Mississippi River Headwaters **One Watershed, One Plan**	**Policy/Advisory Committee** Meeting #6	**Date:** August 2, 2019 **Time:** 8:50am – 11:00am **Location:** Beltrami Administration Building, 701 Minnesota Street NW, Bemidji, MN 56601

Staff Support:	**Zach Gutknecht** **Note taker: Megan FitzGerald**
Invitees:	**County Commissioners and Staff**: Craig Gaasvig, Dick Downham, Davin Tinquist, Ted Van Kempen, Charlene Christenson, , Brent Rud, Zach Gutknecht, Megan FitzGerald, Daniel Swenson, John Ringle, Eric Buitenwerf, Dan Hecht. **SWCD Supervisors and Staff:** Del Olson, David Peterson, Marcel Noyes, Ted Lovdhal, Clearwater SWCD Supervisor, Andy Arens, Kelly Condiff, William Lee, Chester Powell. **BWSR Staff:** Chad Severts Board Conservationist, Jeff Hrubes Clean Water Specialist
Pre-work:	Review: Meeting Materials attached
Please bring:	1W1P binder (Policy Committee)

Agenda Items

Topic	Purpose	Presenter	Time allotted
✓ Call to Order		Craig Gaasvig, Chair	8:50am
✓ Review and Approval of Agenda	DECISION	Craig Gaasvig, Chair	5 min.
✓ Financial Update	DECISION	Staff Support	5 min.
✓ Advisory Committee Update	INFORMATION	Staff Support	20 min.
✓ Land and Water Resource Inventory Update	INFORMATION	Staff Support	15 min.
✓ County Comp Plan Review Update	INFORMATION	Staff Support	20 min.
✓ Adjourn	DESCISION	Craig Gaasvig, Chair	5 min.

Attachments to agenda:

- Financial Summary, page 3
- DRAFT Issue Statements (Updated), Pages 4-6

Policy Committee Ground Rules and Expectations

In addition to following the requirements of the Memorandum of Agreement and bylaws, Policy Committee Members will:

1. Actively prepare for, attend, and participate in all scheduled meetings* of the Policy Committee.
2. Actively engage in the decision-making process for watershed-based planning with the understanding that goals, objectives, and action items of the water plan must be prioritized, targeted, and measureable.
3. Initiate and/or assist with providing opportunities for constituents to be appraised of updated progress of the watershed-based planning process.
4. Regularly update their respective Boards on the progress of the watershed planning process.
5. Utilize the technical resources of their respective entities to assist and inform their decisions in the water planning process.

2019 Mississippi River Headwaters One Watershed, One Plan Partnership
GRANT BUDGET & EXPENSES

	LEAD	ESTIMATED COST			2019 EXPENSES									
Plan Development Costs		**Consultants**	**Partnership**	**Total**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**October**	**November**	**December**	**Remaining Funds**
Pre-Planning					**Pre-Planning**									
Aggregate watershed information	Partnership	$ -	$ 8,000.00	$ 8,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 8,000.00
Notify plan review authorities and host public kickoff meeting	Partnership	$ -	$ 12,000.00	$ 12,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 12,000.00
Planning					**Planning**									
Write the land and water resources narrative	Partnership	$ -	$ 9,000.00	$ 9,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 9,000.00
Identify and prioritize resources and issues	Partnership	$ 1,000.00	$ 27,000.00	$ 28,000	$ -	$ -	$ 1,998.45	$ 1,110.25						$ 24,891.30
Establish measurable goals	Partnership	$ 5,000.00	$ 28,000.00	$ 33,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 33,000.00
Develop a targeted implementation schedule	Partnership	$ 3,500.00	$ 13,000.00	$ 16,500	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 16,500.00
Describe implementation programs	Partnership	$ 4,500.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 14,500	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 14,500.00
Determine plan administration and coordination	Partnership	$ 1,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 8,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 8,000.00
Write draft plan for review	Partnership	$ 4,100.00	$ 20,000.00	$ 24,100	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 24,100.00
Plan Review and Submission					**Plan Review and Submission**									
Conduct formal review	Partnership	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,000.00	$ 2,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 2,000
Write final plan and submit to BWSR	Partnership	$ 4,150.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 9,150	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 9,150
Other Costs					**Other Costs**									
Expenses: printing, travel	Partnership	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 20,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -						$ 20,000.00
SUBTOTAL: Plan Development				**$ 184,250**										**$ 181,141.30**
Administration Costs	**LGU Lead**	**Hourly Rate**	**Hours**		**Total**	**Administration Costs**								
Fiscal Coordination	Beltrami SWCD	50	70		$ 3,500	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 133.23					$ 3,366.77
Grant Reporting (Elink)	Beltrami SWCD	50	44		$ 2,200	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 88.82					$ 2,111.18
Policy /Advisory Committee Coordination	Beltrami SWCD	50	255		$ 12,750	$ 721.66	$ 1,265.69	$ 1,332.30	$ 977.02					$ 9,175.00
Meeting Expenses (facility, materials, food)					$ 5,000	$ -	$ 878.09	$ 25.76	$ -					$ 4,096.15
Publication Expenses (notices, invitations)					$ 5,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -					$ 5,000.00
SUBTOTAL: Administration					**$ 28,450**									**$ 23,749.10**
CONTINGENCY (add 10% to final amount)					**$ 21,270**									**$ 21,270.00**
TOTAL					**$ 233,970**									**$ 226,160.40**

