

Thief River 1W1P

Planning Group/Advisory Committee/Policy Committee
December 13, 2017 - Meeting Notes

Policy Committee: Grant Nelson, Wally Byklum, LeRoy Ose, Ray Hendrickson, Neil Peterson, Gary Kiesow, Brad Berg,

Planning Group: Drew Kessler, Matt Fischer, Myron Jesme, Josh Johnston, Zach Gutknecht, Peter Nelson, Corey Hanson, Darren Carlson, Ashley Hitt, John Johnston

Advisory Committee: Jeff Franson, Mike Dransveight, Stephanie Klamm, Jenilynn Marchand, Bill Neuschwander, Lowell Smeby, Craig Mowry, Lon Aune, Elroy Aune, Wayne Johnson, Brian Dwight, Mike Flaagan, Steve Holte, Curtis Hunt

Drew Kessler and Ashley Hitt discussed the PTMApp maps that identify priority points and how they are determined for lakes. There are currently 101 points, with a meeting scheduled with staff from Agassiz NWR to get a more precise location. PTMApp will identify where sediment, phosphorus and nitrogen are leaving the point and where its getting delivered to. Some of the dots are water quality sites. This will gage from a predication standpoint and someday could need additional monitoring if there is no current site there. This will estimate what kind of change we could see if there was a project there. This is tool to measure the pollutants coming into the stream, which is a standardized process owned by the state. By giving input on the PTMApp, this group has not decided to include the information in the plan. This is a computer model, not actual monitoring, rather a tool that will assist us in our decision-making process for priority areas. In the future we will have a presentation specific to what will come out of this process. Brian Dwight will any of these points be coordinated to the distributed storage study. We could identify flow reduction targets, which is also related to load contributions. Discussion was held on points representing existing water quality sites, HUC 12, topography, and boundaries.

Kessler requested as an action item to identify on the map if something is marked wrong and it will be addressed.

Discussion was held on water quality results in areas where water is stored. Kessler stated that we are not considering additional storage, we are trying to document where existing storage could be utilized, and may discuss later in the process additional storage. Corey Hanson stated that impoundments don't cause impairments, e-coli coming out of Moose River is low and low dissolved oxygen is low due to the lack of base flow. There are some complicated issues with Agassiz NWR, but it is a unique situation.

ACTION: Priority Points and Lakes for PTMapp analysis-will have a final set at the next meeting. This group can bring back comments prior to the next meeting. Homework date is December 22nd.

Zonation: Discussion was held on using a Zonation tool created by the DNR. Zonation would formulate objective statements, by creating a survey to align with the issues identified in the

matrix. The survey will ask individuals to rank items basined upon the spatial data layers that impact the watershed. What that will do is give you a pancake map on a spatial map, which you will get a map that shows the hot spots where people's priority aligns in a spatial sense. It's a targeting exercise. In-depth information can be presented by staff to the DNR which will be implemented in the model. Costs for the Zonation would be covered by the DNR as it is a service they already supply to local units of governments. DNR will develop and run the model using data provided by the local unit of government. Peter Nelson stated that we would use the existing matrix we decided on as part of the ranking tool to help identify areas in the zonation. Kessler stated that this is just an option, but zonation could aide in targeting where to develop projects in conjunction with other data. Once we have the map from the DNR, we get to decide how we want to use it. PTMApp will target where the practices can go (water sediment control basin, farmable dike, side inlet structure) and estimate the water quality in place, zonation gets to understand multiple benefits. Kessler stated that he is looking for a decision to move forward and bring this idea to the policy committee. Nelson stated that this tool will help benefit the planning process. We will give the DNR the input/data based on our priority concerns. Brad Berg and Gary Kiesow expressed their concern about Zonation and lack of information from other organizations using the tool. Zonation tool was developed in Sweden. Matt Fischer stated that a number of watersheds in the state have ran this tool and have seen it as a beneficial tool. Berg requested finding out who's using the information and bring it back for further discussion. LeRoy Ose stated that it would cost this project a lot of money if we run the program, but it sounds safe to have the DNR run it without it going wrong. Brian Dwight stated that staff with HDR Engineering was involved in this tool. Jenylynn Marchand stated that this is the first time she has seen Zonation, indicating that this whole approach is the main purpose for the 1W1P as it overlays the priorities to see where we can get the biggest bang for the buck. Marchand likes this process and hopes we move forward with it.

ACTION item that more information is needed, invite DNR staff to next meeting for discussion.

