

OUTCOMES:

Rum River Watershed Comprehensive Management Plan – Implementation Planning Committee Meeting

Date: February 13th, 2023

Time: 12:30-2:30 PM

Location: Virtual Meeting **Zoom Meeting**

Meeting called by: Planning Partners

Type of meeting: Work Planning Meeting

Facilitator: Tiffany Determan

Note taker: Lydia Godfrey, Isanti SWCD

Attendees:

Voting members:

Jamie Schurbon, Anoka SWCD
Sam Seybold, Aitkin SWCD
Tiffany Determan, Isanti SWCD
Lydia Godfrey, Isanti SWCD
Talisha Zimmerman, Isanti County
Perry Bunting, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe
Susan Shaw, Mille Lacs SWCD
Lynn Gallice, Mille Lacs SWCD
Dan Cibulka, Sherburne SWCD

Ex-officio members:

Barb Peichel, BWSR
Darren Mayers, BWSR
Robert Pennington, Mille Lacs County

Other:

Jake Janski, Mille Lacs SWCD, JPE Board Representative
Chris Jurek, Sherburne SWCD, JPE Board Representative

Welcome and Introductions led by Determan.

Updates

- At the last JPE meeting the board approved the project policies.
- The grant agreement has been executed.
- Godfrey will create an orientation sheet about the Rum River Watershed Partnership for new IPC and JPE members.

Education and Outreach Work Plan

Godfrey went through the Type A outreach items listed in the Draft Education and Outreach Plan. Actions in the work plan were developed by the education and outreach subcommittee and were informed by the Comprehensive Plan as well as the partnership's annual work plan. Godfrey highlighted the priority levels of actions, and noted that low priority items will be deleted. Partners should review low priority items on their own and provide comments if there is an item that should not be removed from the plan.

Shaw explained Type B outreach items, and the goals set for it. Shaw provided additional details in the Forestry Practices section and the RRWP Awareness section. Partners should review the actions in the outreach plan and notify Godfrey or Shaw before the next IPC meeting of any questions or concerns.

Discussion

Peichel asked for elaboration on what a factsheet would look like, such as the format and depth. Godfrey replied it depends on what is needed, however for factsheets she is in favor of simple but eye-catching PDFs. A variety of preexisting materials may be gathered too such as PowerPoints, word documents, etc.

Seybold questioned if people believed animated videos work better than traditional videos. Godfrey explained the animated videos tend to be more eye catching and seem to be shared more by partners which produces higher views.

Cibulka suggested creating a logo or uniform branding, such as a color scheme, that can be used in materials created for the watershed. Many partners were in favor of the idea, and it will be explored.

Cibulka mentioned the Employees Association has an Education Grant Program that could provide an additional source of funding for the outreach items.

Janski questioned if there were broader efforts to pool generic resources to prevent individual watersheds or LGUs from creating their own. BWSR has had conversations to figure out how to pool resources. Peichel reported the 1W1P coordinator at BWSR has recently set up a Minnesota portion of the Confluence which is an online network where information can be shared. Not many people have begun using it but there is interest.

1st Quarter Project Submission Q and A

Determan relayed that lots of projects have been submitted and nearly half the money has been requested. A summary of the questions so far and their answers were sent to the IPC. Schurbon reminded members they should group entries as much as possible to reduce paperwork. Like projects for the same tier of waterbodies should be grouped, for example multiple forestry projects around Mille Lacs Lake should be grouped. Members can refer to the work plan to see what category a project falls into.

Determan reminded the group that in the future, as the partnership learns, they may find a way to make project submissions simpler. Similarly, a Statement of Work must be filled out for each line item, but the way it is supposed to look may change as the planning team works with the attorney. The Statement of Work is what the JPE board will see.

Members should include a contingency in their project requests, so if prices change, they do not need to put in an additional request to the board.

Discussion

Gallice asked how much detail needed to be included in the "Project Deliverables and Description" column of the ranking sheet. Schurbon said the description should be brief but detailed.

Cibulka questioned if, along with a project development request, members should submit requests for the projects they hope will come instead of waiting to submit for funding later. Determan replied it was a case-by-case decision, and it depended on how confident members are they will get projects.

In the work plan it discusses initial funding targeted to certain priority waters. Cibulka asked when funding would

be opened up to other tier 1 and 2 waters. Determan replied that wording was a way to provide partners with the first access to funding for projects submitted while forming the work plan. This is something that may change in future work plans since it brings up questions.

Remaining funding will be discussed at the next IPC meeting.

Next Steps

February 20th is the deadline for project submissions. Determan will send out a reminder. There will then be a period for partners to review projects and make their recommendations.

Next meeting: Next meeting will be on March 13th over Zoom. The meeting schedule is the 2nd Monday of each month from 12:30 – 2:30pm. Meetings can be canceled as needed.