

Lake of the Woods, Policy Committee Meeting
One Watershed One Plan February 16, 2018
Discovery and Development Hub, Warroad, MN



Attendance:

Policy Committee Members: Nancy Dunnell (LOW SWCD), Jan Miller (Roseau SWCD, and Glenda Philippe (Roseau County).

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

Advisory Committee via WebEx / ITV: Cary Hernandez (MPCA)

Consultant via WebEx / ITV: Jeremiah Jazdzewski, HEI, Charlie Sawdey, HEI

Mike Hirst went over the agenda. Approval of Meeting Minutes was added to the agenda. Mike Hirst was the facilitator. Janine Lovold was the note taker.

Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategies (WRAPS) Overview: Cary Hernandez

Hernandez gave a presentation on the WRAPS process and how the biological and chemical data were used to analyze surface waters in the LOW watershed. Multiple lines of evidence are needed before any waters are tagged as being impaired. Lack of macroinvertebrates/fish triggers identification of stressors that can be the cause. A watershed model is developed and run with the data. From this, waters are classified as good, nearly impaired, barely impaired or impaired. Waters that are impaired get listed (303(d)) and get targeted for restoration efforts. Listed waters go through a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) study, which spells the sources of each pollutant and how much each pollutant needs to be reduced to meet the standard for that watershed.

Call to Order

Nancy called the Policy Committee Meeting to order at 2:10 pm.

Minutes:

The December 20 and January 17 Minutes were reviewed.

The December Minutes were approved on a motion by Phillippe, second by Miller and passed by unanimous votes. The January Minutes were approved on a motion by Miller, second by Phillippe and passed by unanimous votes.

Plan Section 2.0: Analysis and Prioritization of Resource Categories, Concerns, and Issues

Plan Section 2 was reviewed for final comment.

Plan Section 2.0 was approved on a motion by Miller, second by Phillippe and carried by unanimous votes.

Measurable Goals & Strategies/Actions Update:

The Advisory Committee will need two meetings to go over and make decisions on the Measurable Goals & Strategies/Actions piece for Plan Section 3.0. The Advisory Committee Meetings will be March 1 and 21 at the Public Safety Building in Warroad.

Governance

Severts (BWSR) and Jazdzewski (HEI) provided handouts regarding various governance options for implementing the 1W1P once it has been completed. The options that the Pilot 1W1Ps had picked were discussed. Three groups used the Memorandum of Agreement with additional language and one is using Joint Powers Collaboration. One group has not decided yet.

Budget and Schedule Update

Overall the Budget is satisfactory. The Actual expenditures have been under budget, but expenses will go over for Plan Section 3.0. The use of video conferencing will save money for extra meetings or plan development. An invoice for additional work on prioritization, revision of LWRI, Public Meeting, development of maps and tables has been submitted by HEI for \$7,108.

The approval to pay the invoice for extra expenses in 2017 was approved on a motion by Miller, second by Phillippe, and carried by unanimous votes.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 18, 9 am – 12 noon. The location will be DD-Hub in Warroad.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Lake of the Woods, Policy Committee Meeting
One Watershed One Plan June 20, 2018
Discovery and Development Hub, Warroad, MN



Attendance:

Policy Committee Members: Nancy Dunnell (LOW SWCD), Jan Miller (Roseau SWCD, and Bill Thompson (WRWD).

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

Advisory Committee Member: Todd Miller (At-Large) and Jeff Hrubes (BWSR)

Other: Jen Wolf (MCIT)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski (HEI) and Charlie Sawdey (HEI – video conference)

Jeremiah Jazdzewski was the facilitator. Janine Lovold was the note taker.

Meeting start: 9:00 am

Round table introductions were made.

Update:

Jazdzewski gave an update on the Plan progress. The Measurable Goals for Plan Section 3 have been completed. The Planning Work Group have been working to finish the Actions for the Measurable Goals in Plan Section 4. The PTMApp data has been generated for Plan Section 4. HEI will start screening of the data for use in structural and management practice development.