Land and Water Resource Inventory: Kessler stated that this is a homework document. Written comments need to be submitted by December 22nd to Peter Nelson. Review/inventory of existing reports and studies will be completed, information gathered will be included in an Appendix in the report. Nelson discussed more consistency with the maps and sizes and format of the maps. Fischer stated that some of the maps are borrowed from other reports, further discussing the costs of redeveloping them. We will leave original contact intact, and will not go back and develop new ones if its from an existing study. These items will be in the draft plan for review. Hanson stated that we are missing an inventory of impoundments, and list of ditches and who have authority over them. Kessler will edit the full-page maps for read ability. Discussion was held on impairments at various sites. **ACTION:** Send written comments to Peter Nelson by December 22nd

Resource Concern and Issues: Inside the packet on page 54 a series of tables that describe data layers. Comment on data layers you want to see on the map or take off the map. When they developed the resource station maps it was at the resource category, very broad, these are broken out into the certain specific categories. Finer resolution of each of these categories. These will

go in the plan to document resource concerns. This is a homework assignment to get written comments back to Peter by December 22. Houston changed the maps to reflect changes already recommended. Myron Jesme requested the addition of township and ranges to the map. Nelson commented on page 56 the highlighted subsurface sewage treatment-there is a few data points but not enough to justify it. Nelson would recommend removing it from the list. MDH comment on information. Elroy Aune commented on page 59 and how do they determined if the water can get down to the aquifer? Kessler the pollution sensitivity is areas where the groundwater is able to get down, Houston did not develop this information, it was pulled from the MDH. Marchand replied that MDH use the well drilling information and different levels of aquifers. Marchand discussed the ranking MDH use. Kessler will confirm the comments. There will be narrative inserted within the plan that will explain this. ACTION: Homework assignment written comments are due back to Peter Nelson by December 22,

Emerging Concerns: Starts on page 71, this information/concept was introduced at the last meeting. ACTION: This is an item that is homework, comments to Peter Nelson by December 22nd. Emerging issues sections covers items that we don't have enough information about to put in the plan to cover an issue. We want to document things that this group may want to learn more about, to bring in more information to see if it should be addressed in future plans. Houston has drafted a section, once they receive feedback they will document the feedback and develop a final draft and bring it back to the advisory committee/policy committee by January meeting. Dwight recommended including a section on irrigation fed from groundwater in this portion. Hanson recommended adding invasive species and will provide this information.

ACTION ITEMS: Kessler reviewed the following homework assignments: comments on the maps on PTMapp priority points and lakes, Land and Water Resources Inventory, Resource Concern and Emerging Concerns.

Introduce/Introduction. This has been drafted, we have a version of it today, the January meeting will have a homework assignment to review this introduction. Kessler asked for input? Fischer at some point we need a brief description on how the Thief River fits into the larger drainage basin. Kessler to keep the main content brief as possible is to stick this in the land and water appendix. Dwight recommended putting it in the introduction. Decision to include a broader description of the Thief River fitting into the larger drainage basin and keep it in the introduction.

Elroy Aune asked if the 1W1P is attached to the 20% flood reduction. Myron Jesme stated that is a separate strategy, however it will be addressed in the 1W1P plan. Aune questioned if some of the projects in this plan will be designed for flood reduction. Jesme replied that we don't know at this point where these sites are located or if any, but in his opinion flood damage reduction should be included in the plan.

Dwight discussed prioritizing things, stating that Clean Water Funds are weighing heavily on what's been prioritized in the plan. It is important to keep in mind high priority issues. The RLWD gets requests and has a legal obligation to respond to it, if the request is not in a high

priority in the plan does not mean that the project cannot be done. There is still the capability to do it.

Introduce/Introduction will come back as a homework assignment at the January meeting.

Measurable goals: Kessler stated that we are the point where Houston is asking to draft measurable goals. Houston will draft out goals for everything, they will go thru the matrix and draft goals. Kessler discussed general guidance, keep them numeric yet reportable, avoid concentration based goals, consider regional priorities. Kessler discussed the basis on how they will develop the measurable goals. In general, they will go to all the studies out there and start pulling out information and setting goals. They will identify long term goals. Drew displayed some examples of what is out there already. Discussion was held on altered hydrology. There is a plan to discuss ideas on how to set a volume management goal that is meant to address water quality issues. Identify when we do this analysis we do not take a stand on the cause and effect why flows may be different. We will conduct an assessment on what we believe the flow should be to meet a benchmark for the purpose of water quality. goals. To set the benchmark they look at the gage record, plot discharge, and see if there are any break points from a straight line. Stephanie Klamm stated that the DNR has completed some of this analysis and can provide it the information. Kessler explained the integrating metrics and setting a storage goal. Nelson stated that it will be identified as a measurable goal.

Kessler asked if the group wants Houston to start drafting goals in general, and do we want to consider an assessment like this for storage goals. They will need to do some assessment relative to water quality based metrics and pull in additional information that's already out there. Consensus was a yes to setting goals and altered hydraulic storage.

Kessler asked if the group wants Houston to start drafting the implementation programs? They can start a draft to put information together. Kessler discussed implementation concepts and what they would look like. This plan will consist of information on capital projects. There are statutory ordinances. Fischer asked where operation and maintenance fits into, open for discussion. Any ideas could be documented and submitted.

Roles and responsibilities: Houston will draft out, but they do not insert who is responsible for it, this will get discussed and tied to it. It will be listed in the plan by what the expertise of each entity is. They will start drafting it up.

Opportunities for feedback on information to be sent out. We will work with you to create the space and opportunity. We can mail out hard copies upon request.

Curtis Hunt stated that his operation operates over 8 watersheds. Are there any restrictions for him to show his group these plans at this point? Kessler sees no immediate concerns, but the information is draft and subject to change. Items that the policy committee has approved is the best to share. Fischer stated that we are representing a larger group on this committee, for you to take back to your committee.