

# **Thief River 1W1P**

Planning Group/Advisory Committee/Policy Committee

June 13, 2018 - Meeting Notes

Policy Committee (PC) (Delegates and Alternates): Ray Hendrickson, Grant Nelson, Don Jensen, Neil Peterson, Gary Kiesow and LeRoy Ose.

Planning Work Group (PWG): Peter Nelson, Bryan Malone, Myron Jesme, Corey Hanson, Josh Johnston, Matt Fischer, Matt Jacobson, Tony Nordby, and Drew Kessler.

Advisory Committee (AC): Denise Oakes, Henry VanOffelen, Annette Drewes, Curtiss Hunt, Elroy Aune, Mike Drangstveit, Darrold Rodahl, Jeff Fransen, Ray Benson, Chris Parthun, and Brian Dwight.

Drew Kessler gave a recap of the project and reviewed the schedule. Sections 4 and 5 are slated for decisions in September. Kessler reminded the group on the structure of providing advice to the PWG, with comments sent through Peter Nelson to the PWG. Formal owners of the Plan are the PC members who will make the decisions. Darrold Rodahl stated that notes and comments should be reflected in the documentation.

3.2.1 referenced in 5.0

Plan Section 3 comments: 3.2.12 improving water quality from storm water runoff. Better fit into goal 3.4.2 Peter Nelson will provide report from City of TRF.

Comment 8. Confusion in naming of measurable goals. Short and long-term goals rename the categories headings. Example: 3.2.6 drainage management systems would be a measurable goal category then there would be short term/long term goal.

Darrold Rodahl drainage water management 3.2.5 goal in there for storage. Matt Jacobson language he had taken out of somewhere. Could state the goal as a specific volume or flow reduction and not use the language storage. Move down to comment 4. Goal is to not increase runoff. Numbers were pulled out of an existing study. Rodahl numbers are aggressive. Matt – short term goals is to set a set percentage amount towards the long-term goal. Rodahl in his opinion storage is goal. In section 3 for the long-term goal is to describe upon the recommended revision on comment 4. Rodahl add there maybe regions where there is none. Elroy Aune last 30 years shouldn't be included in a formed benchmark, we have increases on peak due to all the impoundments we have. Myron Jesme, we want to protect something that happens more often. Bryan Malone back to discussion on storage and benchmark and what we are comparing future things to. Drew Kessler discussed data gap.

Comment 22- Brian Dwight as a goal that is a good starting point. We will not make it worse than what it is today, there is a data gap, we should not overcomplicate the thought, but the goal is to not make it any worse than what it is.

Darrold Rodahl-there is a 5,000 ac.ft. of reduction can that be struck. Drew Kessler that is from the FDR study from two of the planning regions. Henry VanOffelen those are the areas that

contribute to high peak flows. Discussion on converting from ac.ft. to inches so it makes more sense to people.

Comment 22: Matt Jacobson basically asked the question what the benchmark should be for the measurable goal 3.2.5. we don't have actual gage data, look at HSPF results. Corey Hanson HSPF model has recent flow monitoring on the tributaries. Henry VanOffelen using HSPF you can scenario track them. Kessler revision be to use HSPF information. Rodahl acronym stands for? This is a data gap that was recognized, the need for better flowage information. Make sure the acronym is spelled out in information.