Jen Wolf - MCIT:

Jen Wolf discussed types of 1W1P operation arrangements such as Memorandum of Agreement, Joint Powers Collaboration and Joint Powers Entity. Jen will send a bulleted information document that the Policy Committee members can use to discuss the operational arrangements with their respective Boards. Policy Committee members will bring the feedback from their respective Boards to the August Policy Committee meeting.

Measurable Goals for Plan Section 3.0

Jazdzewski reviewed each Measurable Goal and highlighted background information to clarify the final draft results. The Planning Region map will be modified to match the PTMApp map hydrologic boundaries to help prevent confusion.

Plan Section 3.0 was approved on a motion by Miller, second by Thompson and carried by unanimous vote.

Plan Section 4: Targeted Implementation

HEI introduced Plan Section 4 and went through the first proposed draft. HEI recommends that the entire Actions Table be placed in the appendix. The Actions Table for Plan Section 4 will be broken out in this section to make it more user friendly and useful for the PWG. The Implementation by Other agencies that are independently funded will be kept in this section and will acknowledge the work done by these agencies within this watershed. The overview of PTMApp workflow and how the data can be used will be placed in the appendix. The PTMApp and Zonation data will be sorted with public vs private lands in mind. Structural practice locations will be examined. Practices (structural and management) will be prioritized for multiple benefits in or upstream of hot spots depending on the influencing data layer. The Planning Regions will include structural and management practices, capital improvement projects and relevant actions. Implementation action costs and progress towards the Measurable Goals will be summarized. The WRWD AIG study results will be used for the Warroad River Implementation Section. Local input is needed to review the implementation practices to what is feasible and manageable. The cost-benefit curve was discussed. The Watershed Wide Implementation Section will include the regulations and enforcement, data collection and monitoring for data gaps, and education. The last

section will deal with implementation funding that is baseline, short-term and long-term. The baseline funding is dollars we have now without any additional BWSR funding.

Plan Section 5: Targeted Implementation

HEI introduced Plan Section 5, which is how the Plan will be implemented. The WRWD may want to include the ability to form/implement a Water Management District as a funding mechanism for projects.

Current Schedule and Budget:

Plan Section 4 and 5 are behind schedule. The Measurable Goals piece went over budget. The current withheld billed amount is \$7,012.25.

This withheld amount of \$7,012.25 was approved to be paid by shifting funds from “Consultant Travel Expenses” to “Establish Measurable Goals” line item of the budget on a motion by Miller, second by Thompson and unanimous vote.

Minutes

The February 2018 Minutes were reviewed.

Minutes were approved on a motion by Miller, second by Thompson and carried by unanimous vote.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 22, 9 am – 12 noon. The location will be DD-Hub in Warroad.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:08 pm on a motion by Thompson, second by Miller and carried by unanimous votes.

Lake of the Woods, Policy Committee Meeting
One Watershed One Plan August 22, 2018
Discovery and Development Hub, Warroad, MN



Attendance:

Policy Committee Members: Glenda Phillipe (Roseau County), Nancy Dunnell (LOW SWCD), Jan Miller (Roseau SWCD), and Bill Thompson (WRWD).

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

Advisory Committee Member: Jeff Hrubes (BWSR)

Consultant: Jeremiah Jazdzewski (HEI)

Jeremiah Jazdzewski is the facilitator. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

Meeting start: The meeting started at 9:07 a.m. with an overview of the agenda.

Update:

Jazdzewski gave an update on the Plan progress. HEI has recently finished with the working drafts of Plan Sections 4 and 5. The final draft layouts for Plan Sections 1 – 3 are commencing.

Plan Section 4.0 Targeted Implementation

Jazdzewski walked through the Draft Plan Section 4.0 Targeted implementation with the Policy Committee and included conversations and suggested changes discussed at the Planning Work Group / Advisory Committee on August 21st, 2018.

