



Mississippi River St. Cloud One Watershed, One Plan

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

Proceedings of the Mississippi River – St. Cloud 1W1P Policy Committee Meeting held July 6th, 2022.

Dan Cibulka called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

Date / Time:	July 6 th 2022, 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Location:	In-Person: Sherburne County History Center - 10775 27th Ave SE, Becker, MN 55308 Virtual: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89114376153
Note Taker:	Kendra Sommerfeld- Benton SWCD
1W1P Website:	WEBSITE COMING SOON
Committee Representatives Present:	Benton County – Scott Johnson, * Benton SWCD – Wade Bastian, Clearwater River WD – Bob Schiefelbein, Meeker SWCD – Bob Schiefelbein, Sherburne County – Barb Burandt, Sherburne County Alternate – Raeanne Danielowski, Sherburne SWCD – Shelly Binsfeld, Stearns SWCD – Tom Gregory, Wright County – Mary Wetter, Wright SWCD – Jeff Burns, * Sherburne SWCD – Kerry Saxton,
Individuals Copied:	Policy Committee Alternate Members, Steering Committee Members, Jason Weirnerman – BWSR, Brad Wozney – BWSR, Keenan Hayes – Mille Lacs County Staff, Dilan Christiansen – Mille Lacs County Staff, Amy Kowalzek – Morrison County Staff, Brittany Lenzmeier – Stearns SWCD Staff, Shannon Wettstein – Morrison SWCD Staff, Lance Chisolm – Morrison SWCD Staff
Partners and Staff Present:	Brad Wozney – BWSR, Darren Mayers – BWSR, *Rebecca Carlson – Clearwater River WD, Francine Larson – Sherburne SWCD, Dan Cibulka – Sherburne SWCD, Luke Johnson – Wright SWCD, Alicia O’ Hare – Wright SWCD, Cole Loewen – Stearns County, Kendra Sommerfeld – Benton SWCD

*Attendees joined virtually via Zoom

Welcome and Introductions.

- a. **Name, LGU.** Introductions of Policy Committee (PC) members, partners, and staff.

Review and Approve Agenda.

- a. Cibulka went over agenda items for meeting, mentioned the Policy Committee could elect a chair and vice-chair to run meetings or to let Cibulka continue leading meetings. Policy Committee agreed for Cibulka to continue running Policy Committee meetings until by-laws are established.
- b. **Motion by Johnson to approve the agenda as presented, second by Wetter.** Affirmative: Johnson, Bastian, B. Schiefelbein, Burandt, Binsfeld, Gregory, Wetter, Burns, Danielowski, Saxton. **Motion carried.**

Review and Approve Minutes (3.29.2022).

- a. **Motion by Burns to approve the March 30, 2022, minutes as presented, second by Wetter.** Affirmative: Johnson, Bastian, B. Schiefelbein, Burandt, Binsfeld, Gregory, Wetter, Burns, Danielowski, Saxton. **Motion carried.**

Project Updates.

- a. **Project Updates.** Cibulka stated that the work plan is mostly complete, budget is complete, and timeline has been updated.
 - a. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is almost complete by attorney group, should be ready soon after minor word changes. MOA will need to be signed and approved before each individual board.
 - b. Once the grant agreement is executed, formal notifications and kick-off meetings will take place anticipated for fall of this year (2022).
 - c. Cibulka stated that another step needed in process is interviewing and selecting consultants. Interviews will take place at this meeting.
- b. **Conversation/Questions.** Burns asked why there wasn't a directive for Policy Committee (PC) to approve MOA at current meeting. Cibulka responded that each individual board needs to consider MOA separately before the MOA is officially adopted. There is a discussion item on agenda for draft MOA. Cibulka stated that if PC wants to make a motion to approve the draft MOA, that could be acceptable and might carry weight with individual boards to show that the PC supports the MOA. (Virtual chat) Bastian agreed with Cibulka on PC recommending MOA to show support to individual boards. *Motion is below in another part of discussion.*

Draft MOA.

- a. **Feedback on draft document.** Cibulka reviewed the process the attorneys and staff have completed to create this draft of the MOA. Cibulka suggested going through MOA page by page to discuss.

Wetter asked what happened to the JPA/JPE. Cibulka stated that there were some attorneys who favored an MOA over a JPA but were able to add additional language that addressed some of the needs of those that preferred a JPA. This document is the compromise between an official JPA and MOA.

