BWSR Plan Requirements

1. Executive Summary
2. Identification and Prioritization of Resources and Issues
3. Establishment of Measureable Goals
4. Targeted Implementation Schedule
5. Implementation Programs
6. Plan Appendix-Land and Water Resources Inventory
A. Plan Administration and Coordination
   i. Decision-making and Staffing
   ii. Collaboration with other units of Government
   iii. Funding
   iv. Work Planning
   v. Assessment and Evaluation
   vi. Plan Amendments
   vii. Organizational Structures or Formal Agreements
BWSR Plan Requirements
Decision Making and Staffing

“Describe how the partners will transition from a planning partnership to implementation of a watershed-based plan through description of roles and responsibilities of participating local governments.”

Current Roles
• Policy Committee
  – Decision Making
• Advisory Group(s)
  – Advising
• Services
  – Staffing

Future Roles
• Same or Different?
BWSR Plan Requirements
Organizational Structures of Formal Agreements

“List and briefly describe the organizational structures or entities that will be used to implement the plan’s projects and programs. Indicate whether these are existing entities or new ones”

Options

– Do Nothing
– Memorandum of Agreement
– Joint Powers Agreement
  • Entity
  • Collaboration
– Watershed District
– Others...
Timing

BWSR Operating Procedures

Local Adoption

“If so granted through a joint powers agreement, the adoption may be by a watershed joint powers entity. If no joint powers entity with the authorities of the local plan authority was created, each local government unit shall adopt the plan individually.”

Options

• Wait Until End
  — Every plan authority holds public hearing and approves

• During Plan Process
  — Create entity that has ability to host public hearing and approve plan
Examples

• Cedar River Watershed District
  – Justin Hanson, *Mower SWCD Manager and Cedar River Administrator*

• Root River 1W1P
  – Donna Rasmussen, *Fillmore SWCD Administrator*

• Greater Blue Earth River Basin Alliance (GBERBA)
  – Dave Bucklin, *Technical Coordinator*
CEDAR RIVER WATERSHED 462,295 ACRES

DODGE COUNTY
44,181 TOTAL ACRES
9.56% OF WATERSHED

STEELE COUNTY
4,781 TOTAL ACRES
1.03% OF WATERSHED

TURTLE CREEK
WATERSHED DISTRICT
97,471 ACRES
21.08% OF WATERSHED

CEDAR RIVER
WATERSHED DISTRICT
277,820 ACRES
60.47% OF WATERSHED

MOWER COUNTY
264,100 TOTAL ACRES
57.13% OF WATERSHED

FREEBORN COUNTY
149,233 TOTAL ACRES
32.28% OF WATERSHED

DEER CREEK
WATERSHED
18,848 TOTAL ACRES
4.08% OF WATERSHED

LITTLE CEDAR RIVER
AND OTTER CREEK
WATERSHEDS
59,800 TOTAL ACRES
12.94% OF WATERSHED

WAPSISSIPICON
RIVER
WATERSHED
8,264 TOTAL ACRES
1.78% OF WATERSHED
Dobbins Modeling and Assessments

Cedar River Watershed Monitoring and Assessment Report

TMDL
CEDAR RIVER WATERSHED
SWAT

HEC/HMS

Gridded Surface/Subsurface Hydrologic Analysis “GSSHA”

Dobbins Creek – SWAT Model
Agricultural Watershed Restoration Grant Project

Prepared For
Cedar River Watershed District
1440 20th Avenue Northwest
Austin, Minnesota 55912

Prepared By
HEBB Engineering, Inc.
781 Excelsior Avenue South, Suite 600
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55408

2010

Stream Assessment and Evaluation of Geomorphology

2012
The Local Partners

- Dodge SWCD
- Dodge County
- Freeborn SWCD
- Freeborn County
- Steele SWCD
- Steele County
- City of Austin

- Mower SWCD
- Mower County
- Turtle Creek Watershed District
- Cedar River Watershed District

*Yellow Highlight
Water Planning Administration Done by Mower SWCD
Cedar 1W1P Group Dynamics

• County
  – 4 Active
  – Levy Authority: Water Levy is limited to Funding of SWCD and matching Natural Resource Block Grant
  – Water is not a priority

• SWCD
  – 4 Active
  – No Levy Authority
  – Board is elected officials of members who are elected to do water resource work
Cedar 1W1P Group Dynamics

• Watershed District
  – 2 Districts
    • Turtle Creek WD: Drainage and Flooding focus
    • Cedar River WD: Flooding and Water Quality focus
  – Both have and use Levy Authority
  – Board members appointed by County Board to do special purpose water resource management

• City
  – 1 Austin
  – No traditional water planning
  – Charged with addressing $20+ Million Water treatment infrastructure upgrades
Proposed Organization Structure

- Memorandum of Agreement
- Board wants to operate as an advisory committee (less than that if they could)
- Fiscal agent and Day to Day to be Determined
- Local Water planning model
- Fiscal Agent would hold the funding and operate sub agreements to LGU’s “sponsoring” the projects
Cedar River Watershed
Root River
One Watershed One Plan (1W1P)
Governance

Donna Rasmussen
Fillmore SWCD
Cannon River 1W1P
November 8, 2017
One of five pilot projects statewide
Funding approved in June 2014
Policy Committee held its first meeting January 2015
Plan approved by BWSR December 2016
Governance