4.1 – Purpose and Structure:

4.2 – Targeted Implementation Schedule: This section will be eliminated - The Actions Table has been simplified into multiple tables based on the programs they fall under and whether they pertain to the entire watershed or planning region(s) in 4.6.

4.3 – Importance of Work Completed by Others: This section will acknowledge the work done by other agencies or non-governmental groups relating to actions and goals outlined in the 1W1P.

4.4 – Prioritize, Target, and Measure App: This section will be reorganized to explain more of what the implementation plan is about and briefly explain the PTMApp tool (use and limitations).

4.5 – PTM App and Zonation Targeting: This section will explain the cost-benefit data curves for the Planning Regions in 4.6. It will show which BMPs have the biggest impact for the lowest dollar. Short and Long-Term Goal funding levels are also shown on the data curves. The Zonation tool is explained, showing areas with multiple benefits. Practices will occur within the area or adjacent/upstream of the area depending on the influence. The Planning Regions will be added to the Zonation map.

4.6 – Planning Region Implementation Profiles: The Actions Table is broken up into practices, such as structural and management, that are watershed wide and then unique to that Planning Region. This section will include maps and figures specific to each planning region, including: structural and management practice suitability, PTMApp outputs, stream restoration, and cost benefit curves. The Capital Improvement Projects will be Planning Region based. The Planning Region profile will include its current condition and possibilities of what is driving impairments. A hydrology piece for each Planning Region should be considered. The nearly/barely impaired maps will be also found in the first sections of each Planning Region. Restoration needs to be defined for each Planning Region. Watershed wide components will have regulation & enforcement, data collection & monitoring, and education & outreach components.

The Northwest Angle Planning Region was discussed with the Advisory Committee because are no impairments, no studies, no identified stream restoration, no PTMApp data, and one CIP on Garden Island. The plan is to have the NWA's current conditions, a map showing the protection area, and a map showing areas with an erosion component (developed lands and state/tribal lands).

4.7 –Plan Funding: Baseline funding is the current estimated spending levels addressing the 1W1P's measurable goals. Other funding levels beyond the baseline will be developed based on short term and long term goals. .

Plan Section 5.0 Implementation Programs

Plan Section 5 was not discussed at the Advisory Committee meeting because most of the time was spent on Plan Section 4. Plan Section 5 spells out how the plan is going to work and function.

5.1 – Incentives (funding assistance) for landowners to implement structural and management practices, education and outreach campaign efforts, data collection and monitoring for data gaps, capital improvement project funding efforts, regulation and enforcement already in place. Commissioner Phillippe will have Jeff Pelowski check out any bluff land areas and the ordinance for those areas in Roseau County.

5.2 – Funding – identification of all known funding sources that may be used for plan implementation

5.3 – Plan Administration & Coordination covers the partnership with other LGUs and groups for annual work planning, reporting, fiscal responsibilities, collaboration, assessment on how the plan is progressing, and any plan amendments if issues arise that haven't been addressed in the plan and agreements between LGUs.

Plan Governance Discussion

The Policy Committee reviewed their discussions with their respective boards regarding what type of agreement may be utilized to implement the 1W1Ps. There was good discussion regarding each board's perspective and initial discussions regarding governance structures.

Watershed Management Plan – Manager Thompson would like to have this option added in case this funding option is needed in future projects.

Discussion included the expansion of the watershed district to cover the entire plan area. Manager Thompson asked Severts to check into what it would take to incorporate the entire area into a single watershed district. Severts will check into this and distribute the appropriate information.

Each board is asked to come up with questions/concerns regarding governance structures and send them to Mike Hirst. MCIT will be asked to address the list of questions.

LGU Budget Amendment/Change

Mike Hirst provided a Budget handout and requested approval to allocate \$10,000 of the 10% contingency funding to the LOW and Roseau SWCDs (\$7000 and \$3000, respectively) for extra meetings and hours that will be needed for the next 9 months.

The allocation of \$10,000 towards the SWCDs for future anticipated coordination and facilitation expenses was approved on a motion by Miller, second by Thompson and unanimous votes of the Policy Committee.