Burns pointed out that this MOA ends once project arrives to implementation stage. Burns asked if we would end the MOA and do a JPE or another MOA all over again for implementation. Cibulka replied that the PC will need to discuss that in the future and decide. Cibulka stated the MOA guides the planning phase so we will need to determine the structure of the implementation phase.

Discussion about open meeting law and virtual meetings. It was stated that PC representative would have to post their locations if they attended meetings virtually. Cibulka mentioned that PC members should work with respective attorney on open meeting law requirements and posting location if they are attending meetings virtually.

Discussion about voting threshold. Binsfeld pointed out that there was no voting threshold for PC stated in MOA. Cibulka responded there was some conversation between attorneys and staff that it wasn't needed. Burns asked if voting threshold would be in by-laws instead of MOA. Cibulka responded that by-laws could be a more appropriate place for voting thresholds, could be either document. Loewen stated that there is a voting threshold in draft by-laws which states super majority and simple majority specifications. Binsfeld asked if by-laws are accepted with the MOA and do by-laws need to get approval by all individual boards as well. Cibulka responded that the by-laws don't need individual board approval, PC can approve by laws for themselves. There was PC support for including voting requirements into by-laws.

Discussion about Page 4 “6. Administration Part C Adoption of Plan.” Cibulka asked Carlson to discuss topic of Clearwater River Watershed District (WD) and Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) about the “adopt and replace” item. Carlson stated they have received a letter from BWSR that they will be taking that to their board and discussing what they will be do regarding participating in planning partnership. Clearwater River WD may opt out of MOA and planning process because of the “adopt and replace” requirement from BWSR.

Burns asked for BWSR to comment on this discussion. Wozney from BWSR stated that the language about adopting and replacing wouldn't need to be in the MOA. Wozney stated particular the last sentence of Part C under Adoption of Plan. B. Schiefelbein stated that if Clearwater River WD must replace our watershed plan, we'll back out. If we can't use this as a supplemental to our watershed plan, we'll probably back out.

Cibulka asked if it's appropriate to move forward with this language in the MOA or should there be a modification to the language. Loewen suggestion to strike that last sentence in the “6. Administration Part C Adoption of Plan” section in MOA. Loewen stated “it's a unique sentence, it's not from BWSR template so it's not necessary.”

Johnson mentioned that Benton County has tabled the MOA until it's clean and the final MOA is ready to sign.

B. Schiefelbein and Burns supported changing the language in the “6. Administration Part C Adoption of Plan” section of MOA.

Motion by Wetter to remove the sentence “Each party will need to indicate in its resolution whether the plan will be supplemental to the party's water plan or will replace its water plan.” from, “6. Administration Part C Adoption of Plan in MOA.”, second by Tom Gregory. Affirmative: Johnson, Bastian, B. Schiefelbein, Burandt, Binsfeld, Gregory, Wetter, Burns, Danielowski, Saxton. **Motion carried.**

Motion by Jeff Burns for PC to recommend that individual boards approve the MOA with the language change in “6. Administration Part C Adoption of Plan” of MOA, second Mary Wetter. Affirmative: Johnson, Bastian, B. Schiefelbein, Burandt, Binsfeld, Gregory, Wetter, Burns, Danielowski, Saxton. **Motion carried.**

Discussion about Outreach Coordinator Position. Binsfeld asked if Clearwater River WD backs out, would we need to find a new outreach coordinator to take that role. Cibulka responded yes.

End of Draft MOA Discussion.

Consultant Interviews.

- a. Dan reviewed interview process, questions, and the reference checks.
- b. **EOR Interview**

Camilla Correll, P.E. - Senior Partner & Project Manager

Rosie Russell - Co-Project Manager

Presentation Overview:

- Diverse engineering firm with 60 employees. They practice natural solutions to problems, they don't want to overengineer plan and projects, wants to craft plan that fits social needs of the area.
- They plan to have routine meetings with BWSR and project coordinator to keep communication open.
- Most recent 1w1p completed - Hawk Creek Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan
- Recommended a 3-step phase process to planning
- They plan to have public participation throughout entire planning process
- Project kick off ideas- watershed tour/project tour, public open house, GIS story maps

- They mentioned public participation challenges and solutions to those such as calling locals. Recommended a stakeholder mapping process proposed for our MRSC planning process
- Recommended an activity to engage with public, Water Conversations: prioritize issues with smaller groups
- Mentioned socioeconomic and diversity issues in our watershed
- They recommended HSPF-SAMS for modeling best for our area, which they stated is best for agricultural heavy area
- They will use of graphics to display budget and allocations to certain areas and activities
- Mentioned that team and main contact could change throughout planning phase because of staff workloads. Correll will provide a resume for the alternate team members.