Issue Definition – problems, risks, or opportunities for the watersheds' priority resources that will be addressed in the plan.

Resource Protection Focus – Preservation of our natural resources by limiting the amount of change on current conditions.

Issue Statements

- Drinking water – Residents within the watershed use ground water as the primary drinking water resource and due to the composition of the soils and surficial aquifers there is an elevated vulnerability of contamination both naturally and human induced.
    - High nitrates
    - High arsenic
    - Pollution sensitivity
    - Private well head protection
    - DWSMA
    - Superfund sites, special construction areas etc.

- Forestry – High quality water resources found and enjoyed throughout the watershed is indebted to a largely intact diverse forest landscape. Creating alternative land uses leading to forest fragmentation will have negative consequences.
    - Stewardship
    - Forest diversity
    - Conservation easement
    - School trust fund lands
    - Forest fragmentation
    -

- Wetlands – Land practices have affected the natural structure and function of wetlands there by reducing the intrinsic value and influences hydrologic and habitat values.
    - Wetland Protection
    - Wetland Restoration
    - Wetland use impact (from development)

- Environmental Sensitive Lands - The Mississippi Headwaters Watershed contains areas of biologically diverse and sensitive habitats that support rare and threatened species, and which require a cooperative approach to protect them from degradation. (rewrite coming)
    - Protecting pollinator populations
    - Rare features
    -

- Emerging Issues of Concern – Issues where LGUs either have not historically been engaged or there has not typically been a problem in the watershed but potentially could be based on land uses adjacent to the watershed.
    - Irrigation
    - Pipelines
    -

Resource Restoration Focus – Conservation of our natural resources though management of resource use.

Issue Statements

- Watercourse Recovery – Human activity has disrupted and disconnected some stream segments, affecting habitat, and water quality and species movements.
    - Roads/culverts
    - Drainage ditches
    - Hydrology restoration
    - Dams
    - chlorides

- Waste Water Management – Poorly functioning or failing waste management systems are threats to human health and the environment though increased pathogens, nutrients, and other chemicals often having a connection to water.
    - SSTS inspection, maintenance, and upgrades
    - City waste water effluent

- Invasive Species – New species introductions or unimpeded infestations have a negative impact affecting on the local economic, natural environment, and recreational benefits.
    - Management
    - Coordination

Land Management Focus – Conservation of our natural resources through management of land use.

Issue Statements

- Lakeshed – Increased land use pressures adjacent to lakes and subsequent drainage area to lakes has altered the habitat in the near shore area and can have a substantial impact to water quality.
    - Shore land management
    - Critical lands
    -

- Urban Lands – Unmanaged or poorly managed land development can have adverse impacts on groundwater recharge and stormwater runoff quality and quantity.
  - Stormwater
  - Smart development
  - Commercial vs residential development
  -
- Agricultural Lands – Depending on how agricultural lands are managed they could potentially be major sources of sediment, nutrients, and other chemicals to surface and groundwater.
  - Soil health/productivity
  - Pasture management
  - Feedlots
  - Buffers
  -

Water Storage Focus – Maintain an average discharge of xxx acre-feet at the pour point of the Mississippi River Headwaters Watershed.

Issues removed but to be addressed elsewhere in the plan

Data Collection/Monitoring – Collecting information needed to understand the water-resource baseline condition for improved management decisions.

Administrative Priorities – Provide a guide for standard operation for each of the ten LGUs throughout the watershed and examination of local policies and controls.

- Fiscal Responsibility
- County Ordinances
- Emergency Management
- Comprehensive plans
- Climate Change