

## Minutes

# Rum River Watershed Comprehensive Management Plan – Implementation Planning Committee Meeting

---

Date: June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Time: 12:30-2:30 PM

Location: Virtual, Zoom

Meeting called by: Planning Partners

Type of meeting: Work Planning Meeting

Facilitator: Tiffany Determan

Note taker: Molly Clyne, Mille Lacs SWCD

Date: June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024

### Attendees:

#### Voting members:

Kyle Fredrickson, Aitkin SWCD  
Jamie Schurbon, Anoka SWCD  
Emily Forbord, Benton SWCD  
Tiffany Determan, Isanti SWCD  
Lydia Godfrey, Isanti SWCD  
Dan Cibulka, Sherburne SWCD  
Lynn Gallice, Mille Lacs SWCD  
Molly Clyne, Mille Lacs SWCD  
Susan Shaw, Mille Lacs SWCD  
Perry Bunting, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe  
Shannon Wettstein, Morrison SWCD

#### Advisory Members:

Barb Peichel, BWSR

#### Other:

Mitch Brinks, Maps by Mitch

1. **Welcome and Introductions** led by Tiffany Determan, Isanti SWCD
2. **Planning Team Updates (INFO)**
  - a. **Administration**
    - i. **Budget:** For the current budget, Schurbon showed that 86% of it has been encumbered, and 21% has been spent. Most of the unencumbered remaining funds are in the Stormwater BMP activity. As of now, we've made \$11k in dividends in our bank account, which are unrestricted funds of ours. The FY25 funds will be in the account soon. Schurbon also noted that we are coming up on the end of Q2 and encourages partners to send in their invoices. He'll also send out a reminder for the invoice due date.
    - ii. The Q2 work plan will be going to the JPE board next, as all projects were voted "fund" by partners.
  - b. **Implementation Tracking** There were no updates on implementation tracking.
  - c. **Education and Outreach**
    - i. **Type A:** Godfrey told the group about the "Fix Your Eroding Shoreline" webinar which she put on with Lynn Gallice as the speaker. 32 people registered, and 8 people attended live. It was recorded, and the recording is on the one drive as well as on the Isanti SWCD YouTube Page. She also noted that there will be an upcoming Soil Health Field Day at Braun's Market in Pease on August 5<sup>th</sup> from 5:30-7:30pm. The team is sending out promotional materials this week as well as getting speakers together. Additionally, the September JPE Board Meeting will feature project tours in Isanti.
    - ii. **Type B:** Clyne described some of the different teams she is working to organize. She is organizing an agriculture tech team for ag techs and ag-adjacent (including outreach) people to begin meeting semi-regularly to facilitate resource sharing, get to know partners, and coordinate projects, activities, and outreach. She asks for partners to reach out if interested. Additionally, she is working on getting the Rum RIM team back together. She sent out a doodle survey to get preferred dates to the partners who usually go to these meetings but reach out if you did not receive this email and wish to participate. The Local Forestry Team is another group she is working on organizing and will discuss what that group is about later in the meeting. She discussed work for the LCCMR project next, in which she described the plan writer workshop that she held a few weeks back. It went very well, and Clyne noted that it is a good step to improving relationships between SWCDs and private plan writers. Additionally, there will be a Tree Planting Open House on August 1<sup>st</sup> at the Sunken Ship Brewery from 5-8pm. Information and materials will be sent to partners soon.
3. **Rum River RAQ by Mitch Brinks**
  - a. Mitch Brinks showed the Rum River RAQ scoring he's been working on. Anything 10 acres or more was scored. In addition to the RAQ score and mapping tool, he will be providing us with a landowner data sheet. The data sheet provides information like names and addresses for mailing list. There's also physical property info and it breaks the RAQ scoring down for each property, and a lot more useful information. He used the

standard list for the “quality” part of RAQ scoring based upon available data sets, as well as the five that were added from partner requests. In the webapp tool, you can search by name or parcel number to find an individual location, and you can also use the query feature to filter certain aspects you wish to target.

**Discussion:**

Cibulka asked if information like landowner names or land value will change automatically. Brinks said that the information in the webapp and spreadsheet are static but can be updated – updates require Brinks to go and grab the parcel data from the county. Cibulka commented that it may be a good idea to update the tools every year or so.