EOR Questions and Answers

Q: Gregory: "What's your most efficient way to get people to attend meetings and get people involved?"

A: Correll: "Calling people and reaching out to them in a personal way, a lot has to do with educating people, most people don't want to waste their time if they're not being heard. We find out who will be involved and who wants to, target people who will have a project that's in this plan."

Q: Wetter: "There's always problem with timeliness, how will you stay in track, and do you foresee any problems? How do you overcome those?"

A: Correll: "We have experience with planning, so we know what to expect if a problem were to arise, but we don't foresee any problems. We overcome problems by communicating with each group and committee."

Q: Wetter: "How do you deal with counties and entities conflicting with each other, fights between entities, power struggles?"

A: Correll "That's something new we'll have to deal with, we've never had power struggles in other plans. We will work through this by establishing those decision-making process, how many meetings are we going to have, what are the rules and process that we'll follow."

Q: Burns: "Would you both be involved in 1w1p planning process?"

A: Correll "yes, myself and Russell, we're here to represent this project."

Q: Burns: "How long has EOR been involved in planning process?"

A: Correll: "We've been representing watershed districts and planning since conception, writing watershed plans for a long time. We're familiar with the new tools and new data for these new modern/extensive watershed plans."

Q: Johnson "How would you explain 1w1p to an elected official that doesn't know what 1w1p is?"

A: Correll: "1w1p is about local resources and values than a WRAPS document that has more technical and numerical data and looking at an impairment. It's looking at what we need to do to clean up all these natural resources that cross jurisdictional boundaries."

Q: Burandt: "What do you expect from the PC so we are successful?"

A: Correll: "We expect that everyone is participating, making decision in a timely manner, helping write down experiences and local capacities, be up front about goals, review plan and helping write sections as we go."

A: Russell: "Make sure the plan is written in a way that is useful to you, it's important for PC and everyone to review plan throughout process."

Q: Binsfeld: "How are you going to work with local communities? Not just committees."

A: Correll: "Unless they are sitting on a committee or brought in by staff/PC, we wouldn't have time to work with them or contact them"

Q: Binsfeld: "How much time are you spending with the advisory committee?"

A: Correll: "It's a large amount of time, having meetings with them and collaborating between the two. We'll meet early on with TAC and then meet with LAC so TAC can help LAC work through processes and exercises."

Q: Burns: "Do you see any unique features in this watershed that might cause unique problems?"

A: Correll: "One thing is your WRAPS is being completed and we may have to incorporate that later in the process. St. Cloud is an interesting unique issue, working with MS4 permits and stormwater management. Being along the river is unique, a lot of recreation, wild rice communities, etc."

A: Russell: "There's more solar developments in this area, challenges with sandy soils. Biggest challenge could be setting those goals because it's so diverse."

Questions for Policy Committee from EOR

Q: Correll: "What challenges does the PC foresee?"

A: Schiefelbein "It's going to be tough to get people to come to meetings and participate. No one's heard of 1w1p and it's hard to get them to care."

Q: Correll: "Would you be open to modifying the team we purposed? Russell's schedule might change because of graduate school."

A: Binsfeld: "Can you forward us their skills and resume?"

A: Whole Policy Committee: "It depends on their qualifications."

Follow up: Correll will send Sommerfeld their resume and staff profile

c. ISG Interview Overview

Julie Blackburn- Project Manager + Content Oversight

Jacob Rischmiller- Main contact/Technical Project Manager

Sarah Boser- Project Coordinator + Facilitation

Presentation Overview: (PDF Available)

- Team has lots of local experience, knows the local community and has worked in the watershed for years
- Has done a total of 12 watershed plans, 7 1w1p plans
- Refined and streamlined planning process in phases
- Mentioned implementation table to work plan process. They pointed out challenges of making the implementation table useful and correlate with work plan in implementation.
- Mentioned that meeting fatigue is a challenge we'll face and being intentional about being productive is a way to solve that.
- Recommended ways to get meeting content before meetings so the focus is on making decisions at meetings.
- Marketing team and graphic designer for plan visuals. Reduce text in plans and simplify technical language.
- Discussed hydro conditioning modeling

- They have numerous innovative engagement tools and interactive online tools such as virtual open houses, jamboards, online surveys, and virtual meeting tools.

ISG Questions and Answers

Q: Gregory: "How will you get people involved in planning process?"

