

# Thief River 1W1P

Planning Group/Advisory Committee/Policy Committee

February 14, 2018 - Meeting Notes

Policy Committee (Delegates and Alternates): Grant Nelson, Wally Byklum, Tim Sumner, Don Jensen, Ray Hendrickson, Neil Peterson, Gary Kiesow, Brad Berg.

Planning Group: Drew Kessler, Matt Fischer, Myron Jesme, Corey Hanson, Darren Carlson, Bryan Malone, Matt Jacobson, Tony Nordby

Advisory Committee: Jeff Franson, Mike Dransveight, Stephanie Klamm, Jenilynn Marchand, Bill Neuschwander, Lowell Smeby, Lon Aune, Elroy Aune, Wayne Johnson, Curtis Hunt, Denise Oakes, Loiell Dyrud, Jim Counter, Henry VanOffelen and Darrold Rodahl.

Drew Kessler discussed the Public Kick-Off meeting and items that were approved by the Policy Committee meeting. Kessler stated that he is asking the Advisory Committee for feedback and to decide on the Priority Issues and Introduction.

## Agenda item 3: Priority Issues

Kessler stated that Houston Engineering Inc (HEI) reviewed the tallied votes on the Prioritization Matrix, and then the Planning Work Group (PWG) completed some analyses on how to proceed with the information. Corey Hanson discussed how the information was put together by ranking the number of votes and the use of percentiles. The PWG went through it issue by issue, noting that they highlighted some where there should additional discussion. Discussion was held on the recommendations from HEI and the PWG and the correlational between the public awareness and public ranking. It was noted that just because an issue did not receive a vote does not mean it will not be mentioned in the plan. There will be some sort of public awareness and outreach. Nothing from the matrix will be lost in the plan, it will be documented.

Discussion was held on the following issues of the Prioritization Matrix:

1.1.1: Peter Nelson asked if the Advisory Committee is ok with a B ranking. Jeninlynn Marschand respond yes.

4.1.3 Changed to B

Discussion was held on the revised rankings:

A-initial implementation action-will get measurables goals

B-will get measurables goals

C-will not get measurable goals

Lon Aune questioned the ranking process, issues were determined a priority, and now the PWG is moving it down because its not measurable. Aune questioned if this is what we should be doing? Nelson discussing using professional judgment, with Hanson discussing the equalizing of votes. Matt Fischer discussed public input, and that the changes do follow what is happening. Aune stressed that we need to make this a public driven plan.

Myron Jesme discussed Issue 1.1.1 which is a high priority, but the issue is already good, do we put this as an A, where this issue has already been addressed?

Further discussion was held on perception and communication why we made the changes. Elroy Aune asked if the public would be involved to fix the problem? Fischer explained that most of the projects that come out of this plan will be on a voluntary based project to adopt these practices. Kessler stated that to be transparent, this could be included in an appendix as to why the decisions were made. Kessler stated that we will describe the input process and how it was included in the plan. It was noted that by people putting all their dots on one item it could skew the numbers.

Darrold Rodahl asked if it can remain on the high priority without doing anything with it because that is what the public said. The issue is maybe fixed now, but it is a priority. Kessler stated we that a section could be added to explain why it was moved. Fisher explained that we are prioritizing things for the next 10 years, we will not get everything done, moving from an A to B does not mean it will not get attention. Curtis Hunt suggested to list two columns one that needs help and the other that doesn't need help it could solve the perception. **Recommendation to change heading from HEI column to public input.** Fischer recommends that the group comes with one recommendations. We can keep this prioritization but just bullet what was in good shape just not a high priority, suggesting the group should step back and see where this fits in. Fischer reminded the group that in the end the Policy Committee makes the final decision on this as they are the appointed officials put in their position for a reason. All final recommendations go to the Policy Committee. Aune recommended an interim document may be needed to go to the Advisory Committee that shows the voting responses and then the work group recommendations and indicate why they made the changes they made.

Kessler state that agenda Item No. 6 will show the structure of how this will be incorporated, it has not been adjusted, this prioritization can also be included as an addendum and will be a package deal that people can look at.

Question was raised that if you are not obligated to spend money on the "A" group why take it out? Fischer explained that this plan should indicate where money should be spent first. Moving things to a "B" you can still get actions on it. BWSR expects things to be prioritized. If there is no need to spend money on something why is it in the "A" category. Within the life span of the work plan which is 10 years. If something comes up in the time frame of 10 years, it can still be addressed.

Kessler stated that we agree to move forward, reserving judgement that we acknowledge the publics input.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Introduction**

Kessler would like a recommendation to move forward with this section. The introduction is an overview of the plan. Very few comments were received, all comments were incorporated in the plan. Fischer and Kessler reviewed the key items. One issue was describing how the watershed fits into the Red River Basin. Another suggested was the abbreviation of the Thief River Watershed. It was recommended to get rid of some acronyms, don't create new ones. HEI

will not create new acronyms. They did create a link to the RLWD website. **Consensus to move forward with the Introduction.**