Fredrickson posed an idea on having a status option that can flag parcels that were contacted by partners for outreach, projects, etc., so we do not recontact the same people for the same thing. Brinks said that it is possible, but after discussion on feasibility from partners, it was decided that at least for now, partners should track that information themselves. The group can discuss later if there continues to be an interest in having a feature like that.

**4. Rum River Local Forest Technical Team Overview**

- a. Clyne gave a presentation on the Rum River Local Forestry Technical Team, of which she is the Coordinator. She discussed the history of its establishment, how it relates to the Landscape Stewardship Plan and the 1W1P, and why forestry is important in relation to water management. Additionally, she discussed the mission of the LFT, some potential responsibilities and goals, members, and why it’s important. She also noted that the LFT can be what partners want it to be. It is to help promote forestry and landscape stewardship in our watershed, so the partners will shape it. She asked partners to confer with their teams, see if they want to have a role in the LFT or be kept in the loop, and to think about their district’s long-term forestry plans. Clyne will continue to have the LCCMR sub-group of the LFT meet and is working on getting a larger LFT meeting set up.

**5. FY25 WBIF Work Plan**

- a. Determan noted that we’ll should expect to receive the FY25 funds as early as July. She encouraged partners to feel confident and comfortable about the budget so at the June 27<sup>th</sup> JPE board meeting, we can have the board approve our work plan.
- b. On the 45-day review for the work plan amendment, Determan noted that the boards she heard from did not have any concerns. She did not hear from all partners on board discussions. The review period has ended.
- c. Determan walked the group through the FY25 work plan. Determan noted that the FY25 Plan is similar to the FY23, in that it is loaded with staff time. The JPE board noted that they want to see more funding for projects. It was noted that with there being less Clean Water funds for staff time, there is a shift to using WBIF funds for that.

**Discussion:**

*Administration:* Determan noted that for Administration, we can allocate up to 10% of the budget for that work, which came from the Comprehensive Plan. The FY25 work plan had less than 10%. Partners discussed the time and costs associated with administering this grant to

determine if money should be shifted. Partners agreed that we should put a full 10% into Administration, so talk turned to where in the work plan to take those funds from. \$10k was taken from Ag Practices and \$10k was taken from Planning and Assessment, giving a total of \$20k to Administration, which still puts it under the max 10%.

*Forestry:* Partners working on the forestry policies determined that there is a need for additional talks between the partnership and BWSR before we continue to delve too much into practices. The work plan line on Forestry will be kept for now if we can come to a consensus on policy, but if we cannot, the funding for that line can be shifted to a different one.

*Staff time and Match:* Partners discussed whether staff time towards these meetings can be counted as match. Wettstein mentioned that some other watersheds do that. Discussion then shifted to how the budget would change if we implemented it as match. Determan posed that it could be an equal reduction in match across line items. She asked Peichel to confirm that this is a possibility before June 20<sup>th</sup>, and Peichel said she will work on it. If this gets confirmed by BWSR, Determan would send out a proposal to the partners asking for agreement or disagreement of the adjusted match. She asked partners to send her an email if they have any preferences or thoughts for the match components. Partners discussed that it may be possible for partners to request reimbursement for the meeting and prep times rather than using staff time as match; most partners preferred to use it as match.

*Tracking:* Peichel asked the group to be thoughtful in the work plan when looking at the goals and proposed outcomes of the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that partners should be tracking regarding the ten-year goals. BWSR is asking partners to be thoughtful of that so it can be easier for our 5-year and 10-year reporting.

**6. WBIF Policy Updates (DISCUSS/DECIDE)**

- a. Determan will send out the link for policies so partners can see what's changed/been updated. She asks partners to take time to review it and see if any red flags pop up and if there's anything that needs to be discussed further. The goal is to get a draft in front of the JPE board on June 27<sup>th</sup> to gauge how comfortable they are with the updated policies.
- b. **Forestry:** More conversation is needed for forestry practices policy.
- c. **Wetland Restorations:** The group did not have time to discuss.

**7. Other**

**8. Wrap up & Next Meeting:**

- a. The next JPE meeting is on June 27<sup>th</sup>. The September JPE meeting will be a tour of practices in Isanti, more details to come.

**9. Adjourn**