

## **Lower Minnesota River East 1W1P**

### **Policy Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Date & Time: 3:00-5:00pm, Thursday, July 20, 2023**

**Location:**

Le Sueur County Soil and Water Conservation District Office  
181 W Minnesota Street, Le Center, MN 56057

And

Virtual – Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Holly Bushman (Le Sueur County); Mike Schultz (Le Sueur SWCD); Greg Entinger (Le Sueur SWCD); Lauren Salvato (LMRWD); Danny O’Keefe (Le Sueur County) (chair);; Meghan Darley (Scott SWCD); Doug Schoenecker (Scott SWCD); Jeff Docken (Rice County); Virgil Pint (Scott County/SWMO); Linda Loomis (Lower MN River Watershed District); Troy Kuphal (Scott SWCD); Anne Sawyer (BWSR); Lauren Salvato (LMRWD)

#### **I. Welcome & Review Agenda - Policy Committee Chair**

Chair O’Keefe called the meeting to order at 3:06 pm. Holly gave an introduction on the agenda and what will be covered in today’s meeting.

#### **II. Review and Approval of Agenda**

Motioned by Schoenecker; Seconded by Docken to approve the agenda.

**The Motion carried unanimously for the agenda to be approved as presented.**

#### **III. Review and Approval of April 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

Motioned by Entinger; Seconded by Schoenecker to approve the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes.

**The Motion carried unanimously for the approval of the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes.**

#### **III. Advisory Committee & Subcommittee Updates (Informational Item)**

Holly gave an update on the planning activities completed to date. The Advisory Committee has been working on developing implementation activities for the plan, identifying partners, activity leads, and activity costs. Work will continue with review and revisions to the implementation table. Three subcommittees were formed to help further refine measurable goals and implementation activities: Groundwater, Education & Outreach and Shoreland & Urban BMPs. Groundwater subcommittee met June 29<sup>th</sup>, (27 participants), Education & Outreach

subcommittee met July 14<sup>th</sup> and will meet again in August, and Shoreland & Urban BMP subcommittee is scheduled to meet in August. The Groundwater subcommittee group suggested adding three townships in Scott County to the priority area including the Shakopee Drinking Water Supply Management Area (DWSMA) in the Plan.

#### **IV. Review Plan Content: Implementation Table (Informational Item)**

Holly & Mike reviewed Priority Issues and Measurable Goals to the Policy Committee. After the modeling updates, some Goals were revised, those revisions were presented. Revisions occurred for the following Goals: Surface Water Quality, Surface Water Hydrology, Groundwater Quality, Groundwater Knowledge, Habitat Restoration, and Habitat Protection and Preservation. Rice County asked if this Plan could help with updating septic systems discharging into Roberds Lake. Holly indicated that would fall under assessments/studies and she would investigate it. Holly indicated the modeling done by ISG only accounts for overland flow, not near channel erosion. Lake modeling does not include internal loading for phosphorus, it only includes measurable goals for external loading.

Holly reviewed the work to the Implementation Table and a handout was provided. A few examples were provided of issues, goals and activities within the implementation table. The table is organized by practice and audience.

Holly indicated staff is still looking for guidance from the Policy Committee on how to present information from the implementation table. A current example of the draft implementation table was presented.

Cmsr. Schoenecker asked regarding the implementation costs and measurable outcomes, do these activities just involved 1W1P funding? Secondly, can the partnership take credit for the measurable outputs that another organization programs to help towards these goal numbers? Mike responded that the dollars presented in the table, (unless they have an asterick), are considered group dollars. Mike indicated the intent is to try to work with and combine other funding sources to achieve the measurable outcomes in the table.

Lauren asked, have you all discussed doing a benefit cost analysis to see which sticks out to restore the most acres for the least amount of cost? No, the Steering Committee has not discussed that. This will likely be an exercise to do during workplan development.

Holly asked the PC, what practices, projects, and priority areas are most important to their organization? Cmsr. Docken indicated surface water and groundwater. Holly asked the PC what they would like to see in the table and how staff should present it in the Plan that would be most helpful for them. Cmsr. Schoenecker indicated numbers and units for measurable outcomes.

#### **IV. Organizational Arrangement (Informational & Decision item)**

Holly gave a quick summary of the different options available for the partnership to choose for plan implementation and indicated they are looking for a recommendation on how to move forward with a formal arrangement.