Current Schedule and Budget:

The plan is running a little over budget, which is normal based on other plans. Approximately \$300 is left for Phase 4. Currently, the total project budget is under \$50,000. The meeting budget has \$9,000 left. More teleconferences will be held versus in-person meetings to cut down expenses. The final Plan draft budget has \$30,000, which is more than enough based on the pilot 1W1Ps. No monies are currently being withheld.

Minutes

The June 2018 Minutes were reviewed.

Minutes were approved on a motion by Miller, second by Thompson and carried by unanimous vote.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:14 pm on a motion Thompson, second by Miller and carried by unanimous votes.



Attendance:

Policy Committee Members: Nancy Dunnell (LOW SWCD), Ed Arneson (LOW County), Bill Thompson (WRWD), Jan Miller (Roseau SWCD) and Glenda Phillipe (Roseau County).

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

Mike Hirst is the facilitator. Janine Lovold is the note taker.

- 1. Welcome/Intro/Update:** The meeting started at 9:00 a.m. with an overview of the planning process. The PWG and Advisory Committee is currently working on Plan Section 4. Draft Plan Section 5 is out, but hasn't been worked on yet. Governance structure will be discussed. Jen Wolfe (MCIT) will be available by video to answer questions and scenarios. The Budget & Schedule will be reviewed.
- 2. Minutes:** The August Minutes were reviewed. The Minutes were approved on a motion by Phillipe, second by Miller, and carried by unanimous votes.
- 3. Plan Section 4.0 Targeted Implementation**
Planning Work Group and Advisory Committee are currently going through the Action items and tailoring them for the Planning Regions, what years the Actions will be started, and who will be leading. PTMApp generates cost estimates that are used in short and long term goals. This cost estimate for practices will be utilized in the Actions table.

Mike explained that the PWG and Advisory Committee are now modifying the Plan towards Planning Region level rather than watershed wide for implementation clarification.

The five Planning Regions were reviewed with the provided handout.

Warroad River Planning Region

- WRWD added log jams being a problem where they cause water backup, which then causes bank instability and sediment issues.
- The harbor sediment will be split into lake sediment deposits at the Warroad River outlet and river sediment deposits in the harbor.
- The WRWD is interested in changing the political boundary in an area north of Warroad because waterflow impacts the Roseau River watershed. This is not a planning item.
- The PWG will review the impact of the usage of the word "abandonment" as in "ditch abandonment" to ensure that it does not negatively impact PILT payments that the Counties receive. Language can be changed to "restoration of hydrologic function of peatlands."
- Water storage will be to be reworded to convey water detention, so impoundments are not immediately assumed. Detention may be in the form of culvert sizing, cover crops, tile drainage management etc. There is not a lot of opportunity for storage. The PWG and AC utilized PTMApp to come up with a an achievable number of 5100 ac ft. or 1/8 inch of water "storage" over the entire watershed planning area not just the Warroad Planning Region.
- ACOE has dredged the harbor in the past. In the Warroad area, the commercial designation has been changed to recreation. This change affects what ACOE can do. ACOE has no money despite the dredging agreement.
- Glenda Phillipe mentioned that she and Kathy Lovelace (City of Warroad) are working with the Greater MN Regional Parks & Trails Commission to obtain a Park designation for Warroad.

- The main priorities that will be the focus are 1) overland and in-channel sediment reduction, 2) reduction of peak flows, 3) multipurpose drainage management, and 4) a better understanding of the hydrology and restoration/dredging of the Warroad harbor dredging.

Zippel Planning Region

- Very similar scenario to Warroad PR.
- Zippel Bay needs dredging.
- Feasibility studies of community sewer system around Zippel Bay and Graceton Beach needs to be done. Some areas are on holding tanks and have built on their secondary areas. There is no room for sewer alternatives.
 - Williams community sewer system was very expensive and only worked for 10 years. The Springsteel system (north of Warroad) is not working very well either. There may be a way to tie Springsteel into the City of Warroad system as annexation doesn't have to take place any longer.
 - Koochiching County has been working on areas east of International Falls to tie these areas into a municipal system. Chad Severts will email links for more information regarding this project and where funding is coming from.
- The main priorities that will be the focus are 1) overland and in-channel sediment reduction, 2) reduction of peak flows, 3) water retention, 4) multipurpose drainage management, 5) better understanding of the hydrology, 6) lakeshore protection, and 7) restoration/dredging of Zippel Bay.