Comment 23: 3.2.6 drainage management systems erosion sediment reduction. Several comments. How to best set this goal? We structure the goal how does this group want to set the numbers? Comments 51, 52, 127, 128 on how to set that goal or set an additional goal. Page 24, comment 127 setting goal.... Henry VanOffelen goal is to provide adequate drainage. Drew Kessler this text could be inserted to provide adequate drainage to not flood ag land for 24-48 hours and if you can't do that, address the flooding as best as you can. Annette Drewes: also need to address sedimentation. This language will go into description. Brian Dwight what crop would require the shortage duration? Darrold Rodahl have to talk to University Extensions. Rodahl why is the 48 in there? Kessler study looks at range of crop types. Van Offelen depends on the crop, time of year and many other factors. Kessler comments 227 and 128 add descriptions provided by BWSR add short and long-term goal to provide adequate drainage. Dwight define adequate drainage. Comment 23-yellow boxes need to be filled in. Matt policy related goal and adequate drainage definition goal. Kessler strike the sediment and address through [REDACTED]. VanOffelen adequate low maintenance systems. Rodahl well maintained means vegetative cover. VanOffelen and not filled with sediment, sediment and slumping and instability, Drewes any system even channelized, the water itself is going to try and move, try to dissipate its energy. You can't manage every water system in here, make sure that there are two sides to the sediment issue. Streams carry sediment, the channel should carry sediment appropriately. Need to find a balance. Rodahl straight ditches well maintained systems cause the least amount of erosion. Kessler the group is ok with two goals related to multipurpose and drainage has to be managed. Drewes WRAPS indicated some systems that were under stress through the geomorphology. Comment 23 will be addressed through comments 127 and 128. Add manage a drainage system. Comment 25 - CD 20, Moose, Mud and Thief there were comments in there. Kessler incorporate goals relative to the geomorphology studies. Call out the four systems that need multi-purpose management. Work could still occur, targeted practices through this plan. Kessler addressed based on BWSR comments with the addition of the specific regions mentioned in the geomorphology.

Comment 29-measurable goal-MN stream habitat assessment use as a metric to set goals. Stream habitat done for each plan region. Will include a link to the information and how it was conducted. Drew Kessler if the condition is better you won't do as high of a percentage of a reduction goal. Corey Hanson multiply numbers for each planning region, take a minimum for each planning region. Kessler tiered system with goal set based upon the minimum quality observed within the planning region. Annette Drewes healthy quality habitat is not defined, add

a definition of that or does everyone understand what a healthy quality habitat is? Drewes/MnDNR will provide suggestive language. Brian Dwight discussion is up here over the head, brief explanation of who is going to be responsible to obtain these goals? Dwight would assume not the landowners, but the LGU's work with people that have the desire to do activities to accomplish things in a manner that helps improve this healthy river score. Kessler that is correct, it will be spelled out in Section 4, a table with all the actions and it assigns who this group assigns what group will be responsible for those actions. Section 5 will describe the programs the LGU's can use. Bryan Malone the whole process is for the LGU's to work together with the other state and federal agencies, that is the goal.

Comment 31: this was addressed in planning regions and multiply goals.

Comment 46 is a yes and a best available tool.

Comment 53: Habitat. Last meeting discussion and recommendation to remove to focus more on enhancement of existing habitat and not increasing. How to best do that? Brian Fischer there is wetlands and not a desire for increase, we do have a WCA, have a goal related to mitigation acres in spots where they will have impact on water quality and habitat. Strategic placement of banking acres. Annette Drewes asked if the title got changed on that one. HEI it will get changed. Curtis Hunt last time we talked about continuous areas being important to wildlife, shouldn't have long narrow strips, etc. that was a concern last time. Wildlife needs continuous source of area. Maintain, enhance blocks for habitat. Matt Fischer comment could be added in Section 5 regarding placement of banking acres. Henry VanOffelen there is bank service areas in the state, we may want to reference that process. Dwight maintain and enhance the terrestrial blocks, etc. the discussion just turned to wetlands discussion we need to address upland, connectivity relations between the blocks, not necessarily increase but work towards the connectivity issues that are out there. It concerns Dwight that we turn around and go right to wetlands. Kessler modify the goal and add consideration of habitat correctively issues. Drewes what is easiest for measuring? Elroy Aune how do we define a good habitat area? Drewes if there is an existing area. Aune all there is, is ticks and mosquitos, no single duck in these ditches, no deer, moose but its wildlife habit that is so full if we get rain its too full to hold any water. There is nothing living out there. It is a killer of wildlife. Closer to the farmland is where the wildlife is. Aune is this what we are trying to create? This is a disgrace, we are ruining it and going backwards. VanOffelen we could add reviewing management plans in existing WMA's. Kessler, we did strike the word "increase". We are looking at maintenance and enhancement.

