Cannon River
One Watershed, One Plan

"Aligning local water planning on major watershed boundaries with state
strategies towards prioritized, targeted and measurable implementation plans"

Minutes
Policy Committee Meeting
March 13, 2019
Rice County Government Services Building
320 Third St NW, Faribault, MN 55021

Policy Committee Members: Brad Anderson (Goodhue County), Kevin Chamberlain (Dakota SWCD),
Doug Christopherson (Waseca County), Mike Ludwig (Rice SWCD), Rick Gnemi (Steele County), Cletus
Gregor (Le Sueur SWCD), Dan Hansen (Steele SWCD), James Hedeen (Belle Creek WD), Jeff Beckman
(Goodhue SWCD), Galen Malecha (Rice County), Keith Morgan (Waseca SWCD), Mike Slavik (Dakota
County), Steven Rohlfing (Le Sueur County), James Brady (Steel County)

Also in Attendance: Brad Behrens (Rice County staff), Haley Byron (Waseca County staff), Ashley
Gallagher (Dakota SWCD staff), Eric Gulbransen (Steele SWCD staff), Beau Kennedy (Goodhue SWCD
staff), Holly Kalbus (Le Sueur County staff), Shaina Keseley (BWSR), Dale Oolman (Steele County staff),
Steve Pahs (Rice SWCD staff), Glen Roberson (Goodhue SWCD staff), Mark Schaetzke (Waseca SWCD
staff), Mike Schultz (Le Sueur SWCD staff), Brian Watson (Dakota SWCD staff), Jennifer Mocol-Johnson
(BWSR)

1. Call to Order
Chair Rohlfing called the meeting to order at 9:02 am.

2. Approval of Agenda
Motion by Gnemi, second by Anderson to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
Motion by Malecha, second by Gnemi to approve the minutes of the January 23, 2019 Policy
Committee meeting. Motion carried.

4. Invoices for Payment
Gallagher mentioned that the fiscal agent, Rice SWCD, will be processing the amendment for an
additional $12,000 from BWSR. This as well as the full use of the contingency funds is reflected
in the updated budget column.

Motion by Hansen, second by Gnemi to recommend approval of invoices for payment.
Motion carried.
5. EOR Work Change Order
Change order is warranted due to extra work required on the water storage goal and the
measurability of the goals in order to meet Plan Content Requirements. The contract amount
would be increased by $9,000 and the deadline would be extended to September 2019.

Motion by Anderson, second by Hansen to approve the change order. Motion carried.

6. Updates on the Joint Powers Agreement
A number of entities have signed the JPA. This includes, Le Sueur County, Le Sueur SWCD, Rice
County, Rice SWCD, Steele County, Steel SWCD and Waseca SWCD. Goodhue County and SWCD
plan to have a joint meeting to discuss the JPA in April. Dakota County, Dakota SWCD and
NCRWMO are waiting on a decision from BWSR on Watershed Based Funding (WBF) policy for
the 7-county metropolitan area. Depending upon how the policy is written, it may influence
these entities to choose between the metro 1W1P process and the greater Minnesota 1W1P
process. It is anticipated that BWSR Board decision would be made in August 2019.

Dakota SWCD expressed that their intent is to sign the JPA and continue to be a partner. An
example of what may influence the decision for Dakota SWCD would be if metro process brings
more funds to the Cannon River Watershed portion of the county than the greater Cannon
1W1P process, and BWSR does not allow Dakota SWCD to access both funding sources. Brian
Watson is participating in the BWSR focus groups for gathering input on the WBF policy in order
to make recommendations to BWSR Board.

Timeline may align for BWSR WBF policy decision and anticipated Pan approval. BWSR staff may
even have a recommendation before August. The Plan would likely be approved by BWSR Board
in August, then would come back to the Cannon River Watershed Joint Powers Board (CRWJPB)
for adoption.

7. Implementation Vision
A. Purpose, Mission and Vision
B. Administration
An update was provided on options for day-to-day and fiscal roles. The Planning Work
Group (PWG) supports Dakota SWCD continuing as the day-to-day but feel a Plan B is
needed in case Dakota SWCD does not sign-on to the CRWJPB. As stated earlier, Dakota
SWCD intends to be a part of the CRWJPB but is waiting for a decision from BWSR on WBF
policy for the 7-county metropolitan area. The other overarching question is whether day-
to-day and fiscal roles remain separate or combine. Roles were originally separated for
checks and balances while operating under an MOA. The CRWJPB would have some built
in checks as they are subject to audit and most grant sources have extensive grant
oversight. The PWG supports both options and may be a question of workload and
efficiencies.

This transition period from plan writing to plan implementation is a gray area, until the
CRWJPB is formed and making decisions. A number of questions were raised:
• From a staffing standpoint, is it possible to combine roles, does Dakota SWCD have the capacity? Would need to be analyzed, but most likely feasible. Experience with other organizations shows that combining roles increase some efficiencies. Comment that capacity of many SWCDs is limited and taking on roles could require hiring.

• Is there an understanding of the amount of time needed for day-to-day and fiscal roles? We are entering new territory and much will be figured out as we go, but we can look to others. Estimated the Root River staffing requirements for day-to-day on 1W1P is about ¾ staff time. Discussion on absorbing ¾ time could be difficult with follow-up comment that it could be a shifting of duties from water planning to 1W1P.

• Would the PC be willing or able to craft a resolution to go to BWSR in support of WBF policy for the metro area that would allow flexibility? BWSR stated that WBF policy may come down to what is fair access to funding sources, should some have access to 3 while others only have access to 2. No discussion on a possible resolution, it was mentioned again that Brian Watson is participating in the focus groups and can bring some of these concerns forward. Comment that having metro participation in this and future 1W1P Planning efforts would be beneficial to the watershed, and a JPB is an entity that can help make the dial move on water quality.

• There was not much discussion on legal counsel, besides that this will need to be determined going forward. Rice County may be interested in continuing this role.

C. Bylaws

Staff began to compare the JPA to possible bylaw items. The JPA is very good and covers many items. It is possible that the CRWJPB may not need bylaws. The JPA states that bylaws may be adopted but does not say they must be adopted. This will have to be further explored with the PWG and PC members.

Comment that bylaws would be a good place for the purpose, mission and vision that are being developed. It would also be good to make the flow of money clear, having items like this in the bylaws is easier than having them in the JPA as bylaws can be internally changed. Workplanning was mentioned and is a process laid out in the Watershed Plan, the CRWJPB would adopt the workplan. Approving contract and establishing a process for doing so was also mentioned. Comment that it would be best to accomplish tasks with the least number of agreements, but there needs to be enough agreements that roles and process are clear. PC gave direct to the PWG to research what may be needed in bylaws.

D. To Do List

The last slide in the presentation on the purpose, mission and vision had a good list of items that will need to be addressed moving forward. This list includes:
• Cost-share policies
• Sub-agreements
• Programs
• Roles
• Project selection criteria

PC asked staff to send the list to PC members via email so that they could have time to process these items.

8. Adjourn

Motion by Gnemi, second by Slavik to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 10:25 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Galen Malecha, Secretary
Cannon River Watershed 1W1P Policy Committee