Bostic Planning Region

- Bostic is a smaller Planning Region and includes Pine Island.
- The focus will be on sediment reduction and reduction of peak flows.
- The SWCD had received a grant to stabilize County Rd 4 ditch and figure out a feasible restoration of the bog.
- Changes in channel navigation through 4 Mile Bay has been observed. In 2014 the Rainy River flood washed out lighthouse gap and has changed the flow from the river. Pine Island areas have boat navigation issues from sediment bars due to island erosion and the flow changes.
- The main priorities are 1) overland and in-channel sediment reduction, 2) reduction of peak flows, 3) water retention, 4) stabilization of County Rd 4 ditch through Graceton Bog, and 5) a better understanding of the hydrology and restoration/dredging of Bostic Bay.

Northwest Angle Planning Region

- The main issue is erosion.
- With the dam installation at Kenora and the lake levels being held 3-3.5 ft higher, erosion on state land is prevalent. Enough state land has eroded where tribal lands will soon be affected.
- The main priority is lakeshore protection.

Muskeg Bay Planning Region

- Similar to Northwest Angle with many drainages to the Lake.
- There is a lot of ag land and shoreline development.
- The SWCD received \$750,000 for shoreline projection projects from 2014 flood.
- The main priorities are 1) overland and in-channel sediment reduction, 2) reduction of peak flows, 3) a better understanding of the hydrology, 4) shoreline protection, and 5) community sewer systems.

Mike Hirst is to update PR summaries and email document to local agencies to share with their corresponding boards.

Winter Issues Regarding the Lake:

- Ed Arneson would like to see lake issues from the winter season addressed in the Plan. Through education and possibly regulation to address the trash and human waste issues regarding winter ice fishing. Enforcement is difficult.
- Glenda Phillipe added that enforcement of “no wake zones” in the Warroad Harbor are also difficult to enforce.

4. Plan Section 5

Mike went through Plan Section 5 briefly. Not much time has been spent on work has been done on this section yet by the Planning Work Group. Plan Section 5 is tabled for another meeting.

5. Plan Governance

How the Plan will be implemented was gone over along with the general leanings from respective local governments.

- The optional expansion of the WRWD to encompass the entire planning area (excluding the Northwest Angle) was discussed. Even if the WRWD was expanded, the watershed district would still need to partner with Counties and SWCD's in an agreement. Watershed district staffing changes (manager redistribution and hired/shared staff) were also discussed.

- 6. Jen Wolfe (MCIT)** joined the meeting to answer questions. She recommended to plan for disagreement and not how well we are working together now. Most local partners formed a collaboration on paper because of uncertainty, however it was stated that many of these agreements were functioning like a Joint Powers Entity. She may see changes across the state when a couple of budget cycles are completed and when local partners may see the need. Collaboration vs Entity situations were discussed. MOA's are more for plan development not plans involving fund distribution. Scenarios presented to Jen included: the fiscal agent vs local government partner, who exactly has authority, mishandling funds, projects with no landowner interest, how will a grant match be handled, budget amendments (redistribution of funds), the impact Plan specificity or vagueness, liability (who is likely to get sued), and liability coverage.

7. Budget

We are currently a little over budget. Total funds remaining are \$43,305.59. HEI will utilize ITV meetings to keep costs down.

Schedule

HEI projects that we are 5 months behind in the planning process and 2 months behind for plan finalization. The original March 2019 deadline for the Plan to be presented at the North Region BWSR meeting would now be May 2019.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:22 pm on a motion Thompson, second by Miller and carried by unanimous votes.