

Missouri River Watershed
One Watershed, One Plan
September 13, 2017
Rock County Law Enforcement Center
Planning Work Group Meeting

Present: Doug Goodrich, Ed Lenz, Andy Geiger, Chris Bauer, Mark Hiles, John Shea, Brian Nyborg, Mark Hanson, Doug Bos, Sara Soderholm, Rachel Olm

Summary of Public Kickoff Meeting:

HEI gave a summary of the public kickoff meeting and results. Worthington had roughly 46 attendees with 18-20 being members of the public. Pipestone had roughly 30 attendees with 12 being members of the public. The top responses at Worthington were fertilizer and pesticides applied on urban landscapes, consistent local funding for water management projects and increased levels of nitrates in groundwater. The top responses at Pipestone were decreased soil health, application & disposal of manure, and increased levels of nitrates in groundwater.

Discussion was had on the weighting of votes due to the larger number of AC and PC members. A consensus was reached that weighting will not be done until after the PWG and AC votes are tallied and only if the results seemed skewed or send up a red flag.

The PWG discussed the Missouri River Watershed logo made by HEI. HEI will add a riparian corridor along the stream.

Land & Water Resources Inventory:

Primary purpose is to be a "simple account of water resources and physical factors affecting water resources within the watershed". Language was taken mostly from the Missouri River Basin Monitoring & Assessment report, Missouri River Basin TMDL, and WRAPS documents because they are specific to the area.

The geology section will be changing. Feedback was given to HEI that there were better references than the MPCA document for geology. The consensus within the PWG was to use the US Geologic Survey in conjunction with the MPCA document.

On page 7, the 3.4 inches of average precipitation was for July not annually. HEI will try to find annual rainfall data to replace Figure 4 instead of looking at just the month of July. Figures created by HEI will be formatted to look more like Figure 33 (pg. 50) with white space instead of excess map and legends will move up onto the white space. Hopefully, this will allow them to make the maps bigger. The group decided not to spend the time and money remaking figures created by other agencies. Any comments on the Land & Water Inventory need to be sent to Dan Livdahl by September 20. Changes will be made and it will be presented to the PWG again before sending it on to the PC.

Introduction:

HEI will work on a style manual and add logo to the plan. The introduction draft was recommended for approval by the PC with a few changes. The Upper Big Sioux, Lower Big Sioux, Rock, and Little Sioux watersheds will be referred to in the same order throughout the plan, starting in the Northwest and moving to the Southeast. On Figure 1-1, HEI will deemphasize the WDs and highlight the HUC-8 watersheds. They will also put a little more emphasis on cities and a few major roads for individuals to

get their bearings. Figure 1-1 will also be formatted similar to those in the Land & Water Inventory with more white space, less excess map, and the legend moved onto the white space.

Planning Regions:

Areas were divided using a combination of geologic and WD boundaries. Regions allow for a better ability to manage projects and shift how you select BMPs in different regions. It will also make it easier for PTMApp to select BMPs.

Discussion was had on how funds will be divided between planning regions and implementation structure. This topic will be brought up at the next PC meeting for them to begin thinking about. The PWG can set a specific number of practices to be implemented per planning region.

Prioritization of Issues:

Due to low attendance, absentee ballots will be sent out with the emphasis that it is a one-time thing. State agency individuals present were asked to vote with the AC.

Resource Concern Maps:

These are used to articulate priority issues and concerns and were partially done as part of the public meeting. These maps differ from the resource category maps because the resource categories are broken down further into resource concerns. A handout was distributed with the data layers for each map. The yellow highlighted sections were asked to be provided by PWG members. Feedback on the handout must be sent to Dan by September 27. If your feedback is about adding a specific data layer, please include the shapefile.

Maps will be formatted similar to those in the Land & Water Inventory and will show up in Section 2 of the plan. PWG will receive maps in a high-resolution PDF and MDX format later on.

Emerging Concerns:

Scientific/Technical

- Climate change & infrastructure resilience
- Chemicals of emerging concern
- Invasive species
- Wind erosion
- Chlorpyrifos (Insecticides)

Discussion was had about using the words 'climate change' as they can be a buzz word for some people. Consensus was made to make it less political and change it to something more like extreme weather events. Wind erosion was removed as it was addressed in the issues table. Herbicides is to be included with insecticides. Depending on how MDH divides it, insecticides and herbicides can be categorized with chemicals of emerging concern. There will be a write up for each category in Section 2 of the plan.

Policy & Funding

- Funding for plan implementation (implementation block grants)
- Conservation practice delivery mechanism
- MN rules: compliance and inconsistent application across jurisdictional lines
- Farm law legislation (national & international)
- Renewable energy legislation

The language will be changing from implementation block grants to include competitive vs. noncompetitive grants. Discussion was had about different feedlot and septic ordinances within the watershed. The PWG recommended that the MN rules section for sure include information about 1030e and septic systems. There will be a write up for each category in Section 2 of the plan.

Strategies and Actions:

Each issue will be broken down into strategies and further into specific action items and will be in Section 3. These are developed for each issue regardless of priority. HEI recommends the list be in the appendix of the plan as the action items show up again in the targeted implementation schedule in Section 4. The targeted implementation schedule will include the location, roles/responsibilities, timeline & funding.

HEI presented the PWG with a new format for the strategies and actions in Excel with the hopes of making review less cumbersome. The consensus was to continue with the new format in Excel instead of having a very large list in a Word document as action items can be repeated multiple times. HEI had mentioned that in one watershed the Word document was 30 pages long.

Surface Water Protection & Restoration Mapping:

An update was given on the protection & restoration mapping that was approved last month. HEI briefly went over the maps for above average quality, potential impairment risk, threatened impairment risk and low and high restoration effort as the PWG was running short on time. The consensus was to add impaired streams to the maps. Maps will show up again in Section 3.

Measurable Goals:

This will be presented at the next meeting.

PWG members that were present voted for their top issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah A. Soderholm