A: Blackburn: "Rely on marketing department, information that captures attention, online survey tools, pop up booths at farmers markets, all different kinds of ways to grab people's attention."

A: Boser: "We would have kick off meetings, virtual open houses is also an option"

Q: B. Schiefelbein: "Who would be the lead person?"

A: Blackburn: "Overall project person in charge, but Rischmiller is day to day contact, Boser would be making sure content is there and facilitation."

Q: B. Schiefelbein: "Will you come in within budget"

A: Blackburn: "Yes. Meetings are the expensive thing, so we try to reduce meetings. But you set the pace and develop content. If we need to add or change things, we are adaptable as well."

Q: Wetter: "How do you deal with counties and entities conflicting with each other, fights between entities, power struggles?"

A: Blackburn: "putting together principles of how we're going to make decisions. Figuring out how decisions are going to be made and stick to that. Once that's figured out, we re-enforce those principles."

A: Boser: "Also, being on top of facilitation and noticing when someone isn't getting their voice heard. Used tools such as fist of five, different activities for engagement."

A: Rischmiller: "If something we're doing at that moment isn't working, we'll actually change it on the fly to try a different strategy."

Q: Burns: "How many 1w1p have you, Sarah and Jacob, been a part of?"

A: Boser: "I was on the LGU side, went through 1w1p planning effort as staff, working on 2 1w1p right now. Been at ISG for 3 months"

A: Rischmiller: "This is my first 1w1p experience planning effort. Have been on multiple watershed comprehensive plans and developed other watershed plans."

Q: Johnson: "How would you explain 1w1p to an elective official?"

A: Blackburn: "1w1p doesn't follow jurisdictional boundaries. It provides the blueprint of how we're going to protect and restore the watershed across the landscape."

Q: Wetter: "Do you see anything right now that could create a bump in the road or challenge for our planning process?"

A: Blackburn pointed out the delayed timeline already. Cibulka responded that the group is looking at renewed timeline and had some conversations about extending grant.

A: Blackburn: "We'll try to condense all information that's out there and accelerating the development of the implementation table to shorten timeline. Hydro-conditioning might slow things down if there's a greater scope. Timing of completion of WRAPS and TMDL's might come into play and timeline."

Blackburn mentioned their internal note taking and internal communications is streamlined and efficient and that will help speed up work their team completes.

Q: Bastian: "How has your process changed from the first 1w1p plans to these newer ones?"

A: Blackburn: "We've framed up content at meetings to where people can just input their comments and inputs and we organize and put that content together. We also have taken lots of the words and put it into the graphics

to simplify plan and condense the content and speed up the process. We assemble data quickly and do a rapid assessment. We know where these plans are going, so we have that end vision, we just need to metrics and goals from you”

d. Discussion After Interviews

- a. Discussion about budgets.** ISG was over budget. PC recommended making the final budget amount and working with ISG to get to that amount. Carlson mentioned that PC could direct staff to progress on negotiation and bring back different costs and what was cut from proposal. Also, Carlson stated that you could ask the consultants how they would handle conflict in terms of facilitation. Because we probably won't be a technical issue, it'll be a facilitation issue.

Binsfeld- Favored ISG. She liked their experience with the area, how they presented, and Boser has facilitator. Concerned about EOR because they brought up a staff change in interview.

Gregory- Favored ISG

Danielsowski- asked staff opinions on ISG, will chose consultant based on groups majority which is ISG

Burns- Favored EOR, he liked how they'd engage the public, liked the layering of the watersheds in worksheets but could go with any.

Wetter- Favored EOR because she doesn't like that ISG is overbudget

Burandt- Favored ISG, feels they could adjust their budget and have capacity to do more engagement with public.

Johnson- Favored ISG

B. Schiefelbein- Favored ISG, but either one is fine, would go with EOR if staff didn't change throughout planning.

Bastian- Favored ISG. Likes their facilitation plan streamlining meetings and process.

Danielowski- Favored ISG, could go with either, will go with PC majority

Kerry Saxton- Favored ISG

b. Consultant Recommendation

PC is making a recommendation to Benton SWCD to select ISG as the plan writer and facilitator for Mississippi River St. Cloud Watershed planning partnership.

Next Meeting Date/Time.

Cibulka with send out a poll. Next step is to finalize MOA and get it out to individual boards. Benton SWCD to consider consultant at board meeting July 27th, 2022.

Cibulka adjourned the meeting at 2:59 p.m.