Chris Parthun, Comment 95 and 97 conductivity and terrestrial habitat. Does that address the concerns of wetland habitat?

Rodahl meeting notes correction. (Not sure where he was referring to).

Comment 72: How will this measured? Best available model. General agreement or model will be used on how we measure things.

Comment 76: Marked as a No. Annette Drewes checked into.

Comment 77: Focus on 3.2.7 – buffer, riparian areas. Comment not a lot of water courses that are not covered by buffer law. Strike the recommendation from the short-term goal. Bryan Malone was there any other water course mentioned. Marshall or Beltrami County did not map anything. Drew Kessler we can reference county and SWCD decisions.

Comment 79: Annette Drewes issues that were covered by more than one. We will mark it as a No, it's an acknowledgement that things are covered.

Comment 89: 3.2.5 Annette Drewes we are good with that.

Comment 105: Annette Drewes no idea, say No.

Comment 122, 123: similar. 3.2.10 measurable goals that are hard to write them as not as an action. How do you measure awareness if you don't write them as an action? Matt Fischer we are pushing measurable goals, but not every goal can be measurable. Annette Drewes, we have some measurements, events lead to an enrollment for cost share programs. How you do it is an action item? Strike the [REDACTED]. Conservation program participation, programs listed in Section 5 of the plan. Change to: Increase enrollment and plan programs. Increase compliance with regulations as referenced in Section 5. Darrold Rodahl concern is the policing to increase compliance, there are agencies doing that. Compliance is fine. Drewes develop a biannual targeted education plan. Set goals every 2 years and come up with a plan for focus for the two years. Kessler two goals to address comment 122-124 increase enrollment and plan program, maintain compliance with regulations. Reference section 5. Drewes typo in 3.2.11 it's under a data collection and not under public education. Need to correct label relative to plan section 2.

Matt Fischer 3.1.10 one issue statement not addressed. Increase regular input from stakeholders. Two goals we talked about are not being addressed. Fischer, we don't need a percentage just a goal statement. Kessler one statement of increased knowledge of (local governments use stakeholders when making decisions). 122-124 language will be added to the description section to spell out the two goals we are setting are being used to address the four issues. Drewes comment about document on comment 123 we will revise to make sure consistency between language and plan section.

Chris Parthun 112, 113, 119 arsenics. Another watershed placed this in enhanced baseline condition. Provide information to the landowner of that level and provide information. 3.2.1 add arsenic is to delete from goal section but to bring it up in 3.2.11 as an education and outreach goal, could lend itself to a program to give information to individuals with high levels, the same is for nitrates and [REDACTED]. 112, 113 and 119 will be moved to 3.2.1.

Corey Hanson comment 116 false statement on JD 11 maintenance. WRAPs have documented that what they are doing in JD 11 is causing problems downstream. Mark it as NO and do not revise the text. Darrold Rodahl does not agree with changing it, key word is maintenance. Myron Jesme they are referring to within the pool, where the JD 11 system in the refuge is full, they are dipping it out and causing sediment to go downstream. Cleanouts are common practice. Denice Oakes there is a debate if it's an actual legal ditch system. They do not know if the maintenance rule applies. Drew Kessler is the language correct as written? Henry VanOffelen is

there a better word than problematic. Revision to comment 116 change the work from problematic to a concern with a need for further investigation. Comment will stay, but the final comment will be in the right column. Matt Jacobson check back with the watershed district as they provided a revision to this comment.

Darrold Rodahl comment on 56: No already addressed will be stricken.

Darrold Rodahl comment 59: feedlots-Neauschnader. 2000 legislation created the rule on it simply to go to MPCA, who is the watch dog to go to correct agencies to have that done. SWCD regulates feedlots. Drew Kessler this revision will be consistent with maintenance.

Darrold Rodahl comment 60-septic systems. 100% compliance? Would it be helpful to include the levels? Per comment receive yes revised and include descriptions of categories which will go to section 5.

Plan section 4 the PWG will go through it. Next meeting, we will go through Section 4 and 5.

Section 3 is done, they will incorporate comments and submit to the PC.