Holly gave a background on the options, she indicated there were two options for this group, Joint Powers Collaboration (JPC) and Joint Powers Entity (JPE). She gave a quick overview of these two options as a refresher. She did mention that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOA) is not an option for the partnership to receive 1W1P funding. A one-page handout was included in the packet.

Lauren Salvato (LMRWD) commented that their board met last night, and they had some of the same concerns as the Scott WMO/Scott County Board. LMRWD is interested in a MOA and continuing in that path. Linda Loomis continues with saying the LMRWD has their own plan, which is their primary plan, and they are interested in continuing with prioritizing their plan over this one.

Troy Kuphal (Scott SWCD) inquired whether an organization that does not join the implementation arrangement would still be eligible to receive funds under this 1W1P? Anne Sawyer (BWSR) explained a non-member organization could potentially receive funds through a separate subcontract with the JPE, but they could not receive funds directly. Troy asked if, as an example, the LMRWD wanted to request funds for a project from the Watershed Based Implementation Funds (WBIF) allocation, could they do that. Holly clarified they could still request funds they just wouldn't have a vote in the decision-making process. Troy asked what the disadvantage of joining the partnership would be. Lauren Salvato (LMRWD) responded a JPC or JPE assumes the lowest common authority of its member organizations and as a metro watershed district the LMRWD has more authorities. She further clarified the LMRWD wants to be at the table and have progress occur outside their boundaries. Troy asked for clarification on how differing authorities impact the decision on whether to join the JPA. Linda Loomis responded the LMRWD is not opposed to the JPA, they just don't know if they want to be a party at this time, noting they want to partnership to decide what works for them and the LMRWD will decide how they will participate.

After discussion Holly asked the PC if they need more time to review information and discuss organizational arrangement?

Cmsr. Entinger made a motion to decide on a Joint Powers Agreement today. Seconded by Cmsr. Schoenecker.

Holly called the role:

Danny O’Keefe – Yes; Greg Entinger – Yes; Jeff Docken – Yes; Doug Schoenecker – Yes; Virgil Pint – Yes (Scott County); Virgil Pint – Yes (Scott WMO); Lauren Salvato – Yes

Chair O’Keefe stated he would entertain a motion to go ahead with a Joint Powers Entity or a Joint Powers Collaboration.

Cmsr. Entinger made a motion to move forward with a Joint Powers Entity. Seconded by Cmsr. Docken.

Holly called the roll:

Danny O’Keefe – Yes; Greg Entinger – Yes; Jeff Docken – Yes; Doug Schoenecker – Yes; Virgil Pint – No (Scott County); Virgil Pint – No (Scott WMO); Lauren Salvato – Abstain

**The Motion carried 4-Yes/2-No for the approval of the partnership forming a Joint Powers Entity.**

Holly indicated the next step is a Joint Powers Agreement, she will develop a draft for the next meeting.

## **V. Planning Effort Timeline & Policy Committee Meeting Schedule (Informational Item)**

Holly gave an update on the Plan timeline. ISG is planning on attending the August Policy Committee meeting. They will have a table developed. ISG will also be developing drafts of sections of the plan, Programs, Issues Prioritization, and Issue Framework. We are hoping to have a full draft plan written in September. There likely won’t be a PC meeting in September. By October, we hope to have the full plan being reviewed by the Steering Committee. November 2023, ISG will be revising the plan, by December, staff will review the Plan and answer any remaining questions. January 2024, ISG will attend the PC meeting for full review and approval for starting the 60-day comment period. Tentatively, the 90-day comment period should end in August of 2024.

## **VIII. Updates & Next Steps**

Updates & Next Steps

- Updates – Holly indicated there will be two more subcommittee meetings coming up.
- Next Steering Team Meeting: **Wednesday, August 16<sup>th</sup> 1:30pm-3:00pm**
- Next Policy Committee Meeting: **Thursday, August 17<sup>th</sup> 3:00pm-5:00pm**
- Advisory Committee Meeting: **August 16<sup>th</sup> 10:00am-1:00pm**

## **IX. Meeting Adjourn**

Motioned by Entinger, Seconded by Docken at 4:33pm

**The Motion carried unanimously for the approval to adjourn at 4:33pm.**

DRAFT