#### **Agenda Item 5: Protection and Restoration Strategies**

Kessler stated that Hanson reviewed, and updated information prepared by HEI. Hanson gave prioritization based on water quality assessments based on statistics, which was used for WRAPS. Hanson reviewed the maps and tables, further discussing the standards and various monitoring sites. Kessler discussed non-point source funding plan. We can help identify to the state funding plan with the information we have, which in turn we can receive funding to improve the impairment. Kessler would like to see HEI work with Hanson to get the information incorporated into Section 2. The PWG/Advisory Committee will get a revised Section 2 for review and comment. Hanson discussed the color scheme used on the maps and local planning decisions and what standard do we want to apply to the Moose and Mud Rivers. Moose River falls within three categories, right now the standard for the Mud River is 30 mg/L, but it has met the standard at 15 mg/L. Hanson questioned If it is ok with the group if we use the 15 mg/l to meet for goals. if we set it too high we are setting a goal that can't be reached? Hanson stated that 15 mg/L is achievable. Our local goals may be different than the MPCA goals. This would be on the Mud and Moose Rivers, we could include the other ditches if we want. Measurable goals are not on the agenda for today. The watershed was not assessed for biology, but we did have the data. Marchand stated that she liked the maps, the restoration vs protection Hanson captured, but there is not a differential between what streams need to be protected and streams that need to be restored. Maybe rank them between each category. Hanson stated that he can do that if needed. It was recommended to create a table that could compare the categories. This will be brought back to the group. **Homework assignment: Approval to work with Hanson, this group will see this as homework for the next meeting. Provide specific comments to Peter Nelson by February 21<sup>st</sup>. Circulate Hanson's maps to the PWG by the end of this week. Cleaned up materials will be in packet for March meeting.**

#### **Agenda Item 6: Section 2 ID and Prioritize issues**

Kessler stated that given the discussion today, he would like to have the PWG and HEI review this item and have this item as discussion for the next meeting. The document is the packet to review. At the March meeting we will come back with a clean draft of Section 2 and will ask for a decision at the April meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 7: Altered Hydrology**

Kessler stated they ran an assessment that sets hydrology goal based on water quality needs. They ran into an issue that the gage they have is below the flood control project. Assignment from last meeting was HEI worked with RLWD to dig into water monitoring on how to proceed with this section. First map shows dots were monitoring data has been collected, table is summary of what's there, next is how to we proceed with this information. Not enough information to set a realistic goal at this time, but they do recommend continuing monitoring to look at further information. We do not have a baseline condition. Altered hydrology comes into play during the biological assessments portion of the plan. Henry Van Offelen asked how this relates to FDR, is this an area that the watershed targets for 20% flood reduction. VanOffelen stated that we should recognize the amount of runoff per unit of rain. This is an increasing trend, which has implication for long term planning. HSPF model will give us runoff coefficients for

this region. May be area that have higher runoff coefficients. There are many strategies to help runoff. Kessler stated that information related to goals will be in section 3 of the plan and strategies in section 5. Do we want to assign a task to pull out runoff coefficients?

**Homework: Stephanie Klamm will pull the information on coefficients and have the information to Peter Nelson by February 21<sup>st</sup>.** Kessler addressed Elroy Aune and the types of types of strategies, actions and projects to manage in the watershed. We will have plenty of time to discuss these. Darrold Rodahl stated that tile drainage needs to be included for retaining waters. Kessler stated soil health will also. VanOffelen asked if we should consider for the next meeting, to bring someone (Chuck Fritz) in to talk about the potential of tile drainage for storage, referencing a study done on tile in its relation to storage in the Red River Basin. **Homework: VanOffelen will reach out to Chuck Fritz and see if he's available to come to the March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting and will relay that information back to Peter Nelson by February 21<sup>st</sup>.**

#### **Agenda Item 8: Capital Projects, local rules and ordinances and Section 5 of the Plan**

Kessler stated that HEI started drafting this as information purposes today. Focus for today's discussion is on capital project, local rules and ordinances. This was a homework assignment from the last meeting to get this information compiled. **Homework: next meeting homework assignment to have this table finished. HEI needs it by February 28<sup>th</sup>.** This will come back to March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting for final review. If you see anything missing get that information to Peter Nelson. We are just documenting information that is already out there. Lowell Smeby asked about streambank stabilization. Does not include Mud River which needs attention. Jesme stated that Wally Byklum mentioned Moose River also. It was noted that Capital projects are determined as a project that costs more than \$150,000. **Homework: Kessler responded that from today's meeting he heard add Mud River to this list and we want feedback from any specific ditch systems that need a comprehensive work done over \$150,000. Get that information to Peter Nelson by February 21<sup>st</sup>.**

#### **Agenda Item 9: Strategies and Actions**

Table is a comprehensive list of actions to address the issues for measurable goals for each issue. HEI pulled out all the actions that were documented in the WRAPS process for the Thief River Watershed as well as actions that HEI compiled based on previous plans. Each action is tied to the source, what implementation program it would fall under for funding, where in the watershed that action would occur and how many issues it is tied to. Actions will be assigned for each issue, but goals will only be assigned for A and B. These are things you may do to introduce issues in your watershed. **Homework: go thru this and see if there are local watershed plans that they missed and get feedback on their overall reaction, are we missing actions, etc. Information to Peter Nelson by March 16<sup>th</sup> just for item No. 9-Strategies and Actions. In April, we will ask for a decision on this item from the Advisory Committee. Matt Jacobson will provide the excel spreadsheet on this information to Tammy Audette to send out by Friday, February 16.** This will be in section 5 of the plan. Kessler that that this massive table will not be in the plan, instead there will be a summary of this in the plan. Marchand asked if they can add recommendation for other actions. Yes, they can.

**Agenda Item 10: Prioritize, Target, and Measure Application (PTMApp)**

Kessler reviewed the development of the PTMApp. PTMApp is being developed across the state. This is being run by RLWD staff from a BWSR grant. This data will be used in this planning process. Kessler discussed priority resource points and how the points were determined. Targets where you could place conservation practices. Does not indicate if there is a conservation practice already in place. PTMApp looks at soil types, topography, overland surficial, it uses high level resolution.