* Policy Committee held its first meeting January 21, 2015
  * MOA signed for planning phase
    * **Policy Committee**: 13-member decision-making committee; 6 County Commissioners, 6 SWCD Supervisors and the 1 Watershed District Board Manager (Crooked Creek)
    * **Advisory Committee**: state agencies, ag and conservation groups, non-profits to provide input for the plan and its priorities
    * **Planning Work Group**: Local water resource management staff from each of the participating local government units to coordinate the day-to-day development of the plan.
Governance discussion for implementation began August 31, 2015
Winona County Attorney was the lead
  * Other five county attorneys
  * MCIT

Three key questions:
  * What are the entity’s goals?
  * What authority do the individual boards want to maintain?
  * What authority are the boards willing to delegate?
Governance Concerns

* Strong resistance to forming another Joint Powers Board—no additional “layers of government.”
* Liability for projects, employees, etc.
* Whoever pays an employee is responsible for health insurance and other benefits.
* How to handle one of the members leaving the agreement.
* How will funds be received? Keep grant administration as simple as possible.

Outcomes:
* Support for either a Memorandum Of Agreement or a Joint Powers Agreement
* No support for a Joint Powers Board (Entity), watershed district or going it alone
A collaborative group formed for the purpose of advising and guiding the implementation of the watershed plan in a cooperative and cohesive manner; a framework for coordination and consistency for implementation, not a separate entity.

- Cites the Joint Powers statute (MS Chapter 471.59).
- Does not supplant or replace local land use planning or zoning authority.
- Liability caps in effect for the individual entities.
- Employees are the employees of the individual entities, not the group, therefore each member is liable for their own employees.
Joint Powers Agreement

Policy Committee:

* Each representative is subject to the authority delegated by their respective governing board.
* The representative has the authority to act on behalf of their board for:
  * Grant applications relevant for implementation of the plan
  * Review and approval of interim reports
  * Approval payments for grants
  * Approval of professional contracts
  * Voting on the recommended watershed plan for local review and comment
Fiscal agent:

- Appointed annually (currently Winona County SWCD)
- Accepts all fiscal responsibilities for grants applied for and received by 1W1P where no other fiscal agent is specified
- Perform financial transactions for contracts
- Provide Policy Committee with financial records
- Responsible for financial record retention
Day to day contact (currently Fillmore SWCD)

- Administrative responsibilities for ongoing planning and implementation
- BWSR and other grant reporting
- Assist Policy Committee with administrative details
- Maintain 1W1P website

Advisory Committee and Planning Work Group roles basically the same.

Implementation funding expected from BWSR in 2018.
Lessons Learned

* Governance and funding for implementation is a HUGE issue for LGUs
  * Governance structure is not as clear-cut as we would like: Joint Powers Agreement vs. Joint Powers Entity
  * Counties with multiple planning areas have anxiety about having more than one plan to implement
Thank you!
GBERBA Structure & Organization

"To lead implementation of scientifically-based conservation projects of natural resources within the Greater Blue Earth River Basin."

Dave Bucklin – Technical Coordinator
Member Counties
Blue Earth
Brown
Cottonwood
Faribault
Freeborn
Jackson
Le Sueur
Martin
Waseca
Watonwan

The Basin

www.GBERBA.org
The Policy and Executive Boards meet in a staggered, bi-monthly schedule.

The Executive Board may meet more frequently as necessary to implement administrative decisions and conduct pressing business.

Policy Board
1 Appointed County Commissioner & 1 SWCD Supervisor from each Member County

Executive Board
3 County Commissioners & 3 SWCD Supervisors elected by the Policy Board

Technical Committee
Member County & SWCD Staff

GBERBA Coordinators
Administrative, Technical & Financial Coordinators

GBERBA Staff
Watershed Coordinators & MAWQCP Certification Specialists

GBERBA Partners
Local, regional, and state agencies and organizations that provide advice and regulatory guidance to the Technical Committee

www.GBERBA.org
Financial Structure

- Each member County pays an annual due based on area within the Basin and population.
- GBERBA Coordinators are further funded through administrative allocations through competitive grants
- GBERBA Watershed Coordinators are funded through competitive grants
- Area Certification Specialists are funded through a grant from the MDA
Pros
+ Watershed Scale
+ Information Flow
+ Collaboration
+ Shared Services
+ Leverage
+ Relationships/Politics
+ Staff Input
+ Training Opportunities
+ Agency Interaction
+ No infrastructure

Cons
- Watershed Scale
- Structure Identity
- Timelines
- More Meetings
Our Focus

• Drainage
  – Implementation funding

• Watonwan River Watershed 1W1P

• Hydro-Conditioning
  – Up-to-date culvert inventory for field-scale BMP targeting

• Cover Crops & Alternative Tile Intakes
Questions?

• Cedar River Watershed District
  – Justin Hanson, *Mower SWCD Manager and Cedar River Administrator*

• Root River 1W1P
  – Donna Rasmussen, *Fillmore SWCD Administrator*

• Greater Blue Earth River Basin Alliance (GBERBA)
  – Dave Bucklin, *Technical Coordinator*
Check-In

• What information do you as a Policy Committee member need?
• How could our Cannon River 1W1P efforts fail?
• What does success look like?
Wrap Up

• Open communication
  – Among members, staff and the Boards you represent

• Continued participation
  – Great progress so far, we need everyone to make this a success