River Valley area. Note for HEI as the WRAPS is still in draft to make the changes in the WRAPS documents so there is consistency between the 1W1P and the WRAPS.

Schedule:

Plan Section 3 is 3 months behind and \$1300 over budget. Plan Section 4 is 3-4 months behind. The Plan is also still 3 months behind from last year from the prioritization of issues. To meet March 2019 deadline for the BWSR Northern Committee meeting, a draft plan will need to be done by August 2018.

Next Meeting:

The next scheduled Advisory Committee meeting will be on July 18, 2018 in Warroad, MN. Location and time will be sent out later.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm.



Attendance:

Advisory Committee (AC) Members: Annette Drewes (DNR), Jeff Hrubes (BWSR), Dan Trosen (City of Warroad), Phil Talmage (DNR Fisheries), and Cary Hernandez (MPCA)

Planning Work Group (PWG) Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR), Kayla Bowe (teleconference - Red Lake DNR) and Scott Johnson (WRWD fiscal agent)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting to order at 1:07 pm. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

Update

Jazdzewski gave an update on completed work since April. HEI recently finished on the working drafts of Plan Section 4 (PS 4) and Plan Section 5 (PS 5). Local Government Units have been discussing the governance structure for plan implementation. HEI is starting work on completing the final layout for Plan Sections 1-3 that incorporates the correct formatting, table and figures.

Plan Section 4.0:

Jazdzewski commented that no formal comments were expected for this meeting, just general content dialog as the materials were just sent out a few days ago.

- **Section 4.2** – Take out
- **Section 4.3** – Ok
- **Section 4.4** – Have tool description in appendix or footnote. Consider streamlining the background piece because what the plan is about is more important. Mention profiles strongly at the beginning.
- **Section 4.5** – Include the zonation map with table. Omit “hot spots indicate” and “focus on” in the zonation table. In 4.5.1 HEI included the actual choices that the AC and PWG made. The CB curve example figure needs to be reworded as it is confusing.
- **Section 4.6** – Organize the first three like last three. BWSR will be sending out some working draft guidance documents for CIPs. Section 4.6.4 - The EPA changed the TMDL for the LOW TMDL. Can go with 54% as it is close to baseline. The LTG would need to be changed.
- **Stream Restoration** – Warroad (AIG), Bostic & Zippel (DNR) locations need to be ranked for restorations. Need hydrology piece as water quantity seems to be the problem – Gap Data. Add this to restoration part. With the altered watercourses – develop an H & H study as this correlates with biological stressors. Ask Drew Kessler about hydrology / peatland connection to the south. Add hydrology subsection for each planning region. Define stream restoration (ditch vs stream). Cary Hernandez will explore sites this fall for putting in flow meters to get data, which is a two-year process. Ranking of locations need to be completed.
- **Need prioritization** – what Actions can be done in 10 yrs and then ranking the Actions
- **Muskeg Bay** – Leave STG at zero, LTG at ?
- **NWA** – currently the only item for this PR is a CIP for Garden Island, because no PTM App data exists, no stream restoration, no studies, and no impairments. Current conditions will be added. A protection status will exist for most of the region, except for the dredged areas. Huge erosion issues on areas along the lake such as south shore and American Pt should be mentioned along with developed tributaries with sediment issues.

Plan Section 5:

Plan Section 5 was not discussed due to time restraints.

Budget and Schedule:

The Budge and Schedule was not discussed due to time restraints.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:14 pm.



Attendance:

Advisory Committee (AC) Members: Annette Drewes (DNR), Phil Talmage (DNR Fisheries), and Cary Hernandez (MPCA)

Planning Work Group (PWG) Members: Mike Hirst (LOW SWCD), Janine Lovold (Roseau SWCD), Chad Severts (BWSR), Josh Stromlund (LOW County), Brian Ketring (Roseau County HD) and Scott Johnson (WRWD fiscal agent)

Policy Committee: Bill Thompson (WRWD)

Other: Evelyn Ashiamah (MPCA)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski

Mike Hirst called the Advisory Committee (AC) Meeting to order at 10:08 pm. Janine Lovold is the note taker. The main meeting objective is to go over Plan Section 4 and summarize the amended development.

Update

Jazdzewski gave an update on the Plan process. Plan Sections 1, 2 and 3 are currently undergoing formatting for the draft Plan that will come out January 2019.

Plan Section 4

Currently, HEI has been working on Plan Section 4 (PS 4): Targeted Implementation Schedule for the last four months. PS 4 goes into the explanation of tools used to develop the implementation schedule (PTMAApp and Zonation), Planning Region profiles, Planning Region specific actions, watershed wide actions, the funding levels, and work done by others. The PWG had decided to break the planning area into five Planning Regions instead of keeping everything watershed wide as was first proposed. The PWG along with a couple Advisory Committee members developed the profiles for each Planning Region. Each profile gives a background, a summary of the state of the waters (impairment, protection, restoration, stressors), summary of important matters, summary of priorities, baseline funding actions, and additional funding actions. The PWG recently put together the funding levels per Planning Region along with the funding level breakdown of actions that are characterized within the following treatment groups: filtration (PTMAApp), protection, storage (PTMAApp), source reduction (PTMAApp), in-channel, and other.

Plan Section 5

Draft Plan Section 5 (PS 5) was released in August of 2018. So far, efforts have been focused on PS 4. PS 5 tells how the plan will be implemented. Implementation Programs are broken down into Structural and Management Practice Incentives, Education & Outreach, Data Collection & Monitoring, Capital Improvements and Regulation & Enforcement. The Funding section will show the local, state, federal and other dollars that is typically used to fund the baseline actions. The Plan Administrative & Coordination section will spell out who play a part in the roles for decision making and the collaborative process that will be governing structure to carry out this plan. Annual planning along with assessments and evaluations will help guide the plan to the 10-year completion.

The process from the finalized draft plan to official plan review by BWSR Northern Region Committee & state agencies (60 days), public hearing, and final submittal to BWSR (90 days) was discussed.

Homework:

HEI

- Where H & H Studies are mentioned in the PR profiles, make sure that it is clear that H & H studies will be targeted where needed for projects and not Planning Region wide.
- Emphasize that sediment loading into Bostic Creek is channel driven rather than sheet & rill
- Broaden statement in Bostic Creek PR regarding public ditches rather than state CR 4 Ditch
- Soften language for NWA and Muskeg Bay PR so people feel represented in those areas
- Instead of MG-1, put in GW-1 (Ground Water) to make more descriptive rather than having to look up what MG-1 is.
- Use bold words / titles in Actions Tables

Chad Severts

- Get Thief Rivers 1W1P wording for differences on local controls. Matt Fischer will be contacted.

PWG

- HEI needs further directive for PR hydrology, in-channel and CIP pieces.
- Review PS 5

Budget and Schedule:

The Schedule is about 6-7 months behind and the Budget is limited (more for a 4-5 month timeframe).

Next Meetings:

Advisory Committee: No additional meetings until draft Plan meeting.

Policy Committee: No additional meetings until draft Plan meeting.

The draft Plan meeting will be a combined Advisory and Policy Committee meeting.

Planning Work Group: Conference calls as needed.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.